USDA Forest Service
Tonto National Forest
Arizona

December 2024

# Process Memorandum to File

## Resolution Copper Project
## Consistency with the Tonto Forest Plan

This document is deliberative and is prepared by the third-party contractor in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other laws, regulations, and policies to document ongoing process and analysis steps. This document does not take the place of any Line Officer's decision space related to this project.

**Prepared By:**
**SWCA Environmental Consultants**

# Introduction

This memorandum documents a review of the action alternatives contained in the 2025 final EIS (FEIS) for the Resolution Copper Project and Land Exchange (Resolution Copper Project) for consistency with the December 2023 "Tonto National Forest Land Management Plan" (forest plan) (U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service) 2023). The forest plan contains components that, in their entirety, provide overarching direction for managing resources and lands on the Tonto National Forest. Failure to comply with non-discretionary components requires that the plan be amended or the project modified.

# Purpose of Process Memorandum

The purpose of this process memorandum (memo) is to describe the process by which the action alternatives for the Resolution Copper Project were reviewed for consistency with the December 2023 forest plan. The following sections provide background on forest plan components, assumptions made while completing the consistency review, the review methodology, and whether any aspects of the action alternatives do not comply with specific components of the forest plan. Appendix A of this memo contains the full review of the forest plan and rationale for determining whether the alternatives are consistent with applicable forest plan components.

Earlier memos were prepared to determine consistency with the 1985 "Tonto National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan" (as amended through 2017) (Forest Service 1985). These memos were used to support the draft EIS (DEIS), released in August 2019, and the January 2021 version of the Resolution Copper Project FEIS, which was subsequently withdrawn.

# 2023 Land Management Plan Components

The Tonto National Forest plan consists of a series of documents: FEIS; record of decision (ROD); and final land management plan (forest plan). The forest plan describes plan components and how compliance with each category of component is to be determined (forest plan, pp. 21–24).

### Plan Components

Plan components guide future project and activity decision-making across the Tonto National Forest. They include desired conditions, objectives, standards, guidelines, management areas, and suitability of lands.

#### Forest-wide Direction

The following components apply to the entirety of National Forest System (NFS) lands within the Tonto National Forest (forest plan, pp. 15–17).

**Desired conditions** are specific social, economic, and ecological conditions of the forest plan area, or a portion of the forest plan area, that are described in terms specific enough to allow for progress toward their achievement. Desired conditions are not commitments or final decisions approving projects and activities. The desired conditions for some resources may currently exist, but for other resources they may only be achievable over a long period of time.

**Objectives** are concise, measurable, and time-specific statements of a desired rate of progress toward desired conditions. Objectives are mileposts along the road toward desired conditions and in implementation the Tonto National Forest may exceed the measurable component in the given time period.

**Standards** can be thought of as the sideboards within which the Tonto National Forest will operate. They are mandatory constraints on project and activity decision-making established to help achieve or maintain the desired conditions, avoid or mitigate undesirable effects, or meet applicable legal requirements. A deviation from a standard within a project requires a plan amendment for that deviation.

**Guidelines** describe constraints on project and activity decision-making that allow for departure from its terms, as long as the intent of the guidelines is met. Guidelines serve the same purpose as standards, but they differ from standards in that they provide flexibility in defining compliance, while standards are absolute constraints. Projects may deviate from the exact language of the guideline as long as they are meeting purpose of the guideline, and any deviation from the purpose or intent requires a plan amendment.

### Area-Specific Direction

**Management areas** represent deviations in forest management and identify designated and recommended areas. Forest plan components for management areas are applicable to each specific area that calls for management that is in addition to, or deviates from, forest-wide plan direction. A management area represents a management emphasis for an area or several similar areas on the landscape. Management area direction takes precedence over forest-wide plan direction.

**Suitability of lands** is identified as specific lands within a plan area (Tonto National Forest) that are suitable for various uses or activities based on the desired conditions applicable to those lands. The forest plan also identifies lands within the forest plan area as not suitable for uses that are not compatible with desired conditions for those lands.

