

Cultural Resources Specialist Report for Gila National Forest

Travel Management Rule Implementation, DEIS

October, 2010

**Erin Knolles, Gila NF Assistant Forest Archeologist
Jeanne Schofer, Gila NF North Zone Archeologist
Bob Schiowitz, Gila NF South Zone Archeologist
Chris Adams, Gila NF East Zone Archeologist
Gail Firebaugh-Smith, Gila NF Forest Archeologist**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Cultural History and Affected Environment/ Existing Condition	3
II.	Methods	5
III.	Effects on Cultural Resources	12
IV.	Tribal Consultation, Land Uses, and Socio-economic Effects	32
V.	References	38
Appendix A:	Laws, Regulations, and Policies for Cultural Resources	41
Appendix B:	Glossary of Cultural Resource Terms	45
Appendix C:	Acronyms Used in This Report	48
Appendix D:	Gila NF TM Risk Analysis Procedure	51
Appendix E:	List of Current and Foreseeable Projects for Cumulative Effects Analysis	55
Appendix F:	List of Gila NF Cultural Resource Projects 1980 to present.	Disc

I. CULTURAL HISTORY AND AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/EXISTING CONDITION

GILA NATIONAL FOREST (Gila NF) HISTORY:

The Gila National Forest has a rich archaeological and cultural history. The Gila NF includes lands that have been used and occupied by humans throughout the prehistoric era, beginning with the Paleoindian Period (<9,500 B.C. -5,500 B.C) (ARMS 2009). Paleoindian peoples were highly mobile hunters and gatherers who hunted megafauna (now-extinct large mammals such as mammoths) (Cordell 1997). The Archaic Period (5,500 B.C. -A.D. 200) follows the Paleoindian Period (ARMS 2009). Archaic peoples were also mobile and relied on hunting and gathering. However, this is the period in which people began to rely more on plants, and horticulture began (Cordell 1997). The Mogollon Culture (A.D. 200-A.D. 1400) spanned about 1,200 years during which people relied more on horticulture, followed by predominance of agriculture. Pottery and more permanent dwellings (pithouses, A.D. 200-A.D. 1000, and then pueblos, A.D 1000-A.D.1400) were hallmarks of the period (ARMS 2009; Cordell 1997; Diehl and LeBlanc 2001; Martin 1979). Phases of the Mogollon Culture are primarily defined by pottery and dwelling types (see Anyon and LeBlanc 1984; LeBlanc 1980a; LeBlanc 1980b; Lekson 1992; Berman 1989; Martin and Rinaldo 1950). The Mogollon people are the most widely studied on the Gila NF. Most prehistoric sites found on the Gila NF are Mogollon, including habitation remains in the form of pithouses or masonry dwellings; roasting pits; lithic (stone) and pottery artifact scatters; some agricultural features like check dams; cultural landscapes; etc.

The historic period began in New Mexico with Spanish contact in 1539. On the Gila NF and elsewhere in New Mexico, the historic period is divided by the rise and fall of political control by the Spanish (A.D. 1539-1821), Mexican (A.D. 1821-1848), and American (A.D. 1848-present) periods (Opler 1983). From the Spanish Period through the first several decades of the American Period, the goal of each political entity was to secure safe passage through this area and/or provide access to its resources for mining, ranching and grazing. During the American Period, overlapping interests of Apache peoples and settlers of the area led to conflict between the two groups. Eventually, the U.S. Government turned to the removal of Apache peoples to reservations. Most resisted as long as possible, but eventually most Apache Tribal people were removed to several reservations within and outside New Mexico (Opler 1983).

Contemporary and historic land uses include mining, ranching, grazing, logging, frontier settlement, frontier military activities, and government land management. Evidence of these activities persists in the archaeological record today in the form of the remains of forts, cabins, corrals, windmills, abandoned mines, military reservations, water wells, irrigation ditches, check dams, bridges, sawmills, homesteads, historic roads and trails, and Forest Service administrative sites. Other site types include rancherias, camps, battle sites (Indian Wars in particular), and trash dumps. Since the establishment of the Gila NF in 1905, ranger stations, administrative sites, lookouts, and recreational areas have been built as well. Finally, Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) associated camps and infrastructure like roads, bridges and campgrounds are found on the Gila NF.

Today, land use in the Gila NF continues to follow the multiple use mission of the Forest Service (FS), including grazing, mining, ranching, and vegetation and fuels management. Native American tribes also continue to intermittently use the Gila NF for traditional activities including plant gathering and visits to special places. A very few places on the Gila NF are recognized by Tribes as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), though none have been identified in the Travel Management project area.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT:

For the past thirty-five years or more, Forest Cultural Resource Specialists (Archeologists), in compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, have inventoried about 384,267 acres (11.6%) of the Gila NF's 3.3 million acres to professional standards. A total of approximately 5,932 cultural sites are in Gila NF electronic databases, which contain the best available baseline information for known cultural resources and archeological surveys on Forest.

For the Gila NF and Region 3 of the Forest Service, a cultural resource site is defined as "a locus (location) of purposeful human activity which has resulted in a deposit of cultural material beyond one or a few accidentally lost artifacts." (USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 1987. FSH 2309.24, pp. 2-3). Please see page 5 of this document for an expanded definition. In practical terms, cultural resource sites include things like ancient pueblo structures, broken pottery sherds, grinding stones, arrowheads or other stone tools scattered on the ground, rock walls, or the remains of historic homesteads or mines.

On the Gila NF, eight sites or groups of sites known as Districts are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); 1,118 sites have been determined eligible for the NRHP, and 294 have been determined ineligible. The other 4,512 sites are unevaluated for NRHP eligibility, and must be treated as if they are eligible until an official determination is made in consultation with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Unevaluated sites require further study before it can be determined whether or not they are eligible to the NRHP.

II. METHODS

CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA)

In lieu of using the 36 CFR 800 regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act (http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title36/36cfr800_main_02.tpl and <http://www.achp.gov/docs/nhpa%202008-final.pdf>, respectively), the Forest is complying with this law by following the USDA-Forest Service Region 3 Protocol regarding Section 106 consultation for Travel Management Route Designation (TM Protocol) (USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico SHPO; Appendix I; 2007). The TM Protocol is Appendix I of the Southwestern Region Programmatic Agreement (PA) between SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and USDA-Forest Service. Both the Cultural Resource PA and TM Protocol streamline and standardize the Section 106 consultation process for Forests in Region 3, including the Gila NF. For example, the Protocol stipulates that in some cases archaeological surveys will not be required or can be conducted at less than 100% coverage. In many instances, the Protocol also eliminates the need for prior consultation with SHPO for sample surveys.

The TM Protocol exempts existing road prisms and associated constructed features (culverts, ditches, etc.) from Section 106 compliance and consultation. In the protocol, it is agreed that impacts to cultural resource sites may have occurred when these roads were created, and that disturbance from continued use of these roads is acceptable if the portion of the site within the road has already been disturbed to a substantial degree. Therefore, cultural sites or portions of sites within road prisms and/or associated constructed features are exempt from further consideration and consultation, resulting in an overall determination of No Adverse Effect for the TM project.

TM activities considered new undertakings under NHPA will go through NHPA Section 106 compliance per R3 PA, TM Protocol or 36CFR800 before they appear on the Motorized Visitor Use Map (MVUM). These include: designation of motorized dispersed camping (MDC) corridors, areas, and routes such as adding unauthorized routes to the National Forest road and trail system, re-opening closed roads, and converting closed roads to NFS trails. If potential effects to cultural resources are identified, they will be addressed by the Forest in consultation with SHPO. Under the TM cultural resource Protocol, the TMR NEPA decision can be signed based on existing cultural resource data. Additional cultural surveys and compliance may be phased up to three years after the decision has been signed.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Definition of Cultural Resource Sites:

For the Gila NF and Region 3 of the Forest Service, a cultural resource site is defined as "a locus of purposeful human activity which has resulted in a deposit of cultural material beyond one or a few accidentally lost artifacts." (USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 1987. FSH 2309.24, pp. 2-3) Under this Forest Service handbook definition, cultural resources that qualify as sites should exhibit at least one of the following:

- a. One or more features (defined as non-portable items made, modified, or manipulated by humans, including hearths, prehistoric and historic architecture, trash middens, walls, bedrock mortars, agricultural check dams, fences, corrals, "rock art", etc.)
- b. One formal tool if associated with other cultural materials, or more than one formal tool;

OR

- c. An occurrence of cultural material that contains one of the following:
 1. Three or more types of artifacts;
 2. Two types of artifacts or materials in a density of at least 10 items per 100 m²
 3. A single type of artifact or material in a density of at least 25 items per 100 m²

Boundaries of cultural resource sites include all features, tools, identifiable activity areas and all areas of cultural material exhibiting a density of ten or more cultural items per 100 square meters. These criteria may be modified, where appropriate, based on a professional archaeologist's judgment. Isolated occurrences (IOs) are loci of human activity that do not meet site criteria and are considered not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places.

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Eligibility:

A cultural resource site is included in or considered eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Evaluation of a site's eligibility involves considering the property's age and significance in the context of its integrity. To be considered historic, a property must generally be at least 50 years old. A property's significance relates to its association with events, patterns, persons or characteristics that were important in the past, including the lives of important individuals, significant history, historic or prehistoric landscapes, and engineering/architectural achievements. A site may also be considered significant if it has the potential to yield scientific information through archaeological investigation. A significant cultural resource site that is eligible to, or listed on the NRHP, is termed an "historic property". Integrity is defined as the degree to which a site retains its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (USDI-National Park Service; Cultural Resources; Interagency Resources Division. 1990. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>).

NRHP eligibility recommendations are made for every cultural site found during recent Travel Management inventories, and must be concurred with by New Mexico SHPO to be official. Cultural sites located in past cultural resource survey areas may or may not have been evaluated for NRHP eligibility, and the majority of sites on the Gila NF are currently unevaluated.

DATA

Information for this analysis was gathered using the most current data available from the Gila National Forest electronic Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database, FS Heritage INFRA, as well as hard copies of Gila NF site records.

Cultural Resource Sites:

The Gila NF cultural resources data set includes 5,932 sites in the corporate GIS layers. This database was built primarily using site data from within the Gila NF's external administrative boundaries shown in the New Mexico Archaeological Records Management Section (ARMS) database.

There are certain discrepancies and limitations in the State data that was used to build the Gila NF corporate layers. Since all ARMS sites located inside the Forest's external administrative boundaries were used to build the database, a number of cultural sites included in the database are located on State lands, private land inholdings, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and National Park Service (NPS) lands. Some sites that were transferred from ARMS did not have FS site numbers. These sites were given temporary FS numbers by the state which included the number '99' in place of the Ranger District

identification number. Some of these sites are duplicates of existing FS sites, some are on non-Forest land and others are sites that, for one reason or another, were never given FS site numbers. There are about 625 '99' sites within the GIS database.

Other discrepancies with ARMS data include duplications or errors for known sites, site numbers, site locations, and incorrect information in fields such as NRHP site eligibility. In the case of NRHP eligibility, data from GIS indicates that the Forest has about 47 National Register Listed sites, which is incorrect. The FS Heritage INFRA database shows 8 cultural sites (or NRHP Districts containing multiple sites) as Listed on the NRHP. For the purposes of this analysis, the remaining sites were placed on the NRHP undetermined list, though this has not yet been adjusted in the Gila corporate GIS layers.

Sites that are ineligible to the NRHP are not included in this analysis because the Forest Service and all Federal agencies are not required to consider the effects of their projects on ineligible sites. There are 294 ineligible sites in the Gila NF GIS database. All sites that are listed, eligible, or unevaluated/undetermined for the NRHP are included in this analysis regardless of whether they were identified through cultural resource survey or other means. In evaluating effects of Alternative B (No Action), cultural sites located in existing non-motorized areas on the Gila NF (wilderness and other special areas) were removed from consideration because TM designations and effects will not occur in those areas.

Surveys:

The Gila NF cultural resources survey data set was built from digitized survey maps in hard copy survey reports. Although comprehensive cultural resources surveys started in 1974 on the Gila NF, professional standards have changed for cultural survey transect width over time within New Mexico and Region 3 of the Forest Service. Cultural resource surveys dating from 1980 and later, and those where survey methods were intensive, are considered to meet current professional standards, and were used for this analysis (USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 1987. FSH 2309.24–Cultural Resources Handbook. Chapter 10–Survey Standards, page 5). This date range encompasses the largest number of surveys and data likely to be adequate by current standards. Overall, there are approximately 384,267 acres of previous heritage survey meeting these criteria, or approximately 11.6% of the Gila NF land base.

Determination of Cultural Survey Needs:

Appendix I of the Region 3 First Programmatic Agreement (PA) between New Mexico SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and USDA-Forest Service regarding Section 106 consultation for Travel Management Route Designation allows for sample survey in areas of National Forests where known site density is low. All other areas (i.e. high site density) require intensive 100% cultural resource survey.

Gila NF heritage specialists developed criteria for high and low site density based on empirical analyses of data from previously surveyed areas of the Forest, and the frequency of known sites by elevation and slope. Once site frequency was determined, site density was calculated according to acres in elevation and slope categories across the Gila NF. These densities were then used to determine which locations would require intensive cultural survey or sample survey for the Travel Management project.

ANALYSIS

The purpose of cultural resource analysis for Travel Management is to gather data to determine the effects of this project on cultural resources on the Gila National Forest, and how these effects may be addressed to minimize or eliminate them.

Background Assumptions:

- Cultural resource sites adjacent to motorized access including cross-country, routes, areas, motorized big game retrieval, and motorized dispersed camping corridors, may provide easier access with potential for existing, ongoing, or new disturbances from recreational activities like motorized camping.
- Some data suggest that cultural sites located near routes may be more susceptible to looting (Spangler 2006).
- On the Gila National Forest, most cultural sites exhibit some level of vandalism or looting, so the presence of this type of disturbance is not necessarily related to access provided by motorized routes or motorized dispersed camping.

Measures:

Motorized Routes:

To assess the effects of designating motorized routes, variations in miles/acres among TM Alternatives were analyzed for the presence of overlap or intersection between motorized routes and heritage resource sites. When evaluating routes, the effects of parking adjacent to roads were also considered, where applicable. GIS provided data on the number of cultural sites, the number of total acres, the number of acres surveyed to standard and total miles per Alternative for comparison.

Routes were analyzed to 10ft either side of the centerline for trails, and roads to 50ft either side of centerline. These distances were selected to encompass where disturbances are known to occur in road and trail prisms, to be consistent with distances used by other resource analyses for TM, and to account for adjacent roadside parking. These distances are not used for cultural surveys and NHPA compliance, which instead follow the requirements of the Region 3 TM Protocol for 7.5 meters from centerline for motorized trails and existing roads, and 30 meters from centerline for new road construction.

Assumptions:

All routes within Forest boundaries were used in Motorized Route analysis. These include US highways, State highways, and county roads. While the FS has no jurisdiction on these roads, they are adjacent to FS lands and recreationalists may park on them in order to access FS lands. This may directly or indirectly impact cultural resources near these roads.

Analysis of motorized routes combined both FS roads and trails, because direct and indirect effects from these routes are similar in nature.

Motorized Dispersed Camping (MDC) Corridors and Areas:

To assess effects from the designation of motorized dispersed camping corridors and Areas, variations were analyzed among Alternatives for the number of acres available for motorized camping, the number of heritage sites in each MDC corridor and Area, the number of acres of previous survey meeting current professional standards, and existing site condition for corridors and Areas.

Analysis of MDC corridors covered 300ft either side of road centerlines. GIS provided data on corridors, and a random sample of 300 additional sites was taken from sites not outside corridors or motorized areas for the Risk Analysis (described below).

For Areas, GIS provided information on the number of acres surveyed to standard and the total number of acres in Areas per Alternative. A GIS search of Areas was performed to determine the number of known sites per Alternative.

Motorized Big Game Retrieval (MBGR):

To assess effects from designation of motorized big game retrieval corridors, variations among Alternatives were analyzed for overlaps of MBGR corridors with known heritage resource sites, and the number of acres available for MBGR per Alternative. This information was evaluated in the context of potential MBGR disturbance, calculated from New Mexico Game and Fish harvest records for 2006 through 2009, the number of vehicle trips used to retrieve game, vehicle size, type of animal being harvested and number of days in the hunt season (Gila NF travel management EIS project record).

Risk analysis:

A process was developed to assess existing impacts to cultural resource sites located within TM project areas and motorized dispersed camping corridors (see Risk Assessment in Appendix D). The objective of this process is to identify direct, indirect, and potential cumulative effects to cultural resources as a result of Travel Management designation under various Alternatives.

Specialists used the risk assessment to: 1) evaluate condition of cultural sites visited for the travel management project; and 2) evaluate condition identified in hard copy records for previously recorded cultural sites located in MDC corridors and throughout the Gila NF. Site condition was assessed for most known sites in proposed motorized dispersed camping corridors, and a random sample of known sites Forest-wide.

Federal undertakings authorized by the Gila NF's Land Management Plan and other authorized Forest projects are carried out in compliance with NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act. Therefore, effects to cultural resources resulting from these projects are (or have been) addressed under these laws, regulations, and policies. There may be some effects to cultural resources that occurred prior to passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, or prior to its implementation in the Forest Service in the 1970s. Effects to some cultural resource sites Forest-wide have not yet been documented due to (1) sites are not located in project areas requiring cultural resource survey under NHPA; and (2) sites fall into the 88.4% of the Forest that is still unsurveyed for cultural resources.

To assess site condition for the Risk Analysis, heritage specialists determined how many and which sites overlap with Areas and motorized dispersed camping corridors per Alternative. Sites with missing site records and sites evaluated as Not Eligible for the NRHP were not included in this assessment. This left 722 remaining sites which were analyzed using hard copy site files. An additional 300 sites were randomly selected across the Forest and outside all proposed TM designations, for comparing the No Action Alternative with Action Alternatives. These sites were randomly selected using GIS from both high and low site density areas throughout the Gila NF, excluding motorized dispersed camping corridors, and existing non-motorized areas on the Gila NF (wilderness and other areas restricting motorized vehicles). In total, heritage resource specialists reviewed 1,022 sites for risk analysis.

Because site records for previously recorded sites vary in the extent to which they meet current professional standards and the degree to which site condition is documented, especially as it relates to motorized camping and vehicle impacts, data collected on site conditions from site records is variable and limited. Limitations of this analysis method may affect results. Sites may not have been visited in several years; site reports may not contain information specific to this analysis; and site conditions may

have changed. Site documentation was considered adequate when the site report included detailed information on the site as well as site maps. Full Laboratory of Anthropology site records are found in site files beginning the early 1990s. Heritage specialists determined the adequacy of site documentation for each site (Tables 1 and 2). For MDC corridors analysis, 52-55% of sites within Alternatives C, D, F, and G were reported as having adequate site documentation. Only 47% were reported adequate for Alternative B. All sites within Areas for Alternatives C, F, and G were reported as having adequate site documentation.

Table 1: Adequacy of documentation for previously recorded sites within MDC corridors.

Adequacy of Site Documentation	B	C	D	E	F	G
Adequate	470 (46%)	370 (52%)	226 (54%)	N/A	307 (52%)	263 (55%)
Inadequate	549 (54%)	346 (48%)	191 (46%)	N/A	285 (48%)	219 (45%)
Total	1019	716	417	N/A	592	482

Table 2: Adequacy of documentation for previously recorded sites in Areas.

Adequacy of Site Documentation	B	C	D	E	F	G
Adequate	470 (46%)	3 (100%)	N/A	N/A	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Inadequate	549 (54%)	0 (0%)	N/A	N/A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1019	3	N/A	N/A	3	3

Scoring:

Risk analysis measures cultural site condition. A site’s score is based on 29 elements within four categories: road-site intersection or overlap, camping disturbance, authorized activities, and unauthorized activities (see Appendix D). Each site can be placed into one of four levels of impact depending on its score (Table 3).

Table 3: Risk Analysis Impact Levels (Also see Appendix D).

Impact Level	Number of Points
No effect	0 points
Low	1-3
Moderate	4-6
Severe	7+

Risk Analysis Elements for Effects Assessment:

For MDC, heritage specialists specifically looked for impacts such as dismantling site structures for campfire rings or using cultural materials in campfires, the presence of one or more campfire rings,

presence of modern trash, user-created ruts outside of existing road prisms, use of structural stone in campfire rings, and camping impacts that appear to be less than 10 years old.

For unauthorized activities on Forest, heritage specialists specifically looked for evidence of looting, modern graffiti, pot hunting, collectors' piles, the removal of structural stone from features, natural erosion or bioturbation, human-created non-motorized trails (foot, equestrian, etc.), and wildfire.

For authorized Forest activities, site records were examined for impacts to cultural resources by construction and development (primarily roads and associated engineering features such as culverts, bridges, etc.), grazing, range/wildlife habitat improvement, erosion relating to construction/development and grazing activities, fences, utilities, formal foot or equestrian trails, and prescribed fire/vegetation management projects.

For motorized routes, cultural sites were ranked by the number of roads that intersect or overlap with the site. Effects from all roads were examined, including those considered exempt under the Travel Management protocol (USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer. 2007. Appendix I, p. 69-70).

III. EFFECTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

For all Alternatives, cultural resources (heritage resources) have been analyzed with respect to potential effects from four issues: motorized routes, motorized dispersed camping (MDC), motorized big game retrieval (MBGR) and motorized areas. Because not all cultural surveys for TMR have been completed, existing survey data and known sites are used in this analysis.

EFFECTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES:

Roadside Parking:

For all alternatives, vehicles will be able to park adjacent to roads within one vehicle length for dispersed camping purposes and other outdoor activities. The Forest Plan has always allowed this type of roadside parking, so there is no change from current condition. In addition, roadside parking is exempt from Section 106 consultation under the TM Protocol, because continued motor vehicle use is considered acceptable where the integrity of cultural sites has already been disturbed and compromised (Appendix I, Stipulation II.C.; USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer. 2007).

While Section 106 consultation is not required for roadside parking, it was analyzed within motorized routes. Roadside parking has potential to cause direct and indirect effects to cultural resources near roads. Direct effects may include, but are not limited to, vehicles driving over cultural sites causing disturbance to features and artifact displacement. In wet weather or sensitive soils, vehicles may cause rutting, compaction, and erosion which could disturb cultural deposits. Indirect effects of roadside parking may result from parking within walking distance of a site or within a site boundary, which can lead to dispersed camping in cultural sites, looting (opportunistic, inadvertent or purposeful), graffiti, and other site damage or destruction.

These effects may occur in all alternatives, but are correspondingly reduced as miles of designated roads are reduced. All Action Alternatives will substantially benefit the condition of cultural resources on Forest by greatly reducing miles of roads and roadside parking as compared to current conditions open to cross-country travel. Many fewer cultural resources will be subject to indirect effects from roadside parking, because parking may occur only along designated roads.

EFFECTS COMMON TO ALTERNATIVES C, D, E, F, AND G

Motorized Cross-Country Travel Prohibition:

Motorized cross-country travel is prohibited under all Action Alternatives. This means that vehicular off-road travel will not be permitted, except in appropriate MDC corridors, areas, or for MBGR. Vehicles must stay in the confines of routes or corridors for driving; access outside of these routes will be reduced to foot traffic or other authorized access (equestrians, pack animals, special uses, for example).

Studies in California, Utah, and National Parks demonstrate that off-road vehicle travel can result in direct and indirect effects to cultural resources (Long et al. 1999, Sampson 2007, Schiffman 2005). These can include, but are not limited to, vehicular contact with site features, artifact scatters and cultural deposits, deliberate or opportunistic looting, rutting or trail creation, and artifact collecting.

These studies cover much smaller areas than the Gila NF, with much more concentrated use of off-highway vehicles, and different environmental conditions than those found on the Gila NF.

On the Gila NF, prohibiting cross-country travel under Action Alternatives would be highly beneficial to cultural resources by reducing ease of access to sites located in areas that do not have designated routes. This would considerably reduce the potential for direct and indirect effects from motorized use. The potential risk of other indirect effects associated with recreational use of FS lands may be reduced because access would be limited to non-motorized traffic. Foot traffic off routes can result in some indirect effects like looting or camping within a cultural site (Schiffman 2005). However, limitations on vehicle use are cited as one way to protect cultural resources (Spangler et al. 2006).

EFFECTS FROM MOTORIZED ROUTES:

Motorized Routes provide ease of access to Gila NF lands and the cultural resources located within them. Reduction of miles/acres of motorized routes and prohibition of cross-country travel are highly beneficial to cultural resources by reducing the number of cultural resources exposed to direct and indirect effects of motorized vehicle use.

Analysis of routes focused on comparing existing conditions (Alternative B) of routes and cultural sites with the number of miles/acres proposed per Alternative, and the number of cultural sites within areas of potential effect for trails (10’ either side of center line) and roads (50’ either side of center line). These widths (buffers) represent land that may be disturbed by motorized use authorized under this decision, including roadside parking. Table 4 shows the number of known sites with NR status per alternative.

Table 4: National Register Status of cultural sites located in each Alternative.

NR Status	B (# of Sites in Buffered Route Prisms)	C	D	E	F	G
Eligible	385	378	316	277	336	337
Unevaluated	887	882	766	633	793	790
Not Eligible	88	86	75	71	77	77
Listed	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total Number of Sites	1362	1348	1159	983	1208	1206
Total Number of Sites Analyzed w/o Not Eligible	1274	1262	1084	912	1131	1129

Alternative B:

Alternative B has about 5,320 miles/63,726 acres of routes (Table 5). There are 1,274 known sites within these routes. Types of potential direct and indirect effects are discussed below, and these types of effects will be the same for each alternative.

Cultural sites found within buffered route acres and cross-country travel acres for Alternative B may be at risk for direct affects related to vehicular contact. Vehicles may be driven over sites causing disturbance to features and artifact displacement. In wet weather or sensitive soils, vehicles may cause rutting, compaction, and erosion which could disturb cultural deposits.

Additional direct and indirect effects of motorized route designation include activities that recreationalists may participate in once they have reached their destination. These may include, but are not limited to, dispersed camping, fuel wood collection, hiking, etc. These kinds of activities may result in damage, dismantling or scavenging of historic or prehistoric sites for structural materials that can be used for fire rings or wood for fire; deliberate or opportunistic looting and artifact collecting; graffiti on historic and/or prehistoric features; and mixing of modern trash litter with historic artifacts or collection of historic trash mistaken for modern trash.

Also, use of vehicles within sites may cause vegetation to become disturbed, thereby exposing soils. This may cause erosion which can displace artifacts and cultural deposits.

Table 5: Summary of miles, acres, and number of sites by Alternative for motorized routes.

Alternative	B	C	D	E	F	G
Changes in Route System in Miles	0	412	515	468	501	502
Miles of Existing Routes	5,320	4,941	3,648	3,011	4,029	4,006
Total Miles	5,320	5,353	4,163	3,478	4,530	4,508
Change in Number of Miles of NFS Motorized Routes Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		+0.6%	-21.7%	-34.6%	-14.8%	-15.3%
Acres for Routes	63,726	62,268	48,796	41,769	52,677	52,430
Change in Number of Acres of NFS Motorized Routes as Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		-2.3%	-23.4%	-34.5%	-17.3%	-17.7%
Known Cultural Sites	1274	1262	1084	912	1131	1129

Change in Number of Known Sites within NFS Motorized Routes as Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		-0.5%	-15.0%	-28.4%	-11.2%	-11.4%
---	--	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Effects Common to Alternatives C, D, E, F, AND G:

Motorized Route designation effects are common to all alternatives, however, the number of cultural sites that may be at risk will change as cross-country motorized travel is restricted, and the number of miles/acres and sites are reduced. Beneficial effects will increase as cross-country travel is prohibited and route mileage/acreage is reduced. Prohibition of cross-country travel should reduce indirect effects to cultural sites, especially erosion and rutting. Closure of routes may promote natural reclamation of the routes themselves. As miles/acres of routes close, indirect effects like looting and camping-related impacts should also decline as sites outside the route system will be harder to access.

Alternative C:

Changes under Alternative C result in 5,353 miles/62,268 acres of routes. This is a 0.6% increase in miles from Alternative B, but a decrease of 2.3% in acreage. Although the mileage for Alternative C is greater than Alternative B, most of the additional miles are proposed new trails which are narrower. Therefore, the available acreage for routes is less. There is 0.5% decrease in number of known sites from Alternative B (Table 5). Alternative C does not allow cross-country travel.

Possible types of direct and indirect effects seen in Alternative B are the same in Alternative C, but there is less potential of risk for such effects to a fewer number of sites given the prohibition of cross-country travel. Also, the prohibition of cross-country travel should provide beneficial effects to those cultural sites outside of routes. Effects to cultural sites outside the route buffers are considered in sections on motorized dispersed camping, motorized big game retrieval and areas.

Alternative D:

Changes under Alternative D result in 4,163 miles/48,796 acres of routes, which are a decrease of 23.4% in miles and a decrease of 23.4% in acres from Alternative B. There is a decrease of 15.0% in number of known cultural sites from Alternative B (Table 5).

Alternative D provides less access to sites than do Alternatives B and C (Table 5). Possible effects are the same, but the potential for these effects is decreased greatly from Alternative B because access to sites is greatly reduced given the prohibition of cross-country travel. The potential for effects and access to sites is decreased from Alternatives C.

Beneficial effects of this alternative increase from Alternatives B and C because the number of sites outside of routes also increases. These cultural sites should not be exposed to direct vehicular impacts. Because the numbers of miles/acres have decreased from Alternatives B and C, cultural sites that are located farther from the route system should also see a decrease in indirect impacts. This should occur because access to these sites would be reduced to widely dispersed foot traffic and some other authorized access (like equestrians and pack animals).

Alternative E:

Changes under Alternative E result in 3,478 miles/ 41,769 acres of motorized routes. This is a decrease of 34.6% in miles and a decrease of 34.5% in acres from Alternative B. There is a decrease of 28.4% in the number of known sites from Alternative B. Alternative E does not allow cross-country travel. When compared to Alternative B and all other alternatives, changes in Alternative E result in the least number of miles/acres for routes, which equates to the least access to cultural sites both within the route system and outside of routes (Table 5).