### Plan Implementation

To ensure that a project is consistent with the forest plan, its design and implementation should consider its setting, any management areas it overlaps, and plan guidance related to any resources or conditions that may be present in the area (e.g., cultural resources, invasive species, riparian areas, and wildlife).

While not every project will move all resource areas toward desired conditions, all standards and guidelines contained in the plan must be met as a project requirement, or a plan amendment is needed.

## Consistency of Projects with the Forest Plan

All projects and activities authorized by the Forest Service must be consistent with the land management plan (16 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1604(i) and 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)

219.15(b-c)). If a proposed project or activity is not consistent with a plan component, the responsible official has the following options (forest plan, pp. 22–24):

- Modify the proposed project or activity to make it consistent with the applicable plan components;
- Reject the proposal or terminate the project or activity;
- Amend the plan so that the project or activity will be consistent with the plan as amended; or
- Amend the plan contemporaneously with the approval of the project or activity so that the project or activity will be consistent with the plan as amended. This amendment may be limited to apply only to the project or activity. (36 CFR 219.15(c))

The following criteria should be used in determining whether a project or activity is consistent with the forest plan (36 CFR 219.15(d)). Note that the criteria below is used in descriptions of forest plan consistency in appendix A of this memo.

1. **Desired conditions and objectives**. A project is consistent with plan desired conditions and objectives when it:
    a. Maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project;
    b. Has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives;
    c. Does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives; or
    d. Maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more of the plan's desired conditions or objectives even if the project or activity would have an adverse but negligible effect on other desired conditions or objectives.
2. **Standards.** A project or activity is consistent with a standard if the project or activity is designed in exact accord with the standard.
3. **Guidelines.** A project or activity must be consistent with all guidelines applicable to the type of project or activity and its location in the plan area. A project or activity can be consistent with a guideline in either of two ways:
    a. The project or activity is designed exactly in accord with the guideline, or
    b. A project or activity design varies from the exact words of the guideline but is as effective in meeting the purpose of the guideline to contribute to the maintenance or attainment of relevant desired conditions and objectives.
4. **Suitability**. A project with the purpose of timber production may only occur in an area identified as suitable for timber production (16 U.S.C. 1604(k)). Except for projects with a

purpose of timber production, a project or activity can be consistent with plan suitability determinations in either of two ways:

a. The project or activity is a use for which the area is specifically identified in the plan as suitable; or

b. The project or activity is not a use for which the area is specifically identified in the plan as suitable, but is not a use precluded by a "not suitable" determination.

# Key Process Steps

### Information and Assumptions

Several documents were consulted during the forest plan consistency review. Additionally, several assumptions were made regarding the applicability of the forest plan to aspects of the preferred alternative:

- Forest plan documents that provided management direction for this consistency review include the following:
    - Final land management plan: Provides forest-wide direction, management area direction, and suitability direction that apply to the Tonto National Forest;
    - Forest plan FEIS: Provides background data regarding the analysis conducted for the forest plan (e.g., acres of a specific vegetation type across the forest);
- Resolution Copper Project and Land Exchange documents consulted for this consistency review include the following:
    - 2021 FEIS and 2025 FEIS: Both documents identified Alternative 6 (Skunk Camp) as the preferred alternative. Both documents provided background data regarding the analysis conducted for the Resolution Copper Project as well as specific data about the actions and activities included with the preferred alternative. This consistency review was conducted after the 2021 FEIS was withdrawn and before the 2025 FEIS was released. Both versions of the FEIS are cited in appendix A of this document: 2021 FEIS citations are generally pages of the document that are not expected to change; and 2025 FEIS citations are generally sections of that document that may contain updated analysis, as final page numbers have not been determined at the time this review was finalized.
    - Select project record documents: Select documents contained in the project record were consulted when information or data was needed to understand the results or methods of analysis that were pertinent to determining compliance with one or more forest plan components.
- The forest plan applies to only those lands within the NFS on the Tonto National Forest (forest plan, p. 15). Only those actions that would be authorized for the action alternatives that occur on NFS lands are pertinent to this forest plan review.