While the types of effects remain the same as Alternative B, the reduction in miles in Alternative E should decrease the potential risk of direct and indirect effects to cultural resources. Alternative E should provide the most beneficial or protective effects to cultural sites. A much smaller number of cultural sites (Alternative E's 912 vs. Alternative B's 4,774) would have potential to be affected by direct vehicular impact. Sites outside of Alternative E's buffered routes should not be exposed to this type of impact through this action. The reduction of miles/acres would reduce overall access to sites outside the route system decreasing the potential for indirect impacts to cultural sites outside the route system.

Alternative F:

Changes under Alternative F result in 4,530 miles/52,677 acres of routes. This is a decrease of 14.8% miles and a decrease of 17.3% acres from Alternative B. There is a decrease of 11.2% of known sites from Alternative B (Table 5). Alternative F does not allow cross-country travel.

Alternative F greatly reduces access to sites when compared to Alternative B because of the prohibition of cross-country travel. Alternative F provides less access to sites than C, but an increase from Alternatives D and E (Table 5).

The types of effects for Alternative F are the same as Alternative B and all other alternatives, but the potential for effects to cultural sites in Alternative F should be greater than in Alternatives D and E less than Alternatives B and C. The beneficial effects of Alternative F are higher than in Alternatives B and C, but a decrease from Alternatives E and D.

Alternative G:

Changes under Alternative G result in 4,508 miles/52,430 acres of routes, a decrease of 15.3% in miles and a decrease of 17.7% in acres, when compared to Alternative B. There is an 11.4% reduction of known sites from Alternative B (Table 5). Alternative G does not allow cross-country travel.

This alternative is very similar to Alternative F in access to sites, but provides more access than Alternatives E and D; and less access than Alternatives B and C (Table 5). The effects for Alternative G would be the same as in all other Alternatives, but the potential for effects should be greater than in Alternatives E and D; comparable to Alternative F; and less than in Alternatives B and C. The beneficial effects of Alternative G are higher than in Alternatives B and C; comparable to Alternative F; but a decrease from Alternatives E and D.

MOTORIZED DISPERSED CAMPING CORRIDORS

Motorized Dispersed Camping (MDC) corridors may be allowed up to 300 feet on either side of designated roads. These corridors are meant solely for the purpose of motorized dispersed camping. This means driving into a camping spot, setting up camp, and using that camp as a base from which to recreate. This is a traditional use of places adjacent to Forest System roads. Corridors would not be available for unrestricted motor vehicle use. Unless covered by previous complete survey from 1980 or

later, all camping corridors with high cultural site density will receive 100% survey of the total 600 foot corridor (300 feet on either side of the road’s centerline). Sample survey will take place in camping corridors with low site density. All previously recorded sites within the camping corridors will be revisited. All sites located within proposed camping corridors will be assessed for existing disturbances and continued risk potential. Individual camping corridors will not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map until Section 106 compliance and consultation is complete.

Alternative B:

Alternative B allows motorized dispersed camping on 2.44 million acres of Gila NF lands (Table 6). There are about 4774 known cultural sites within this area.

Table 6: MDC Corridor Acres Available by Alternative; Change in Number of Acres Expressed as Percentage of Alternative B; Number of Sites per Alternative; Change in Number of Sites Expressed as Percentage of Alternative B.

Alternative	B	C	D	E	F	G
# of Acres Available	2.44 million	110, 780	85, 921	0	104,390	95,994
Change in Number of Acres of MDC Corridors Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		-95.5%	-96.5%	-100%	-95.7%	-96.1%
# of Known Cultural Sites	4,774	806	474	0	670	546
Change in Number of Known Cultural Sites within MDC Corridors Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		-83.1%	-90.1%	-100%	-86.0%	-88.6%

Cultural resources located near or within places available for recreation, like MDC, may have potential for direct and indirect effects relating to that type of recreation. In some cases, cultural resources within recreational locations like MDC have ongoing potential for disturbances related to that activity. Therefore, it is assumed that cultural resources near or within MDC corridors may have a potential risk of new or ongoing recreational disturbances.

A risk assessment study was conducted for a sample of the total 4,774 sites. This risk assessment was used to identify general trends in impacts from MDC to known sites within each Alternative. The sample included 1,019 (about 21.3%) of known sites in the portion of the Gila NF open to motorized camping in

Alternative B. This sample includes 719 sites analyzed for camping corridors in all Alternatives and an additional 300 sites located outside camping corridors. Therefore, each total given for analyzed sites per alternative is a subset of the 1,019 analyzed for Alternative B (Table 7). A literature search of hard copy site records was conducted for these sites to determine their condition at time of recording. This information was then used to determine the known effects of motorized dispersed camping (see Methods Section).

Table 7: NRHP Status of Sites within Corridors; Number of Sites used in Analysis; Number of Sites used in Literature Search with percentage per Alternative. () indicates percentage of numbers of sites within corridors that were analyzed through the literature search.

NR Status	B	C	D	E	F	G
Eligible	1008	212	139	0	180	147
Unevaluated	3755	594	335	0	490	399
Not Eligible	277	63	42	0	60	46
Listed	11	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Sites	5,051	869	516	0	730	592
Total Number of Known Sites in Corridors	4,774	806	474	0	670	546
Total Number of Sites Analyzed for Risk	1,019 (21.3% of all known sites)	716 (88.9%)	417 (88.0%)	N/A	592 (88.4%)	482 (88.3%)

There are limitations to this analysis method that may impact results. The literature search is based on information collected over a period of more than 30 years for timber sale, range improvement, road maintenance and other projects where recording the effects of motorized dispersed camping may not have been paramount. Limitations include the fact that sites may not have been visited in several years; site reports may not contain information related to this analysis; and site conditions may have changed. Heritage Specialists recorded whether site documentation was adequate for each site based on the completeness of site records. To be considered complete, the documentation should have included a full description of the site, site condition, and site maps. In addition, the year of site recording was sometimes considered. A site that had not been visited in 20-30 years may have been adequately documented at the time, but the lack of more current information warranted a determination that documentation was not adequate.

Adequate site documentation was reported for about 51.7% to 54.6% of sites within Alternatives C, D, F, and G. About 46.1% were reported adequate for Alternative B (Table 8).

Table 8: Adequacy of Site Documentation by Alternative for hard copy Literature Search of site records.

Adequate Site Doc.	B	C	D	E	F	G
Yes	470 (46.1%)	370 (51.7%)	226 (54.2%)	N/A	307 (51.9%)	263 (54.6%)
No	549 (53.9%)	346 (48.3%)	191 (45.8%)	N/A	285 (48.1%)	219 (45.4%)
Total	1019	716	417	N/A	592	482

Cultural sites located where motorized dispersed camping could occur may be directly affected by vehicular contact. Vehicles may be driven over sites causing disturbance to features and artifact displacement. In wet weather or sensitive soils, vehicles may cause rutting and erosion that could disturb cultural deposits.

Additional direct and indirect effects of motorized dispersed camping relate to camping activities that may include, but not be limited to, dismantling or scavenging historic or prehistoric sites for structural materials that can be used for fire rings or wood for fire; deliberate or opportunistic looting and artifact collecting; graffiti on historic and/prehistoric features; and mixing of modern trash litter with historic artifacts or collection/removal of historic trash mistaken for modern trash.

Also, use of vehicles within sites may cause vegetation to become disturbed, thereby exposing soils. This may cause erosion which may displace artifacts and cause impacts to cultural deposits.

MDC effects are common to all alternatives. However, the number of sites impacted by these effects would change as the number of acres and sites per alternative also change. The risk assessment is used to show these trends. The result of this risk assessment study for Alternative B shows that of the 1,019 sites, 104 show impacts attributable to camping, while 919 have no such impacts.

Beneficial effects would increase as acres available for MDC are reduced and MDC corridors are designated. Reducing MDC to specific corridors would help reduce the potential of direct and indirect effects and access to cultural sites. Sites located outside MDC corridors should benefit from this action because vehicles would not be allowed to drive outside the corridor except for MBGR or special use.

Table 9: Sites with MDC Impacts per Alternative from Literature Search.

Sites with MDC Impacts Only	B	C	D	E	F	G
No Impact	915	634	363	N/A	527	421
Low, Moderate, or Severe Impacts	104	82	54	N/A	65	61
Total Sites	1019	716	417	N/A	592	482

Alternative C:

Changes under Alternative C result in about 110,780 acres available for MDC corridors, a reduction of 95.5% in acres from Alternative B (Table 6). This is a reduction of 83.1% from the number of known sites

within Alternative B. Alternative C limits vehicular access to sites within MDC corridors. The number of cultural resources having potential for direct and indirect effects related to MDC is reduced from 4,774 to 806 known sites, when comparing Alternative B to C.

The types of direct and indirect effects seen in Alternative B will remain the same in Alternative C. However, with the reduction in acres available for MDC, there is less potential risk for such effects.

Common to Alternatives C, D, E, F and G, there is a potential for more concentrated motorized use within MDC corridors. This could increase the potential risk of direct and indirect effects to sites within corridors.

Common to Alternatives C, D, E, F, and G, sites outside of MDC corridors may see a reduction in potential for direct and indirect effects of MDC as driving will be restricted to the corridors. Cultural sites will benefit from this action as vehicular impacts should not occur outside of camping corridors, except in cases of road-side parking, Areas, and MBGR. This may reduce potential risk for direct and some indirect effects of MDC. Access to sites outside these corridors should be limited as walking or stock animals will be the only modes of transportation. Controlled vehicular access to sites has been shown to protect cultural resources (Spangler et al. 2006).

The number of sites reported having Low, Moderate, or Severe MDC Impacts in Alternative C is 82 (Table 9). This is a slight reduction from Alternative B. The types of impacts to sites in Alternative C are the same as in Alternative B, but the risk analysis does show a general trend in reduction of number of sites with these types of impacts.

Alternative D:

Changes under Alternative D result in 85,921 acres for MDC corridors, a reduction of 96.5% from the acres in Alternative B (Table 6). This Alternative also has a reduction of 90.1% from the number of known sites within Alternative B. Both are a great reduction from Alternative B and a moderate reduction from Alternative C. The number of cultural resources that have the potential for direct effects from vehicles and indirect effects related to camping is greatly reduced from Alternative B and moderately reduced from Alternative C. Alternative D further reduces access to sites within and outside corridors, which will benefit cultural resources.

The types of direct and indirect effects seen in Alternatives B and C will remain the same in Alternative D. However, with the reduction in acres available for MDC and number of known sites, there is less potential risk for such effects.

The risk assessment indicates that about 54 sites in Alternative D show Low, Moderate, or Severe MDC impacts (Table 9). This is a great reduction from both Alternatives B and C.

Alternative E:

Changes in Alternative E result in No MDC corridors (Table 6). This would be a 100% reduction in acres and known sites from Alternative B. This alternative provides the least access to cultural sites of all Alternatives. Dispersed camping may still occur because of roadside parking, but no driving should occur elsewhere. Potential effects related to camping would still occur in Alternative E. However, because there are no associated MDC corridors this risk should be greatly reduced from all other alternatives, especially Alternative B.

Alternative E should provide the most beneficial effects to cultural resources. Direct and indirect effects from vehicular access to sites should not occur outside of roadside parking.

Alternative F:

Changes in Alternative F result in about 104,390 acres for MDC corridors, a reduction of 95.7% from Alternative B (Table 6). There is a reduction of 86.0% from the number of known sites in Alternative B. This alternative reduces acres to MDC and, therefore, access to sites when compared with Alternatives B and C, but increases acres and access when compared to Alternatives D and E. Alternative F provides some beneficial effects given the reduction in number of sites that could potentially be at risk for direct and indirect effects, but these beneficial effects are not as great as in Alternatives D and E.

The types of direct and indirect effects will remain the same in Alternative F as in Alternative B. With the reduction of access from Alternatives B and C, there is less potential risk for such effects. With the increase of access from Alternatives D and E, there is more potential risk for these types of effects.

The risk analysis reports that about 65 sites had Low, Moderate, or Severe MDC Impacts (Table 9). This is a great decrease from Alternative B, a moderate increase from Alternative C, and a moderate increase from Alternative D.

Alternative G:

Changes to Alternative G result in about 95,994 acres for MDC corridors, a reduction of 96.1% from Alternative B (Table 6). This is a reduction of 88.6% from the number of known cultural sites from Alternative B. This alternative reduces access to sites when compared to Alternatives B, C, and F, slightly increases access from Alternative D, and greatly increases access from Alternative E. Alternative G provides beneficial effects given the reduction in number of sites that could potentially be at risk for direct and indirect effects, but these beneficial effects are not as great as in Alternatives D and E.

The types of direct and indirect effects will remain the same in Alternative G as in Alternative B. With the reduction of access from Alternatives B, C, and F, there is less potential risk for such effects. With the increase of access from Alternatives D and E, there is more potential risk for these types of effects.

The risk assessment analysis shows that 61 sites from those analyzed for Alternative G have reported Low, Moderate, or Severe MDC Impacts (Table 9). This is comparable to Alternative F, a decrease from Alternatives B and C; and an increase from Alternative D.

MOTORIZED BIG GAME RETRIEVAL

Motorized Big Game Retrieval allows hunters to retrieve downed animals using cross-country travel. Hunters cannot hunt from their vehicles, so they are limited to using the vehicle for retrieval. Because this action is limited, seasonal, and occurs over a vast area, the probability of any one cultural site being driven over by any one hunter is minimal, even in Alternative B. Therefore, this action poses only a slight potential of risk to cultural resources.

However, this activity provides limited ease of access to Forest lands and cultural resources located within them. Each Alternative has a proposed distance for MBGR. The reduction in acres for this activity will directly relate to reduction in number of cultural resources having potential risk of direct and indirect effects associated with MBGR. Analysis for MBGR focused on the number of acres proposed per

Alternative and the number of known cultural sites, compared to the number of potential acres of disturbance from MBGR activities (Gila Travel Management DEIS Project Record 2010).

Table 10 displays the number of known sites present in proposed MBGR areas for each Alternative. Sites that are Listed on, considered Eligible, or are Unevaluated for the National Register of Historic Places are addressed in the following analysis.

Table 10: Presents the number of known cultural sites per Alternative within the proposed designated distance for MBGR.

NR Status	B # sites (No Limit)	C # sites (1 mile)	D # sites (300ft along Designated MDC corridors)	E # sites (No MBGR)	F # sites (1/2 Mile)	G # sites (300ft along Designated MDC corridors)
Listed	6	5	0	0	4	0
Eligible	1009	994	139	0	926	147
Unevaluated	3759	3608	335	0	3250	399
Not Eligible	277	226	42	0	208	46
Total Number	5051	4833	516	0	4388	592
Total w/o not eligible	4,774	4607	474	0	4180	546

Alternative B:

Alternative B allows unlimited motorized access for game retrieval on 2.44 million acres containing 4,774 known sites. Disturbance acreage/year was not determined for Alternative B (Table 11). However, general information led to an estimation compared to Alternative C. For Alternative B, game retrieval is not limited by any species or distance from road. In the current condition, there are no guidelines on how to use the retrieval vehicle. A hunter is allowed to take any route through the Forest to get to the downed animal. This is not the case in Alternative C where species and distance from road are limited. Also, Alternative C provides guidance on how hunters should use retrieval vehicles. This provides some indication that disturbance acreage would be slightly larger than that seen in Alternative C.

Table 11: Acreage Available for MBGR; Change in Number of Acres of MBGR Expressed as a Percent of Alternative; Possible Acreage Disturbance/Year; Number of Known Sites within MBGR areas; Change in Number of Known sites of MBGR Expressed as a Percent of Alternative.

Alternative	B	C	D	E	F	G
Acreage Available for MBGR	2.44 million	2.08 million	85,921	0	1.50 million	95,994
Change in Number of Acres of MBGR Expressed as a		-14.8%	-96.5%	-100%	-38.5%	-96.1%

Percent (+or-) of Alternative B						
Possible Disturbance Acreage/year		4,852.5	220	0	953.3	220
Known Sites within MBGR areas	4,774	4,607	474	0	4180	546
Change in Number of Known Sites within MBGR Expressed as a Percent (+or-) of Alternative B		-3.5%	-90.1%	-100%	-12.4%	-88.6%

These figures also provide some indication of the types and amounts of potential risk to cultural resources within areas that allow MBGR. Vehicles may be driven over sites causing disturbance to features and artifact displacement. In wet weather or sensitive soils, vehicles may cause rutting, compaction, and erosion which could disturb cultural deposits. The nature of MBGR should not bring about continued use of a vehicle in one place. There is also potential for disturbance of vegetation within a site, causing erosion which may displace artifacts and impact cultural deposits. Under this Alternative, MBGR does provide access to remote places on the Forest, which has the potential to result in deliberate or opportunistic looting and artifact collecting.

If an animal is killed near or on a site, hunters could potentially displace artifacts, features, or cultural sediments while dragging or dressing the animal. Dressing the animal within the site could attract other animals to the site causing bioturbation.

Alternative C: 1 mile from roads, elk, deer, bear, mountain lion, javelina and antelope

Changes to Alternative C limits motorized retrieval to six species within one mile of open roads. About 2.08 million acres are available for MBGR, a reduction of 14.8% of Forest lands available for this action and a reduction of 3.5% of known sites when compared to Alternative B. Possible total disturbance acreage per year is about 4,852.5 acres (Table 11).

Possible types of effects to cultural resources in Alternative C are the same as Alternative B. Alternative C does limit some access to sites, but the numbers show only a small reduction in potential risk when compared to Alternative B.

Alternative D: 300ft from open roads, Deer and Elk

Changes provided in Alternative D result in MBGR being allowed only within MDC corridors. This includes about 85,921 acres. This is a reduction of 96.5% of Forest lands available for this action and a reduction of 90.1% of known sites when compared to Alternative B. Because harvest is limited to deer and elk, the possible acreage disturbance is 220 acres/year (Table 11).

The types of effects that are seen in Alternative B would be the same in this alternative. Alternative D limits access to sites and greatly reduces the number of sites that have a potential for effects when compared to alternatives B and C.

In Alternative D, MBGR would only be allowed in MDC corridors which would go or have gone through Section 106 consultation and compliance. Some of the MDC corridors will be sampled while others will go through a 100% inventory. Cultural sites located in MBGR and MDC corridors in this Alternative would be avoided by effects associated with these activities.

Alternative E: No MBGR

Alternative E does permit MBGR (Table 11). This alternative poses no potential risk to cultural resources and is a complete reduction in potential effect from Alternative B and all other Alternatives.

Alternative F: ½ mile from open roads, Elk only

Changes represented by Alternative F result in motorized retrieval of elk only from within one-half mile of open roads. Alternative F reduces MBGR to 1.5 million acres. This is a reduction of 38.5% of Forest lands available for MBGR and a reduction of 12.4% of known sites when compared to Alternative B. Because retrieval is reduced to elk, the possible disturbance acreage/year is 953.3 acres (Table 11).

The types of effects identified for Alternative B would be the same in this Alternative. Alternative F limits some access to sites when compared to Alternative B and C, but when compared to Alternatives E and D provides access to a larger number of sites. This alternative should reduce the potential risk of effects when compared to Alternatives B and C, but increase the potential risk of effects compared to Alternative E and D.

Alternative G: 300ft on roads where MDC is allowed, Deer and Elk

Changes in Alternative G result in MBGR within 95,994 acres of Forest-administered land. This is a reduction of 96.1% of Forest lands available for MBGR and a reduction of 88.6% of known sites when compared to Alternative B. Possible disturbance acreage at this distance is about 220 acres/year (Table 11).

The types of effects in Alternative B would be the same for this Alternative. Alternative G limits much more access to sites than do Alternatives B, C, and F. Access to sites between Alternatives G and D are comparable, but G could provide access to a few more cultural sites. When compared to Alternative E, Alternative G provides access to many more sites. This should reduce the potential risk of effects when compared to Alternatives B and C, but increase the potential risk of effects compared to Alternatives D and E.

In Alternative G, MBGR will only be allowed in MDC corridors which will go through Section 106 consultation and compliance. Some of the MDC corridors will be sampled while others will receive 100% inventory. This will help identify cultural sites and allow affects to be mitigated through avoidance. This may mean dropping MDC corridors, which would also mean MBGR activities would not be allowed to take place in the dropped corridors. This may benefit cultural sites because they would be avoided.

AREAS:

Thirty-nine Areas have been proposed in Alternatives C, F, and G. These Areas allow any motorized vehicle activity within them, but 38 of the 39 have traditionally been used as camping areas and this is the expected ongoing use. The remaining Area is located on the Reserve Ranger District, and open to unrestricted OHV and motorcycle use. This 3.31 acre Area is located within a borrow pit near an old landfill. Analysis for Areas focused on the number of acres proposed per alternative and the number of

sites within that Area. Also, sites within traditional camping areas were analyzed similar to those in MDC corridors and the potential effects to cultural resources are the same as those seen in MDC.

Table 12 displays the number of sites in proposed Areas for each Alternative. Sites that are Listed, considered Eligible, or are Unevaluated for the National Register of Historic Places are considered in the following analysis.

Table 12: NR Status of Sites within Areas; for Alternative B, number of cultural sites within acres of similar use as Areas is shown.

NR Status	B	C	D	E	F	G
Listed	6	0	0	0	0	0
Eligible	1009	1	0	0	1	1
Unevaluated	3759	2	0	0	2	2
Not Eligible	277	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number	5051	3	0	0	3	3
Total w/o not eligible	4,774	3	0	0	3	3

Alternative B:

There are no designated areas in Alternative B. However, cross-country travel and MDC are allowed in Alternative B and these activities are similar in scope to those that would occur in Areas. There are 2.44 million acres and 4,774 known sites on Forest that currently allow cross-country travel and MDC in Alternative B (Table 13). Effects of these actions are similar in scope. Effects include but are not limited to vehicular contact. Vehicles may be driven over sites causing disturbance to features and artifact displacement. In wet weather or sensitive soils, vehicles may cause rutting and erosion that could disturb cultural deposits.

Additional direct and indirect effects of motorized dispersed camping in Areas include, but may not be limited to, dismantling or scavenging historic or prehistoric sites for structural materials that can be used for fire rings or firewood; deliberate or opportunistic looting and artifact collecting; graffiti on historic and/or prehistoric features; mixing of modern trash litter with historic artifacts or collection of historic trash mistaken for modern trash.

Table 13: Number of Sites in Areas; Acres available for Areas; Acres of Areas Surveyed to Standard per Alternative.

Areas	B	C	D	E	F	G
Number of Sites	4,774	3	0	0	3	3
Acres for Traditional Camping	2.44 million	28.02	0	0	28.02	28.02
Acres for OHV Play	2.44 million	3.31	0	0	3.31	3.31
Total Acres	2.44	31.33	0	0	31.33	31.33

	million					
Total Acres Surveyed to Standard	355,163 14.6%	16 51.1%	0	0	16 51.1%	16 51.1%

Alternatives C, F, and G:

Changes incorporated in Alternatives C, F, and G result in 38 Areas traditionally used for camping. These areas comprise a total of 28.02 acres; the majority of them are less than one acre in size. Only three cultural sites are known within these Areas, each in a different Area. The changes represented in Alternatives C, F, and G result in a great reduction of acres and known sites from Alternative B, which allows similar activities on 2.44 million acres with 4,774 known sites (Table 13).

The three known sites within these Areas were assessed through a literature search (Table 14) and/or field visits and surveys. Only one site reportedly had camping impacts. This is compared to a total of 104 sites with camping impacts from the Risk Analysis for Alternative B. The effects of camping in these Areas are the same as seen in MDC. However, sites within Areas could be completely avoided by changing the shape of the Area. This reduces the potential for direct and indirect effects from 4,774 cultural sites in Alternative B to 0 sites within Alternatives C, F, and G.

Areas would be delineated to help recreationalists identify their boundaries. This would decrease the potential for effects to cultural resources near the Areas. Areas already have been or will be surveyed and go through Section 106 compliance before they appear on the MVUM. This should further decrease the potential for affects to cultural resources when compared to Alternative B.

Table 14: Results of Literature Search showing MDC Impact levels for sites within each Alternative.

Sites with MDC Impacts Only	B	C	D	E	F	G
No Impact	915	2	N/A	N/A	2	2
Low, Moderate, or Severe Impact	104	1	N/A	N/A	1	1
Total Sites	1019	3	N/A	N/A	3	3

The 3.31 acre Area open to unrestricted OHV and motorcycle use has been surveyed and does not have any cultural resources. There would be no potential for risk to cultural resources in this Area due to OHV activities being limited to this specific location.

Alternatives D and E:

Alternatives D and E do not permit Areas. These alternatives pose no potential risk to affect cultural resources and are a complete reduction in potential effects from Alternative B, C, F and G.

CONCLUSIONS on DIRECT AND INDIRECT TM EFFECTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Alternative B provides maximum potential access to the most number of cultural sites because it permits motorized cross-country travel. All other Alternatives prohibit motorized cross-country travel (except for MBGR and Administrative use/ written authorization), which limits access to sites in less

roaded areas and decreases the potential for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources when compared to Alternative B.

Changes presented in Alternative C result in the most mileage/acreage for routes, the greatest acreage for MDC corridors, the greatest distance for MBGR, and areas. Outside of Alternative B, Alternative C provides the most potential for relative risk of direct and indirect effects to cultural resources because it allows more access to more cultural sites than Alternatives D, E, F, and G.

Changes presented in Alternative D result in the second least potential for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources. Alternative D proposes fewer route miles/acres, less acreage for MDC corridors and MBGR than do Alternatives B, C, F, and G. Alternative D does not propose any areas, unlike Alternatives C, F, and G. This means Alternative D provides less access to a lower number of sites, lowering the potential for affects to cultural resources.

Changes presented in Alternative E result in the least potential for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources of all alternatives. Alternative E proposes the lowest number of miles/acres for routes, no MDC corridors, no MBGR, and no areas. This provides the least access to the fewest number of sites.

Changes presented in Alternative F result in less potential risk for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources than do Alternatives B and C, but a higher potential for risk than Alternatives D, E, and G. Alternative F proposes less mileage/acreage for routes than Alternatives B and C; comparable to Alternative G; and more than Alternatives D and E. Alternative F proposes less MDC corridors than Alternatives B and C and more than Alternatives D, E, and G. Alternative F proposes less MBGR acreage than Alternatives B and C, and more than Alternatives D, E, and G. Alternative F proposes the same acreage of areas as do Alternatives C and G. Alternative F provides less access to fewer sites than do Alternatives B and C, but more access to mores sites than do Alternatives D, E, and G.

Changes presented in Alternative G result in less potential risk for direct and indirect effects to cultural resources than do Alternatives B , C, and F, but a higher potential for risk than Alternatives D and E. Alternative G proposes less mileage/acreage for routes than Alternatives B and C; comparable to Alternative F; and more than Alternatives D and E. Alternative G proposes less MDC corridors than Alternatives B, C, and F; comparable to Alternative D; and more than Alternative E. Alternative G proposes less MBGR acreage than Alternatives B and C; comparable to D; and more than Alternative E. Alternative G proposes the same acreage of areas as do Alternatives C and F. Alternative G provides less access to fewer sites than do Alternatives B, C, and F, but more access to mores sites than do Alternatives D and E.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Cumulative effects to cultural resources relate to potential effects to National Register-eligible or unevaluated properties resulting from impacts of actions in the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future from ground disturbing activities. Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), cultural resource surveys have been conducted and effects addressed through consultation between the Gila NF and SHPO. Future projects occurring on Gila NF lands will require appropriate compliance with NHPA including cultural resources inventories. If potential effects are identified, they will be addressed by the Gila NF in consultation with SHPO under the Section 106 process of the NHPA.

Past Projects:

A list of about 3,830 past projects dating from 1980 to April 2010 is provided on a disc as Appendix F. This list was generated from a Forest Service Region 3 Oracle database called CRAIS. Most projects on this list required Section 106 consultation and compliance, but not all. In addition to routine NHPA compliance, some projects are related to ARPA, NAGPRA or Section 110 of the NHPA including public outreach, monitoring, data recovery plans, excavations, volunteer projects, damage assessments, inventorying collected materials, etc. These types of projects may or may not have affected specific cultural sites located in the current TM project area. This list of projects represents an overview of the type and magnitude of past archaeological work on the Gila NF.

Most of these projects can be divided into a number of project types including: Heritage/Archaeology; Construction and Maintenance; Fire; Land/Survey; Mining; Range; Roads; Soil/Watershed; Timber; Utilities; and Wildlife. Table 15 lists these project types along with some examples of the projects carried out on Forest.

Table 15: Types of projects that have occurred on the Gila NF with NHPA compliance since 1980.

Project Type	Project Examples
Heritage/Archaeology	Section 110; Para-professional Archeologist Inventory; Deferred Maintenance; NAGPRA; ARPA investigations; Interpretation; Data Recovery; Passport In Time; Education Outreach; Field Schools; FOIA searches; Damage Assessments; Special Use Permits
Fire	Prescribed Burns; Fire Lines; Heliport; Landing Strip; Training Area; Hand Lines
Construction and Maintenance	Administrative Site Improvement; Demolition of Buildings; Parking Lots; Landfill Extension
Lands/Survey	Acquisition; Exchanges; FS Property Fence Lines
Mining	Exploration; Closures/Waste Removal; Abandoned Mine Lands Projects
Range	Allotments; Fences; Cattle guards; Corrals; Traps; Water/Drink Tanks
Recreation	Trail Building/Maintenance; Campground Improvements; Toilet installations; Signing
Roads	Opening; Closing; Bridges; Culverts; Easements; Quarries; Erosion Controls; Temporary Road Closures and Openings; Plating; R-O-W work
Soil/Watershed	Soil Terrestrial Ecosystem Survey; Watershed Improvements; Water Gap Fences; Channel Alignments; Groundwater Monitoring; Well Drill Pads; Spring/Seep Development
Timber	Tree Planting; Reforestation; Thinning; Timber/Salvage Sales; Vegetation Management; Christmas Trees
Wildlife	Wildlife Studies/Improvements; Fish Structures; Enclosures; Exclosures
Utilities	Pipelines; Phone Lines; Power Lines; Fiber-optic Cables

The NHPA became law in 1966, and was not fully implemented until the mid 1970s. Ground disturbing projects meeting the definition of a “federal undertaking” have gone through Section 106 consultation

and compliance since that time. This process formally considers the effects of the Forest’s activities on cultural resources, thereby eliminating or reducing the likelihood of further cumulative effects.

Forest projects taking place before the 1970s were not required to conduct the type of cultural resource compliance mandated by NHPA, relying instead on less stringent and less applicable laws like the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960. Therefore, projects and activities taking place on the Gila NF before the 1970s, and even before the Forest was established in 1905, could have impacted cultural resources, including what are now considered historic resources (roads, mines, sawmills, forts, homesteads, etc., over 50 years of age).

Before the implementation of Section 106 of NHPA, motorized routes were generally created without consideration of cultural resources. This resulted in motorized routes intersecting and overlapping with sites. In some cases, cultural features and artifacts are within the route prism and may have been damaged by vehicular contact or route maintenance. Today, about 1,274 known sites are intersected to some degree by motorized routes and/or associated constructed features. An unknown percentage of these sites may also be at risk for erosion related to this previous construction in combination with environmental factors. As stated above, these existing routes and their associated constructed features are exempt from Section 106 compliance and consultation through the TM protocol (USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer; Appendix I 2007).

Grazing has been practiced on the Gila NF for more than a hundred years. Before the NHPA, this activity had the potential to cause some cumulative effects to cultural sites, including erosion. When an area is overgrazed there is not enough vegetation to prevent wind and water erosion. This may cause erosion of cultural deposits and displacement of artifacts. However, current management practices on grazing allotments minimize overgrazing and effects to known sites. All range improvements (fences, pipelines, drinkers, etc.) and range allotments or allotment management plans receive separate and individual consideration as part of Section 106 compliance unrelated to TM.

Cross-country travel and motorized dispersed camping have been authorized through the Gila NF Plan for decades. These actions have the potential to cause some direct and indirect effects that over time could be considered cumulative for some cultural resources on the Gila NF.

The risk assessment completed for MDC provides information on 1,019 cultural sites (about 21.3% of all known eligible and unevaluated sites) relating to existing cumulative effects. Several categories of the assessment (Motorized Dispersed Camping Disturbances, Route-Site Intersections, and effects from FS Authorized activities) have been quantified.

Table 16: Presents data from MDC corridor analysis. It displays the sampled number of sites per Alternative that have reported at least one impact from MDC, Route Intersections, and/or appear to have occurred as a result of Authorized FS disturbance.

Types of Impacts	B (1019 sites)	C (716 sites)	D (417 sites)	E (0 sites)	F (592 sites)	G (482 sites)
Motorized Dispersed Camping Disturbance	104	82	54	N/A	65	61
Route-Site Intersections	268	217	140	N/A	184	160

FS Authorized	391	294	184	N/A	243	202
---------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Table 16 represents the number of sites per Alternative that received at least one point in each of the impact categories. The number of sites in each Alternative is a subsample of the sites in Alternative B. If a site is in one of the other alternatives, it is also in Alternative B.

Cultural sites with existing disturbances from motorized dispersed camping number from 104 in Alternative B to 54 in Alternative D; cultural sites that overlap or intersect with a route range from 268 in Alternative B to 140 in Alternative D; and sites with disturbances resulting from Forest-authorized activities range from 391 in Alternative B to 184 in Alternative D.

This indicates that past activities and processes of many kinds have impacted some cultural resources across the Forest, often in unpredictable or inadvertent ways (for example, ongoing minor cultural site erosion within roads, decades after the road was constructed, or over the very long term). This confirms potential risk for cumulative effects from TM designation, when combined with known (and sometimes unanticipated) effects of past projects and authorized activities.

Current, Foreseeable, and Future Projects:

A list of 119 current and foreseeable projects is provided in Appendix E. These projects will go (or have gone) through Section 106 consultation and compliance using the R3 Heritage PA before the project is (or was) implemented. Effects to cultural resources will be addressed via the PA or Section 106 process, with the intent of avoiding or minimizing effects, resulting in determinations of No Effect or Effects Not Likely to Be Adverse. Therefore, cumulative effects should be reduced and likely not be adverse when added to effects of TM designation, which are also going through the Section 106 process. Effects accumulated from past projects implemented prior to the requirements of NHPA should not be exacerbated by effects of the TM project, so these cumulative effects are also not likely to be adverse.

For TM Alternatives C, D, E, F, and G, cultural sites within existing road and trail prisms and/or associated features are exempt from Section 106 compliance and consultation, and will not be considered in the overall determination of effect for TM. However, actions considered new undertakings under NHPA will go through consultation and compliance as appropriate, before they appear on the MVUM. These include: motorized dispersed camping corridors, areas, and route designations like adding unauthorized routes to the NFS road and trails system, re-opening closed roads, and converting closed roads to NFS trails. If potential effects to cultural resources are identified, they will also be addressed using available NHPA compliance processes to avoid or minimize effects. Therefore, any cumulative effects resulting from TM Alternatives C, D, E, F, and G will be reduced and likely not adverse.

In summary, when the cumulative effects of TM are added to effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, there should not be an increase in effects to cultural resources across the Forest, and these effects should not be adverse.

EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE:

Effects of Cultural Resources on Climate Change:

Cultural resources on the Gila NF include prehistoric and historic sites. Most prehistoric sites consist of habitation remains in the form of pit or masonry dwellings; roasting pits; lithic (stone) and pottery

artifact scatters; some agricultural features like check dams; cultural landscapes; etc . The natural degradation of these sites is not known to emit CO2 or any other greenhouse gases.

Historic sites on the Gila NF consist of historic trash dumps; campsites; cabins; buildings; corrals; abandoned mines including features and associated artifacts; roads and trails; water wells; irrigation ditches; check dams; bridges; battle sites; remnants of frontier military forts and camps; Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) associated camps and infrastructure; etc. Abandoned mines include gold and copper mines. These mines are treated and tested for mercury, arsenic, and lead. However, they are not known to emit CO2 or other greenhouse gasses. The natural degradation of the rest of these site types is not known to emit CO2 or other greenhouse gasses.

There are instances of unnatural degradation of cultural resources that can emit CO2 and other greenhouse gasses. In particular, sites with wooden features are sometimes dismantled for use in modern campfires. There are sites across the Gila NF that have been impacted from this kind of vandalism. In addition, wildfires can cause these features to burn. However, the number of sites with this kind of vandalism or wildfire damage is unknown and the measure of CO2 or other greenhouse gas emissions from these events is unknown.

Cultural resources on the GNF do not emit CO2 or other greenhouse gasses to any known degree that would affect climate change.

Effects of Climate Change on Cultural Resources:

For the Southwest, climate change models predict increased temperatures, a decrease in overall moisture and a possible increase in destructive flooding into the 21st century (USDA 2010: 12-14). The predictive models have limitations, but are still considered credible when projecting possible climate scenarios (USDA 2010).

Increases in temperature and decreases in moisture may not affect cultural resources directly. However, loss of vegetation during these events may cause wind and water-related soil erosion, which may affect prehistoric and historic cultural deposits to varying degrees. An increase in destructive flooding may also affect prehistoric and historic sites located near ephemeral or year-round streams and rivers. Rushing water can cause erosion, move artifacts, affect the integrity of cultural resources, and damage or destroy sites.

IV. TRIBAL CONSULTATION, LAND USES, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS

TRIBAL CONSULTATION

Introduction

Tribal consultation for the Forest Service is guided by a variety of laws, Executive Orders and Memoranda, as well as case law. Laws include the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and subsequent amendments (NHPA), Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFA), National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), and National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA). Executive Orders and Memoranda include a 1994 Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments (59 FR 85, 4 May 1994), E.O. 13007 on Accommodation of Sacred Sites (61 FR 104, 29 May 1996), and E.O. 12898 on Environmental Justice (59 FR 32, 16 February 1994).

Tribal consultation for the Travel Management (TM) project is also guided by Section III of the USFS Region 3 Heritage Programmatic Agreement (PA) with New Mexico SHPO, and Section V of Appendix I of the PA, the Standard consultation Protocol for Travel Management Route Designation. These documents ensure that Tribes are consulted as early as possible in the TM planning process, to identify and address places of traditional and cultural significance, and Tribal access to those places.

The Gila NF is committed to, and has conducted tribal consultation and NEPA scoping during the Travel Management process. These are carried out at the government-to-government level. This is a separate process from public scoping, due to the unique relationship between the U.S. Government and sovereign Federally-Recognized Tribes. It ensures that interested Tribes are given the opportunity to participate in the planning process as required in NEPA and elsewhere. Prior to the Travel Management Rule (TMR) in 2005, specific projects involving road access, obliteration, and maintenance were addressed with Tribes on a case-by-case basis, as identified in the Gila NF’s quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) or other NEPA scoping.

The following eleven Tribes or chapters were consulted regarding travel management. Letters, phone calls, providing TM materials, and face-to-face meetings at tribal offices were the primary methods of consultation. Although all Tribes on this list were contacted, not all were available or expressed an interest in consulting at the time; the Ramah Navajo Chapter has dropped out. Additional government-to-government Tribal consultation will take place in July and August 2010 prior to and during the comment period for the Draft EIS.

Table 17: Summary of Gila NF tribal consultation for Travel Management Rule, in chronological order.

Date	Type of consultation	Tribe	Tribal Contact
February 13, 2007	Letter request from Forest Supervisor for gov’t-to-gov’t consultation on TM, and brief summary of TMR.	Pueblo of Acoma Alamo Navajo Chapter Ft. Sill Apache Tribe The Hopi Tribe Pueblo of Laguna Mescalero Apache The Navajo Nation Ramah Navajo Chapter	Governor Jason Johnson President Buddy Mexicano Office of the President Chairman Ivan Sidney, Sr. Governor John Antonio, Sr. THPO Holly Houghten President Joe Shirley, Jr. President Leo L. Pino

		San Carlos Apache Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Pueblo of Zuni	Chairwoman Kathy Kitcheyan Governor Arturo Sinclair Governor Norman Cooneyate
July 18, 2008	Letter from Forest Supervisor asking to meet & discuss Gila activities (including TM)	Same as above	Same as above
September 8, 2008	Face-to-face meeting between Tribal contact and Forest Supervisor at tribal offices; overview of TMR; sharing info and materials.	Pueblo of Zuni, Zuni, New Mexico	Governor Norman Cooneyate and Tribal Council
September 12, 2008	“ “ “	Ft. Sill Apache Tribe, met at Akela, NM	Chairman Jeffrey Houser and Tribal Council
September 24, 2008	“ “ “	Pueblo of Acoma, NM	Ron Charlie, 2 nd Lieutenant Governor
October 2, 2008	“ “ “	The Hopi Tribe, Kykotsmovi, AZ	Arnold Taylor, Natural Resource Manager
October 24, 2008	“ “ “	Alamo Navajo Chapter, Magdalena, NM	President Buddy Mexicano
November 17, 2008	“ “ “	San Carlos Apache, San Carlos, AZ	Terry Rambler and Natural Resource Committee
September 9, 2009	Gov't-to-Gov't cover letter and TM Proposed Action	Pueblo of Acoma Alamo Navajo Chapter Ft. Sill Apache Tribe The Hopi Tribe Pueblo of Laguna Mescalero Apache The Navajo Nation San Carlos Apache Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Pueblo of Zuni	Governor Chandler Sanchez President Buddy Mexicano Chairman Jeffrey Houser Chairman Ben Nuvamsa Governor John Antonio, Sr. Dr. Carlton Naiche-Palmer, President President Joe Shirley, Jr. Chairman Wendsler Nosie, Sr. Governor Frank Paiz Governor Norman Cooneyate

Tribal Issues, Comments and Concerns

Of the eleven Tribes contacted since 2007, the Gila NF received 2 formal comment letters in response to NEPA scoping (Pueblo of Laguna and Navajo Nation). A small number of tribal concerns about TMR were also brought forward during six face-to-face discussions in 2008. In these discussions, Tribes were provided with TMR information and asked to contact either the Gila NF Travel Management Coordinator or District Rangers if they had further concerns or comments. Several Tribes indicated they intended to share Gila TMR information with tribal elders or other tribal officials.

This list summarizes Tribal comments on Travel Management received prior to ongoing 2010 consultation:

Pueblo of Acoma: No concerns about travel management on the Gila NF.

Alamo Chapter of the Navajo Nation: No specific concerns about travel management on the Gila NF.

Fort Sill Chiricahua Apache: No concerns about travel management on the Gila NF.

Hopi Tribe: No concerns about travel management on the Gila NF.

Pueblo of Laguna: The Pueblo of Laguna determined that the proposed undertakings will not have a significant impact at this time.

Mescalero Apache Tribe: The Gila NF did not receive responses to letters, and was unable to arrange a mutually acceptable time for meeting face-to-face. The Forest is continuing efforts to consult on travel management.

Navajo Nation: The proposed undertaking/project area will not impact any Navajo traditional cultural properties (TCPs). The Historic Preservation Department-Traditional Cultural Program (HPD-TCP) has no concerns at this time.

Ramah Navajo Chapter: The Gila NF has not received consultation responses for any projects on Forest, including travel management.

San Carlos Apache Tribe: The importance of traditional plant gathering was emphasized by the Tribe. Gathering of Emory oak in the Silver City area was identified as important, as well as gathering traditional plants in the Upper Gila, Mule Creek, and Apache Creek areas. Two tribal members were selected to convey Gila NF TM information to tribal elders. No additional feedback from elders or others has been received.

Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo: The Gila NF has not received a consultation response for the travel management project.

Pueblo of Zuni: Concern was expressed about access by tribal members for traditional gathering and activities on Forest. No areas of concern for access were identified.

Other Recent Tribal comments:

The Gila NF receives letters from Tribes consulting on non-travel management projects. These contain both standard language and specific Tribal perspectives on cultural resources, which may be relevant to travel management. Information in letters from four Tribes (Hopi Tribe, Pueblo of Laguna, the Navajo Nation, and Pueblo of Zuni) received during TM scoping periods, or since September 2009, is summarized below.

Non-TM Tribal comments expressed ancestral connections to land now administered as the Gila NF. Certain Tribes identified the presence of unspecified locations on the Gila NF for origin stories, ceremonies, rituals, important hunting areas, clan origins, prehistoric affiliations, oral history, and shrines, representing current or past Tribal traditions and land uses. Some of these locations may include prehistoric structures and sites, "rock art" and rock cairns.

Tribes also support identifying, monitoring and avoiding archeological sites and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs). They have an interest in being notified of finds related to NAGPRA. Some Tribes wish to receive copies of any new information (reports, maps, site records, photos) that may become available for particular Gila NF projects, in addition to data already provided in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) or Tribal consultation letters.

Tribal Consultation Summary:

Of the eleven federally-recognized Tribes contacted for consultation on Travel Management, six expressed no concerns about TM, or that the TM project/decision would have no significant impact. No

responses were received from 3 Tribes (Mescalero Apache Tribe, Ramah Navajo Tribe, and Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo). Two expressed general concerns about the need for continued access by Tribal members for traditional plant gathering and other activities on the Gila NF (San Carlos Apache Tribe and Pueblo of Zuni). The San Carlos Apache Tribe identified the Silver City, Upper Gila, Mule Creek, and Apache Creek areas as general locations used by the Tribe for these activities.

Although concern about Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) has been expressed by federally recognized Tribes, no TCPs have been specifically identified in the Travel Management project area. Therefore, based on current information, none of the TM alternatives would affect TCPs. The Gila NF is engaged in ongoing Tribal consultation, and will consider additional information received during the DEIS comment period under relevant law, regulation, and policy.

CONTEMPORARY TRIBAL LAND USES:

Certain Tribes have cultural and geographical ties and knowledge about the lands now managed by the Gila NF. These include the Pueblo of Acoma, Alamo Navajo Chapter, Ft. Sill Apache Tribe, The Hopi Tribe, Pueblo of Laguna, Mescalero Apache, The Navajo Nation, San Carlos Apache, Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo, and Pueblo of Zuni.

The Gila NF does not manage any Tribal lands, and is not located adjacent to any Tribal lands (trust, reserved, or allotted). In addition, there are no Tribal treaty rights on the Gila NF. Instead, Tribal members sometimes visit the Gila NF to gather traditional resources, engage in traditional activities, hold ceremonies, and visit special locations. For these reasons, Tribes share an interest in the management and protection of natural and cultural resources, including effects from motorized vehicle use.

Traditionally, Tribes with an interest in the Gila NF are:

- (1) Those descended from, or having cultural affiliation with prehistoric indigenous occupants of Gila NF lands (USDA–FS Southwestern Region 1996: 119-121);
- (2) Those who historically occupied lands now comprising the Gila NF (prior to establishment of the Gila NF in 1905); or
- (3) Both of the above.

Tribes have expressed these ancestral connections to land now administered as the Gila NF. Certain Tribes identified the presence of unspecified locations on the Gila NF for origin stories, ceremonies, rituals, important hunting areas, clan origins, prehistoric affiliations, oral history, and shrines, representing current or past Tribal traditions and land uses. Some of these locations may include prehistoric structures and sites, “rock art” and rock cairns.

Concerns expressed by Tribes in government-to-government TM consultation include the need for access to unspecified areas on the Gila NF for plant gathering and other traditional activities. No sacred areas or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) have been identified as being affected by the travel management project, and no Tribal concerns have been expressed about specific routes, corridors, or areas. Although general areas such as Apache Creek, the Silver City area, the Upper Gila, Mule Creek, and the entire Reserve Ranger District were identified, these were not specific enough to assist in developing TM Alternatives.

Because the Gila NF is large, rural, and isolated, Tribal members use its lands on an intermittent or occasional basis. Some Tribes affiliated with the Gila NF's land base are now located a great distance from the Gila NF due to historic and prehistoric migrations and events. Current information on Tribal land use suggests that it is widely dispersed and relatively low in frequency across a large area. This is supported by the few, non-specific Tribal comments and concerns provided to the Gila NF for the Travel Management project and other projects.

There would be no change in Tribal access to the Gila NF under No Action Alternative B. There is potential for unidentifiable minor effects to Tribal land uses under Alternatives C through G from reduction in route mileage that reduces motorized access to some locations on Forest. Alternative E is the most restrictive in terms of access, and could have the greatest effects on these activities. However, these effects are considered minor due to generally infrequent Tribal use and few concerns identified for the Gila NF.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS TO TRIBES:

The ten federally-recognized Tribes identified above in Tribal consultation and land use sections may also have social and economic interests in the Gila NF. As previously stated, these Tribes do not have treaty rights on the Gila NF, and the Gila NF is not located adjacent to any Tribal lands (trust, reserved, or allotted).

American Indian populations in the four counties where the Gila NF is located range from a low of 1.1% (Hidalgo) to a high of 2.8% (Catron), compared to 9.7% for the entire State of New Mexico (US Census Bureau: New Mexico State and County QuickFacts, 2008, <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>).

Because the Gila NF is a greater distance from many Tribal lands and reservations, longer drive times are required to access the Gila NF. This creates inherently greater economic costs for Tribal members travelling to the Gila NF (gas, vehicle, motel, food, etc.). This situation would remain essentially unchanged under all alternatives, including existing condition.

Data on local Tribal businesses are unavailable; such businesses are not known to contribute to aspects of the local economy supported by the Forest. Rather, most Tribal members or groups participate in occasional activities on the Gila NF for personal, traditional, community, group or religious reasons and uses. Locations of such activities may fluctuate, and have not been specifically identified by Tribes. Gathering forest products, such as pinion nuts or Emory oak, has not been identified as occurring for commercial resale, and sale of Forest products is not known to supplement Tribal household income.

This information supports a conclusion (and observation based on tribal consultation) that visitation to the Gila NF by Tribal members is generally less frequent than to places closer to existing tribal lands, and would continue to be so. This visitation appears to be more socially and culturally driven, than economically driven. As such, it is important to maintaining the cultural and social fabric of Tribes.

Because very few Tribal members live and work in the vicinity of the Gila NF compared to other parts of New Mexico and Arizona, changes to Tribal social and economic activities as a result of travel management designation should be minor to none. Tribes would continue to have opportunities to gather culturally important materials on the Gila NF under applicable Forest Service policies (such as FSH 2409.18 on granting permits free of charge to federally recognized Tribes to gather forest products for traditional and cultural uses www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsh/2409.18/2409.18_80.doc).

There would be no change in Tribal access to the Gila NF under No Action Alternative B. There is potential for minor effects to Tribal activities under Alternatives C through G from reduction in route mileage that reduces motorized access to some locations on Forest. Alternative E is the most restrictive in terms of access, and could have the greatest effects on Tribal activities. However, these effects are considered minor due to generally infrequent Tribal use and few concerns identified for the Gila NF.

V. REFERENCES

36 CFR Part 800 – Protection of Historic Properties. Implementing Regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. From: eCFR Data current as of 10-6-2010;

http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title36/36cfr800_main_02.tpl

Anyon R.; LeBlanc, S.A. 1984. The Galaz Ruin: A Prehistoric Mimbres Village in Southwestern New Mexico. Albuquerque (NM): University of New Mexico Press. 612 p.

Archaeological Records Management Section (ARMS). 2009. Instructions for Completing the LA Site Form: Appendices. New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs Historic Preservation Division [Internet]. [Cited March 4, 2010] Available from: <http://stubbs.arms.state.nm.us/arms/>.

Berman, M.J. 1989. Prehistoric Abandonment of the Upper San Francisco River Valley, West-Central New Mexico; An Economic Case Study. Binghamton (NY): State University of New York (unpublished dissertation). 419 p.

Cordell, L. 1997. Archaeology of the Southwest. San Diego (CA): Academic Press. 540 p.

Diehl, M.W.; LeBlanc, S.A. 2001. Early Pithouse Villages of the Mimbres Valley and Beyond: The McAnally and Thompson Sites in their Cultural and Ecological Contexts, Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 83. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University. 144 p.

Drennan, R.D. 1996. Statistics for Archaeologists. New York (NY): Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers. 335 p.

Executive Order 12898. 1994. Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. Federal Register Vol. 59, No. 32. February 16, 1994. 5 p.

Executive Order 13007. 1996. Indian sacred sites. Federal Register, Presidential Documents. Vol. 61, No. 104. May 1996. p. 26771-26772.

“Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies,” 59 Federal Register 85 (4 May 1994), no page numbers available.

Hyde-Sato, Debby. 2010. Assumptions for Travel Management Analysis. 4 pages. Forest Service email, June 19, 2010.

Jarvis, T. D.; National Trust for Historic Preservation. 2008. The National Forests: Cultural Resources at Risk, an assessment and needs analysis. The National Trust for Historic Preservation [Internet]. [cited 29 July 2010]. Available from: www.preservationnation.org/issues/public-lands/additional-resources/NTHP-Forest-Service-Report-2008-web.pdf. 52 p.

LeBlanc, S.A. 1980a. The Early Pithouse Period. In: LeBlanc S.A., Whalen M.E., editors. Archaeological synthesis of South-Central and Southwestern New Mexico, Office of Contract Archaeology. Albuquerque (NM): University of New Mexico. p. 119-141.

LeBlanc, S.A. 1980b. The Post Mogollon Periods in Southwestern New Mexico: The Animas/Black Mountain Phase and the Salado Period. In: LeBlanc, S.A.; Whalen, M.E., editors. Archaeological synthesis of South-Central and Southwestern New Mexico, Office of Contract Archaeology. Albuquerque (NM): University of New Mexico. p. 271-317.

Lekson, S.H.1992. Archaeological Overview of Southwest New Mexico. Las Cruces (NM): Human Systems Research, Inc. New Mexico State Historic Preservation Division Project No. 35-88-30120.004. Approx. 271 p.

Long, R.; Smith, S.; Gallagher, S.; Berning, C. 1999. Off-the-Track: America's National Parks under Siege. San Francisco: Bluewater Network. Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association [Internet]. [cited 2010 July 28]. Available from:
<http://www.gehwa.org/ORV%20Documents/America's%20National%20Parks%20Under%20Seige.pdf>

Martin P.S.; Rinaldo, J.B. 1950. Turkey Foot Ridge: A Mogollon Village, Pine Lawn Valley, Western New Mexico. *Fieldiana: Anthropology*, 38(2): 237-393.

Martin P.S. 1979. Prehistory: Mogollon. In: Sturtevant, W.C., general editor; Ortiz, A., volume editor. *The Southwest: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 9. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. p. 61-74.

National Historic Preservation Act. Act of October 15, 1966. Public Law 89-665 as amended through 2006; 16 U.S.C. 470. Available from: <http://www.achp.gov/docs/nhpa%202008-final.pdf>

Opler, M.E. 1983. Chiricahua Apache. In: Sturtevant WC., general editor, Ortiz A, volume editor. *The Southwest: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 9. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. p. 401-418.

Sampson, M.P. 2007. Effects of off-highway vehicles on archaeological sites in Red Rock Canyon. California State Parks [Internet]. [cited 2010 July 28] Available from:
http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=24576. 28 p.

Schiffman, L. 2005. Archaeology, off-road vehicles, and the BLM. *The Archaeological Institute of America* [Internet]. [cited 2010 July 28]. Available from:
www.archaeology.org/online/features/southwest/. 6 p.

Spangler, J.D.; Arnold, S.; Boomgarden, J. 2006. Chasing Ghosts: An Analysis of Vandalism and Site Degradation in Range Creek Canyon, Utah. Ogden: Utah Museum of Natural History Occasional Papers 2006-1. Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance. BLM Contract JMP052055. 94 p.

US Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts [Internet]. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; [cited 2010 July 29]. 2008. Available from: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>.

USDA-Forest Service. 2008. FSH 2409.18 – Timber Sale preparation handbook. WO amendment 2409.18.2008-1. Effective December 29, 2008. Available from: www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsh/2409.1880.doc 37p.

USDA-Forest Service, Gila National Forest. 2009. Annual Monitoring Report FY 2008. Silver City (NM): US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Gila National Forest. Available from: http://fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5078067.pdf. 43 p.

USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 1987. FSH 2309.24 – Cultural Resources Handbook. Chapter 10 – Survey Standards. R3 Amendment 2309.24-1987-1. Albuquerque, NM. 32 p.

USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 1996. Cultural Affiliation Assessment Mogollon/Upland Lowland. In: Cultural Affiliations: Prehistoric Cultural Affiliations of Southwestern Indian Tribes. Albuquerque (NM): US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southwestern Region. p 119-12.

USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region. 2010. Southwestern Region Climate Change Trends and Forest Planning. Albuquerque (NM): US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southwestern Region. 45p.

USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer; Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; et al. 2003. First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding Historic Property Protection and Responsibilities. December 24, 2003. Albuquerque, NM. 15 p. On file at Gila National Forest. Silver City, New Mexico.

USDA-Forest Service Southwestern Region; New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer. 2007. Appendix I: Standard consultation protocol for travel management route designation. September 25, 2007. Available from the Gila National Forest. Silver City, NM. p 68-76.

USDI-National Park Service; Cultural Resources; Interagency Resources Division. 1990, revised through 1997. National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 54 p. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>.

APPENDIX A: Laws, Regulations, and Policies for Cultural Resources

Appendix A: Laws, Regulations and Policies for Cultural Resources

American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFA): Was created to protect and preserve the traditional religious rights and cultural practices of American Indians. Calls upon governmental agencies to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise traditional religions. Refers to Indians' access to sacred sites, the use of natural resources normally protected by conservation laws, and participation in traditional Indian ceremonies.

Antiquities Act of 1906: Resulted primarily from concerns about protecting prehistoric Indian ruins and artifacts, termed antiquities, on federal lands in the West. It authorized permits for legitimate archeological investigations and penalties for persons taking or destroying antiquities without permission.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA): Expands the protections provided by the Antiquities Act of 1906 in protecting archaeological resources and sites located on public lands. Regulates finds on federal lands to prevent looting and destruction of archeological resources.

Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909-15 – Environmental Policy and Procedures, Chapter 60.1, Physical Factors: Provides guidance on managing cultural resources including archeological, historical, and architectural resources.

Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations: This E.O. emphasizes the importance of NEPA's public participation process, directing that each Federal agency shall provide opportunities for community input in the NEPA process. This has particular relevance to Tribes. Agencies are further directed to identify potential effects and mitigation measures in consultation with affected communities. Under this E.O. Agencies must identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health, environmental, economic and social effects of federal projects on minority and low-income populations.

Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites: This E.O. requires Federal land managing agencies like the Forest Service to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites.

Forest Service Handbook (FSH) Interim Directive 2409.18-2009-2: This interim directive provides direction for granting trees, portions of trees, or forest products to federally recognized Indian Tribes free of charge for non-commercial traditional or cultural purposes.

Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2360 - Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management: Contains Forest Service policies on managing cultural resources.

FSM 2361.3: requires that Forest Service projects with potential to affect cultural resources comply with 36 CFR 800, the implementing regulations for Protection of Historic Properties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA): The National Historic Preservation Act is the primary federal law governing preservation of cultural and historic resources in the United States. The law establishes a national preservation program and a system of processes which encourage identification and protection of cultural and historic resources of national, state, tribal and local significance.

Section 106 of NHPA: Requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties, using processes outlined in Federal Regulations (36 CFR 800). Grants legal status to historic preservation in Federal planning, decision making, and project execution.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA): Establishes the ownership of cultural items excavated or discovered on federal land. NAGPRA requires federal agencies to return Native American cultural items and human remains to their respective peoples. Cultural items include funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony.

Presidential Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies (1994): This document outlines principles that federal agencies are to follow in their interactions with Native American tribal governments. It clarifies the responsibility to ensure that the Federal Government operates within a government-to-government relationship with federally recognized Native American tribes.

Region 3 First Amended Programmatic Agreement (PA) Regarding Historic Property Protection and Responsibilities with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and SHPOs of 3 other states (dated 12/24/2003). Under this agreement, the Forest Service (FS), SHPO, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation agree that the FS shall consider cultural resources and administer activities subject to Section 106 of NHPA in accordance with the stipulations in this agreement. This PA allows development of Standard Consultation Protocols for classes of undertakings with standard, repetitive effects and treatment measures for cultural resources. Such a protocol was developed for Travel Management Route Designation.

Appendix I Standard Consultation Protocol for Travel Management Route Designation (9/27/2007): Determines that authorizing motorized use under the Travel Management Rule has potential to affect Historic Properties, and is therefore considered an “undertaking” (activity) requiring compliance with NHPA. This document provides procedures for all aspects of Section 106 compliance and SHPO consultation related to the effects of Travel Management designation on cultural resources, including:

- Activities exempt from further Section 106 review or consultation
- Situations requiring review and consultation
- Public Involvement
- Tribal Consultation
- Planning
- Inventory Requirements (i.e. cultural resource survey)
- Phasing (i.e. deferring inventory until after NEPA decision under certain circumstances)
- Protection Measures
- Resolving Adverse Effects
- Reports
- Monitoring

The Protocol and PA were officially reviewed by interested parties including federally recognized Tribes. These two documents were concurred with and signed by the Region 3 Regional Forester, SHPOs of 4 states including New Mexico, and the Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic

Preservation. As such, Forests may legally implement these provisions instead of performing standard compliance and consultation as codified in 36 CFR 800.

Gila NF Land and Resource Management Plan: The following management direction in the Forest Plan applies to the Travel Management designation process.

- Cultural Resources 1: *“Inventory and prevent loss or damage of cultural resources until they can be evaluated for scientific study, interpretive services, or other appropriate uses.”* (USDA Gila National Forest 1986: Cultural Resources, page 12) This direction refers primarily to non-project activities (i.e. non-undertakings) under Sec 110 of NHPA, which does not apply to Sec 106 compliance for travel management.
- Cultural Resources A02: *“The Forest will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and with Executive Order 11593, and will undertake active management which recognizes cultural resources as equal in importance to other multiple uses.”* (USDA Gila National Forest 1986: Cultural Resources A02, page 22). The Forest complies with this direction for travel management, except with E.O. 11593. This E.O. is obsolete because it dates to 1971, and its provisions were incorporated into amendments of the NHPA, which the Forest now follows (personal communication David M. Johnson, R3 Regional Archeologist, Albuquerque).
- Management Area 9D: *“The Management Area contains numerous cultural sites primarily of the Pueblo Culture.”* (USDA Gila National Forest 1986: Description, page 268). 214 heritage sites in Management Area 9D are listed on or eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, or are unevaluated for NRHP eligibility and must be treated as eligible. During the NEPA process for travel management, road mileages were reduced in high site density areas for Action Alternatives. In addition, motorized camping corridors were reduced or eliminated where there are known NRHP-listed, eligible, or unevaluated cultural sites.
- Management Area 9E: *“The Management Area contains many cultural sites including a substantial site on top of Apache Mountain.”* (USDA Gila National Forest 1986: Description, page 274). 112 heritage sites located in Management Area 9E are listed on or eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, or are unevaluated for NRHP eligibility and must be treated as eligible. During the NEPA process for travel management, road mileages were reduced in high site density areas for Action Alternatives. In addition, motorized camping corridors were reduced or eliminated where there are known NRHP-listed, eligible, or unevaluated cultural sites. The road leading to the top of Apache Mountain where there is a substantial heritage site is a Level 1 (closed) road. This road remains closed in Action Alternatives to protect this and other cultural sites in the area.

APPENDIX B: Glossary of Cultural Resource Terms

Appendix B: Glossary of Cultural Resource Terms

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP): Established by Title II of NHPA, this Advisory Council is an independent executive agency that reports to and advises the President and Congress on historic preservation matters. Headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Artifact: Portable object made, modified or used by humans. Normally refers to portable prehistoric items such as implements of stone, bone, pottery, or other durable material.

Bioturbation: The stirring or mixing of sediment or soil by organisms, especially by burrowing or boring.

Complete or 100% Inventory: A comprehensive, systematic, intensive examination of an area designed to gather information about the number, location, condition, and distribution of historic properties within an undertaking's APE.

Cultural Affiliation: A relationship of shared group identity which can reasonably be traced historically or prehistorically between a present day Indian tribe and an identifiable earlier group.

Cultural Deposit: Surface or subsurface soil deposits that contain cultural materials.

Cultural Resource Specialist or Heritage Specialist: A Forest Service staff or advisory position with education and expertise in archaeology, history, cultural resource management, or related disciplines. They provide professional recommendations and services to help land managers meet their Heritage Program responsibilities.

Cultural site: A locus of purposeful human activity which has resulted in a deposit of cultural material beyond one or a few accidentally lost artifacts. Any location that includes prehistoric and/or historic evidence of human use or that has important socio-cultural value.

Cultural or Heritage Resources: Resources that are related to the tangible, material life ways of a cultural group or groups as specified in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR 296.3. These may be sites, areas, buildings, structures, districts, and objects which possess scientific, historic, cultural and/or social values. They may include objects or definite locations of human activity, occupation, or use identifiable through field survey, historical documentation, or oral evidence. Cultural resources are prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or architectural sites, structures, places, or objects and traditional cultural properties. Cultural resources include the entire spectrum of resources for which the Heritage Program is responsible, from artifacts to cultural landscapes without regard to eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Exemptions: Those undertakings, which because of their nature and scope, have predictable effects and a very low likelihood of affecting historic properties. These classes of undertakings shall be exempt from further Section 106 review and consultation under this Agreement (Appendix A, Section II).

Feature: Non-portable objects made, modified, or manipulated by humans. Features can include: hearths; architecture; trash middens; soil stains; etc.

Heritage Program. The comprehensive Forest Service program of responsibilities related to historic preservation. The purpose of the Heritage Program is to manage prehistoric and historic cultural resources for the benefit of the public through preservation, public use, and research.

Historic: Point in time after European contact and the introduction of written records.

Historic Properties: 36 CFR 800.16 defines historic properties as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe ... and that meet the National Register criteria.”

Indian Tribe: NHPA defines Indian tribe as “an Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including a native village, regional corporation or village corporation, as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602), which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.”

Infra: Abbreviation for Infrastructure, the Forest Service Integrated Data Management System.

Inventory: The record of cultural resources known to occur within a defined geographic area. An inventory includes a compilation and synthesis of existing information and field surveys for evidence of past human activity. In areas where the ground surface is difficult to see, field survey may include subsurface probing to determine the presence or absence of cultural material.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). A Federal Act, passed in 1966, which established a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the nation and for other purposes, including the establishment of the National Register of Historic Places, the National Historic Landmarks designation, regulations for supervision of antiquities, designation of the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), guidelines for federal agency responsibilities, technical advice, and the establishment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). A register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture. The register was established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and is maintained by the Secretary of the Interior.

Prehistoric. Point in time before European contact and prior to written records being kept.

Programmatic Agreement. Standardized agreement between Forest Service (FS), State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) that spells out the responsibility of each entity in regards to cultural resource management on FS lands.

Protocols (a.k.a. Standard Consultation Protocols): New consultation protocols, which may be developed in consultation with the SHPOs, for specific classes of FS undertakings that will streamline consultation procedures outlined in this Agreement or under 36 CFR 800

Sample Survey: Survey designed to estimate characteristics, density and/or distribution of the population of sites or historic properties in an area based on a sample. Only professional archaeologists, or consultants meeting professional standards, pursuant to 36 CFR 296.8, may design a sample survey or less than 100% (complete) survey.

Section 106 of NHPA: A section of the National Historic Preservation Act requiring federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties, as implemented in the so-called Section 106 process outlined in 36 CFR 800.

State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): A person appointed by a state's Governor to administer the State Historic Preservation Program.

Traditional Cultural Property (TCP): A cultural resource that is eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. The entity evaluated for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places must be a tangible property; that is, a district, site, building, structure, or object as defined in 36 CFR 64.4.

Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). A person appointed by a Tribal leader(s) to administer the Tribal Historic Preservation Program on Tribal Lands.

Tribe. Term used to designate a federally-recognized group of American Indians and their governing body. Tribes may be comprised of more than one Band.

Undertaking. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 301(7) defines undertaking as "a project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a Federal agency, including those carried out by or on behalf of a Federal agency; those carried out with Federal financial assistance; those requiring a Federal permit, license or approval; and those subject to State or local regulation administered pursuant to a delegation or approval by a Federal Agency."

APPENDIX C: Acronyms Used in this Report

Appendix C: Acronyms Used in this Report

ACHP: Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ARMS: Archaeological Records Management Section (State of New Mexico)
ARPA: Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
APE: Area of Potential Effects
CFR: Code of Federal Regulations
FS: Forest Service
FSH: Forest Service Handbook
FSM: Forest Service Manual
GIS: Geographic Information Systems
IO: Isolated Occurrence
MBGR: Motorized Big Game Retrieval
MDC: Motorized Dispersed Camping
MVUM: Motor Vehicle Use Map
NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NAGPRA: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
NHPA: National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended
NF: National Forest
NFS: National Forest System (as in roads)
NRHP: National Register of Historic Places
PA: Programmatic Agreement
R3: Region 3 of the Forest Service (Southwestern Region including New Mexico and Arizona)
RD: Ranger District
SOPA: Schedule of Proposed Actions
SHPO: State Historic Preservation Officer
TCP: Traditional Cultural Property
USC: United States Code
USDA: United States Department of Agriculture

APPENDIX D: Gila NF Risk Analysis and Effects to Cultural Resources

Gila NF Risk Analysis and Effects to Cultural Resources

Assumptions:

- By definition, most cultural sites in this project area have good access due to their location within 300' either side of existing motorized routes.
- The presence, nature, and extent of some site disturbances may relate to ease of access.
- Many cultural sites on Forest exhibit some level of vandalism/looting, so the presence of this disturbance is not necessarily related to access provided by motorized routes and/or motorized dispersed camping.
- Previous cultural site disturbance is a predictor of the probability for future site disturbance.
- All Action Alternatives will reduce the likelihood of cultural site disturbance due to major decrease in acreage/miles open to motorized travel and camping Forest-wide.
- Effects identified in items 1 through 3 below contribute to the assessment of cumulative effects, because they are Forest-authorized in the Gila NF's Land Management Plan, or on a project-by-project basis, including compliance with NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act.
- This analysis focuses on known cultural sites in the project area that were either (1) newly recorded during surveys performed for travel management project, (2) previously recorded and revisited/updated for travel management analysis, or (3) selected for TM analysis as a sample of hard copy site records in the Gila NF's master site files.
- If the items listed below are present, but are not causing site disturbance, they were not given any points.
- Effects and risk identified here in items 1-5 for known sites equate to NEPA existing condition.
- Avoidance is the preferred treatment for all cultural resources potentially affected by Travel Management designations.

Site eligibility:

What is eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for each cultural resource?

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Not Eligible: | Go no further with analysis |
| Eligible: | Continue with analysis |
| Unevaluated: | Treat as eligible and continue with analysis |

Effects:

Information on site effects is taken from existing site documentation and/or site re-visits and updates performed for this project. Data exclude areas exempt from SHPO consultation under Region 3 Travel Management protocol.

Existing effects related directly to motorized routes and camping:

1. Cultural site is crossed by roads, motorized trails, turnouts and/or parking areas. (0-3 points)

None (no crossings & within corridor) =	0 points
Low disturbance (one crossing) =	1 point
Medium disturbance (2 crossings) =	2 points
High disturbance (3+ crossings) =	3 points
2. Cultural site has evidence of previous motorized camping disturbance. **Each** of the following receives **1 point**: (0-9+ points)

- Presence of one modern/recent fire ring or campfire residue
- Multiple fire rings or campfires
- Modern/recent trash
- Large amounts or multiple locations of modern/recent trash
- Rocks for fire rings were taken from cultural site (indirect effect of authorized camping)
- Evidence for more than one incident of motorized camping occupation/ disturbance
- User-created ruts outside exempted road & parking areas
- Scavenging/dismantling of cultural sites related to motorized camping
- Impacts appear less than 10 years old
- Other evidence of modern campsite(s), please specify; 1 point each

Other effects not necessarily related to motorized camping:

3. Gila NF-authorized disturbances to cultural sites (with NEPA and NHPA compliance). Each receives **1 point**: (0-8+ points)
 - Grazing
 - Range/wildlife improvement
 - Other Fence (not related to Range)
 - Utility
 - Construction/development
 - Formal foot or equestrian trail
 - Other erosion caused or facilitated by Forest-authorized activities
 - Prescribed fire/vegetation management
 - Other (please identify; 1 point each)

4. Disturbances to cultural sites not authorized by the Gila NF (illegal activities, natural disturbances, etc.); no prior 106 compliance. Each receives **1 point**: (0-9+ points)
 - Modern or recent graffiti on rock art or cultural features
 - Multiple instances of recent graffiti
 - Pot hunting hole/Old incident of pot hunting
 - Multiple pot hunting holes
 - Collector's piles
 - All types of scavenging/dismantling at cultural sites
 - Natural erosion or bioturbation
 - Human-created unauthorized non-motorized trail (foot, equestrian, etc.)
 - Wildland fire
 - Other (please identify; 1 point each)

Other situations:

5. These kinds of cultural resources receive **0 points** and no further analysis or treatment in this process:
 - Field-checked site was not relocated or does not exist anymore; Not Eligible/No Effect.
 - Multiple site disturbances that would normally yield high point values have instead resulted in complete destruction, loss of data potential and integrity, and an evaluation of Not Eligible.

Note: 'Not Eligible' sites must have concurrence from SHPO to receive a score of zero. New 'Not Eligible' sites that don't yet have SHPO concurrence must be scored under this risk analysis. SHPO concurrence status must be checked on older 'Not Eligible' sites, to make sure this evaluation is official.

Risk Analysis:

- A maximum of 29+ points can be achieved for disturbances at each cultural resource site.
- Most sites will not exhibit most of the effects itemized in the lists above, so the number of points for levels of impact is lower than might be expected.
- 12+ of these points are for effects related directly to past motorized camping; 17+ points are for effects that may have causes other than motorized camping.
- Forest-authorized disturbances are separated in items 1 through 3 above because they contribute to the assessment of cumulative effects, and item 4 does not.
- Sites having no impacts are considered to have No Effect from the project. Adverse effects by this project to cultural sites will be mitigated, resulting in an overall No Adverse Effect assessment.

1. What are total points for disturbances to each cultural resource (effects from items 1 through 4 above)?

- 0 points: No Effect (No impacts, no site, not eligible, or complete destruction)
- 1-3 points: Low impacts (Little disturbance, few or no treatment recommendations)
- 4-6 points: Moderate impacts (Can be dealt with using treatments)
- 7+ points: Severe impacts (Drop from designation or perform extensive mitigation)

2. The following treatment/mitigation/ project design measures are available for cultural resource sites with low, moderate or severe motorized camping impacts. Treatments with an asterisk are identified as Protection Measures in Section IX of Region 3 Travel Management protocol. Selection of particular measures and recommendations should be appropriate and justifiable.

Avoidance of effects to cultural sites is always to be preferred.

Immediate, requiring no 106 compliance:

- None
- *Drop from designation
- *Revise designation
- *Leave off MVUM

Phased, requiring additional future 106 compliance:

- *Re-route or modify designated routes to protect historic properties
- Fence or barrier
- Signage
- *Monitor (part of monitoring plan)
- Interpretation
- Data Recovery
- Test excavation
- National Register evaluation
- No Trace fire rings, trash, etc.
- Mitigation by detailed documentation and recording, HABS/HAER, etc.
- *Temporary emergency closures to address effects to historic properties
- Other

APPENDIX E: CURRENT AND FORESEEABLE PROJECTS FOR TM CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Appendix E: List of Current and Foreseeable Projects for TM Cumulative Effects

Type	Name	Status Action Date	Action Date	Contact	HUC
Regulations, Directives, Orders	Geothermal Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	In Progress	February 2010	Tracy Parker	All
Rec/Road Management	Travel Management Rule Implementation	In Progress	September 2010	Lisa Mizuno	All Blue Creek, Coyote Creek, Largo Creek, Middle San Francisco, O Bar O Canyon, Plains of San Agustin, Upper San Francisco River, Whitewater San Francisco River, Agua Fria, Lower San Francisco River, Mangitas Creek, Mogollon Creek, Puerto Viejo, Tularosa River, Alamocito Canyon, Mangas Creek, Middle Fork Gila River, Negrito Creek, Sacaton Canyon
Vegetation/Special Use Management	TEP Powerline Vegetation Treatment	Developing Proposal	September 2010	John Pierson	Blue Creek, Middle San Francisco, Whitewater
Special Use Management	Aspen Maness Gravel Pit	In Progress	March 2010	John Baumberger	San Francisco River,

Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant, Vegetation/Fuels Management	Luna Outyear Forest Resteration	Developing Proposal	June 2010	Greg Peterson	Blue Creek, Coyote Creek, Upper San Francisco River, Mangitas Creek, Ft. Bayard, Mangus Valley, Sapillo Creek, Thompson Canyon, Bear Creek, Mogollon Creek, Silver City, Corral Canyon, Engineer Canyon, Hot Cold Springs, Upper
Special Use Management	PNM Gila Valley Powerlines	In Progress	March 2010	John Baumberger	Mimbres River, Walking X Canyon, White Signal
Fuels Management	Various Future Fuelwood Projects	Planning	No Date	Fabian Montano	Ft. Bayard, Engineer Canyon
Fuels Management	Gap 2 Wildland Urban Interface	Developing Proposal	May 2010	Greg Peterson	Largo Creek, Agua Fria,
Special Use Management	Quemado Lake Estates Emergency Egress	Developing Proposal	April 2010	Janice Stevenson	Largo Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Forest Product; Vegetation/Fuels/Watershed Management	Slaughter Mesa Restoration	Completed	November 20, 2009	Timothy Hendricks	Largo Creek, Agua Fria, Tularosa River, Alamocito Canyon, Mangas Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Grazing/Watershed Management	Spring Canyon Pipeline	Developing Proposal	March 2010	Stanley Towner	Largo Creek, Agua Fria,

Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Vegetation management	Bar Six Fuelwood	In Progress	February 2010	Fabian Montano	Mangus Valley, Thompson Canyon, Corral Canyon
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Fuels Management; Watershed Management	Burro Mountain Thinning	In Progress	January 2010	Antonio Ybarra	Mangus Valley
Minerals and Geology	Gable Plan of Operations 2008	Developing Proposal	March 2010	John Baumberger	Mangus Valley
Recreation Management	North Burros Continental Divide Trail	In Progress	February 2010	Bob Schiowitz	Mangus Valley, Corral Canyon
Vegetation Management	Mulberry Thinning	Future	2011	Fabian Montano	Mangus Valley
Vegetation Management	Maverick Thinning	Future	2012	Fabian Montano	Mangus Valley
Grazing Management	Alma Allotment	Developing Proposal	April 2011	Pat Morrison	Blue Creek, Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River, Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River, Middle Fork Gila River
Fuels Management	Bearwallow Wildland Urban Interface	On Hold	N/A	Albert Flores	

Special Area Management; Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Grazing/Veg Management; Watershed/Road Management; Minerals and Geology	Challenge Mill Site Reclamation	On Hold	N/A	Melinda Benton	Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River,
Grazing Management	Copper Creek Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River,
Grazing Management	Deep Creek Allotment	Developing Proposal	April 2010	Pat Morrison	Middle San Francisco
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants	Deep Creek Wild Horse and Burro Territory	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River,
Forest Products; Vegetation and Fuels Management	Mogollon Wildland Interface Phase 3	Cancelled	N/A	Paul Randall	Middle San Francisco, Whitewater San Francisco River,
Special Use Management	Kelly Road Easement	Developing Proposal	June 2010	John Baumberger	Middle San Francisco Middle San Francisco,
Grazing Management	Leggett Allotment Easement	In Progress	May 2010	Aaron Baldrige	Upper San Francisco River
Special Use Management	Stanford Road Permit	In Progress	March 2010	John Baumberger	Middle San Francisco, Upper San Francisco River

Fuels Management	Aldo Leopold CFRP Project	In Progress	April 2010	Debby Hyde-Sato	O Bar O Canyon, Sapillo Creek, Wall Lake, Corduroy Canyon, Upper Mimbres River
Recreation Management	CDT Trail Realignment	Developing Proposal	September 2010	John Pierson	O Bar O Canyon, Plains of San Agustin, Tularosa River, Alamocito Canyon, Negrito Creek
Road Management	Forest Road 150, North Star Mesa Road Signal Peak Healthy Frost Restoration Project__4,000-6,000 thinning; 10,000-20,000Rx	Developing Proposal	February 2010	Rex Null	O Bar O Canyon, Sapillo Creek, Wall Lake, Corduroy Canyon,
Vegetation Management; fuels Management		Completed EA	November 17, 2009	Russell Ward	Sapillo Creek, Bear Creek, Upper Mimbres River, White Signal
Vegetation Management; fuels Management	Upper Mimbers Restoration Project/Fuels Vegetation Burning	Planned	2011	Brummett	Sapillo Creek, Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	Fuelwood area; Green and Down/dead area	Planned	2011	Gallardo	Sapillo Creek,
Fuels Management	Lincoln/Terry Rx Burn	In Progress	2011	Gallardo	Sapillo Creek,
Vegetation Management	Gatton's Park	On Hold	N/A	Gallardo	Sapillo Creek,
Fuels Management	Cottonwood Rx Burn	Planned	2012	Gallardo	Sapillo Creek,
Special Use Management	PNM Burro Mt. to Lordsburg	In Progress	March 2010	John Baumberger	Thompson Canyon, Engineer Canyon, Walking X Canyon

Vegetation Management	Fuelwood 5000 AC	Future		Fabian Montano	Thompson Canyon
Facility Management	Woods Canyon Road Special Use Authorization	In Progress	March 2010	John Baumberger	Thompson Canyon
Special Use Management	Verizon, San Francisco Divide Building	In Progress	February 2010	John Baumberger	Upper San Francisco River
Special Use Management	Catron County (Reserve) Airport	In Progress	April 2010	John Baumberger	Upper San Francisco River
Monitoring	Monitoring of Aquatic Species on East Fork Trail #62 and #708-Heavy	In Progress	2010	?	Wall Lake
Rec/Road Management	Maintenance	Funded	2010	Kramer/Carr	Wall Lake
Rec/Road Management	Trail #105-Maintenance	?	2010	?	Wall Lake
Monitoring	Black Canyon Creek	?	2010	?	Wall Lake
Grazing Management	Big Horn Allotment	On Hold	N/A	George Douds	Whitewater San Francisco River
Grazing Management	Citizen Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River, Lower San Francisco River
Special Use Management	D. Campbell Irrigated Pasture	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Whitewater San Francisco River
Recreation Management	Dark Sky Campground Development	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River
Facility Management	Glenwood Administrative Site-Maintenance w/o Burning	In Progress	January 2010	Albert Flores	Whitewater San Francisco River

Fuels Management; Facility Management	Glenwood Ranger District Administrative Site Maintenance/Fuels Reduction	In Progress	April 2010	Albert Flores	Whitewater San Francisco River
Grazing Management	Harve Gulch/Mogollon Allotment	In Progress	March 2010	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River
Grazing Management	Hult Gulch Allotment	Developing Proposal	October 2010	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River
Special Use Management	Lehigh Metals Access Road	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Whitewater San Francisco River
Grazing Management	Pleasanton Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River, Lower San Francisco River,
Fuels Management	Pueblo Park Campground Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Project	Developing Proposal	July 2010	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River
Special Use Management	Verizon, Glenwood Brushy Building	In Progress	February 2010	John Baumberger	Whitewater San Francisco River, Lower San Francisco River,
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants; Vegetation and Watershed Management	San Francisco River Rechannelization	In Progress	August 2010	Melinda Benton	Whitewater San Francisco River
Special Use Management	US Geological Survey Cable Car	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Whitewater San Francisco River
Grazing Management	Whitrocks Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Whitewater San Francisco River
Fuels Management	7 Troughs Hazardous Fuels Reduction	Developing Proposal	June 2010	Greg Peterson	Agua Fria, Tularosa River

Special Use Management	LS Mesa Road Special Use Authorizations	In Progress	April 2010	John Baumberger	Bear Creek
Land Purchase	Bear Creek Property	In Progress	N/A	Russell Ward	Bear Creek
Minerals and Geology	Sierra Kaolin proposed Open Pit Clay Mine	Completed	December 21, 2009	John Baumberger	Corduroy Canyon, Cuchillo Negro Creek,
Grazing Management	Volcanic Stone Company Water Rights	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Corduroy Canyon
Monitoring	Beaver Creek-Native Fish Monitoring, Non-native Removal	Developing Proposal	2011	Rene Guaderrama	Corduroy Canyon
Monitoring	Beaver Creek-CLF monitoring	Developing Proposal	2010	Rene Guaderrama	Corduroy Canyon
Special Use Management	Elberus Mineral Pat. Access Road	In Progress	May 2010	John Baumberger	Cuchillo Negro Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants; Forest Products; Fuels Management	Little Red Thinning for Wildlife Habitat Improvement	Developing Proposal	June 2010	Rene Guaderrama	Cuchillo Negro Creek Hells Hole, Lower San Francisco River, Corral Canyon, Sacaton Canyon
Grazing Management	Apache Creek Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Canyon
Land Ownership Management	Dripping Springs Land Exchange	Developing Proposal	March 2010	Christina Humphries	Lower San Francisco River

Grazing Management	Dry Creek Allotment Golden Link Trail Realignment at Spider Creek	Developing Proposal	February 2011	Pat Morrison	Lower San Francisco River, Sacaton Canyon
Recreation Management		In Progress	April 2010	David Popelka	Lower San Francisco River
Minerals and Geology	Lone Pine Hill Plan of Operation 2008	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Lower San Francisco River, Sacaton Canyon
Grazing Management	Potholes Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Lower San Francisco River
Recreation Management	Trail Canyon 153 Reconstruction	On Hold	N/A	John Kramer	Mogollon Creek
Recreation Management	Turkey Creek Trial No. 155 Reconstruction	On Hold	N/A	John Kramer	Mogollon Creek, West Fork Gila River
Fuels Management	Mangas Electronic Site	Developing Proposal	June 2010	Greg Peterson	Puerto Viejo, Alamosito Canyon, Mangas Creek
Road Management	Cross Mt. Road Use Permit	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Silver City
Vegetation Management	Thinning	Future	?	Russell Ward	Silver City
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants; Grazing Management	Jewett Workcenter Pipeline Extension	In Progress	March 2010	Stanley Towner	Tularosa River
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants; Grazing Management	Uno Pino Pipeline Extension	In Progress	March 2010	Stanley Towner	Tularosa River
Trail Maintenance	Main Gila Trail #724-34 miles	Funded	2010	John Kramer	West Fork Gila River

Fish Stocking and Non-native Removal	Upper West Fork, White , Cub McKenna, Sacaton Creek	Funded	2010	Brummett	West Fork Gila River
Recreation Management	CDT Trail Realignment	Completed	November 2009	Michael McDermott	Alamocito Canyon
Grazing Management	Berenda Allotment	Developing Proposal	September 2010	Kameron Sam	Berenda Creek, Taylor Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare plants; Fuels Management	Tierra Blanca Thinning for Wildlife Habitat Improvement	Developing Proposal	March 2010	Dennis Fahl	Berenda Creek, Percha Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants	Bar Six Riparian Improvement	Completed	November 23, 2009	Michael Head	Corral Canyon
Fuels Management	Harris Rx II	Planning	N/A	Fabian Montano	Corral Canyon
Fuels Management	Buzzard Rx	Planning	N/A	Fabian Montano	Corral Canyon
Fuels Management	Chimney Rx	Planning	N/A	Fabian Montano	Corral Canyon
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant	Forest Road 28 Willow Planting	Developing Proposal	February 2010	Justin Schofer	Middle Fork Gila River
Recreation Management	Gilita and Willow Creek Campground Restoration	Developing Proposal	May 2010	John Pierson	Middle Fork Gila River
Recreation Management	Indian Creek Cabins Special Use Permit	Completed	December 14, 2009	Jeanne Schofer	Middle Fork Gila River
Fuels Management	Willow Creek Wildand Urban Interface Project	On Hold	N/A	Shilow Norton	Middle Fork Gila River
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plants; Vegetation Management and Fuels Management	Burro Forest Restoration Project	Developing Proposal	January 2011	Laura Vallejos	Negrito Creek

Special Use Management	Trujilo Road Easement	On Hold	N/A	John Baumberger	Negrito Creek
Recreation Management	Tularosa Cabin Interpretive Trail	Developing Proposal	April 2010	Jeanne Schofer	Negrito Creek
Special Use Management	Rainy Mesa Access Road	Developing Proposal	April 2010	John Baumberger	Negrito Creek
Wildlife, Fish, Rare Plant; Forest Products; Fuels Management	Sacaton Wildlife Habitat Improvement	In Progress	February 2010	Albert Flores	Sacaton Canyon
Grazing Management	Sacaton Allotment	On Hold	N/A	Pat Morrison	Sacaton Canyon
Grazing Management	Connector Road-East Canyon/Skillet	On Hold	N/A	J Annett Grijalva- Disert	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	Cooney Fuels Reduction	In Progress	February 2010	Robert Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Monitoring-Wildlife Wildlife	Mimbres River Native Fish Monitoring	Funded	On-going	Brummett	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	CLF Refugia	Funded	2009-2011	Brummett	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	Rx Burn Powderhorn	In Progress	2010-2011	Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	3 Circles Thinning	In Progress	2010-2011	Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	Rx Burn Cottonwood	Planned	2012	Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	3 Circles Fuels Reduction Maintenance	Planned	2012	Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	McKight Fuels Reduction Maintenance	Planned	2012	Gallardo	Upper Mimbres River
Fuels Management	Black Mesa Juniper Treatment	Planned	No Date	Mike Head	Upper Mimbres River

Fuels Management	Fierro Area-Fuelwood Treatment	Planned	No Date	Fabian Montano	Upper Mimbres River
Special Use Management	DeBusk Road Use Permit	In Progress	April 2010	John Baumberger	Walking X Canyon, White Signal
Vegetation Management	Whiteop Thinning	Future	2013	Fabian Montano	Walking X Canyon
Grazing Management	Pueblo Allotment	Completed	?	?	Blue Creek
Grazing Management	White Rocks Allotment	On Hold	?	?	Blue Creek
Grazing Management	Blue Creek	Completed	?	Pat Morrison	Sacaton Canyon, Corral Canyon
Grazing Management	Pine Cienega	In Progress	?	?	Sacaton Canyon
Grazing Management	Rain Creek Allotment	Completed	?	?	Sacaton Canyon