- By the time the final ROD for the Resolution Copper Project and Land Exchange is signed, the Oak Flat Federal Parcel will no longer be part of the Tonto National Forest. Therefore, future activities on the Oak Flat Federal Parcel are not considered in this review, as this parcel will no longer be NFS land. This also applies to the 2,422 acres of the Tonto National Forest being conveyed to other ownership as part of the Congressionally determined land exchange (2021 FEIS, p. 1).

### Project Elements Considered

The elements of the action alternatives to which the forest plan applies are those actions and activities that would occur on NFS lands on the Tonto National Forest. These project elements, described in chapter 2 of the Resolution Copper Project FEIS, were considered over both the short term (construction) and long term (operations and maintenance, closure and reclamation, and post-closure).

### Methodology

The forest plan consistency review followed a multi-step process:

1. Identification of applicable forest plan components.
    - All Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines, Management Area–specific and Suitability components of the forest plan were reviewed to identify which components are applicable to the action alternatives (see "Project Elements Considered" above).
2. Review of each action alternative for consistency.
    - The applicable forest plan components were reviewed to identify whether each of the action alternatives would be consistent with the applicable forest plan components (see "Plan Components" above). The reasoning for the finding of consistent or not consistent is provided.

## Key Findings

The full text of the forest plan consistency review is provided in appendix A of this process memo.

Over 600 forest plan components were reviewed to determine whether they were applicable to the action alternatives. The rationale for those determined to be not applicable is provided. Approximately 270 components were identified as being applicable to one or more of the action alternatives.

The following table lists the forest plan components with which one or more of the action alternatives were found to be inconsistent.[1]

**Table 1. Alternatives compared against the 2023 forest plan**

| Forest Plan Component* | Alternatives Not Consistent† | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2/3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Recreation Guideline 10 (REC-G-10) (forest plan, p. 31) | X | X | X | X |
| Wildlife Related Recreation Guideline 03 (REC-WR-G-03) (forest plan, p. 44) | X | X | X | X |
| Cultural and Historic Resources Desired Condition 01 (CUH-DC-01) (forest plan, p. 55) | X | X | X | X |
| Cultural and Historic Resources Desired Condition 02 (CUH-DC-02) (forest plan, p. 55) | X | X | X | X |
| Cultural and Historic Resources Desired Condition 07 (CUH-DC-07) (forest plan, p. 55) | X | X | X | X |
| Scenery Desired Condition 03 (SC-DC-03) (forest plan, p. 67) | X | X | X | X |
| Scenery Guideline 01 (SC-G-01) (forest plan, p. 67) | X | X | X | X |
| Scenery Guideline 03 (SC-G-03) (forest plan, p. 67) | X | X | X | X |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 01 (RMZ-DC-01) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 02 (RMZ-DC-02) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 03 (RMZ-DC-03) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 06 (RMZ-DC-06) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 07 (RMZ-DC-07) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 08 (RMZ-DC-08) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Desired Condition 09 (RMZ-DC-09) (forest plan, p. 135) | X | X | | |

[1] The review cycle for the forest plan consistency included the following process steps: (1) meetings between SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) and the Tonto National Forest and Region 3 to obtain guidance on approach (1/23/2023 [prior to plan signing], 6/23/2023 [prior to plan signing], 10/15/2024); (2) drafting of all materials by SWCA, including this process memo, discussions in chapters 1 and 2 of the FEIS, discussions in each resource section of chapter 3 of the FEIS, appendix T of the FEIS (amendment for preferred alternative), and the draft ROD (DROD); (3) meeting with the Forest Service interdisciplinary team to present the consistency review and initiate Forest Service review (2/18/2025); (4) review by interdisciplinary team, including Tonto National Forest planning specialists (comments received 3/17/2025); (5) meeting with Forest Supervisor to discuss results of review and obtain guidance for revisions (3/24/2025); (6) review of all forest plan consistency materials by Region 3 (comments received 4/3/2025 and 4/7/2026); (7) meeting with Tonto National Forest planning specialist to discuss results of review and obtain final guidance for revisions (4/8/2025); and (8) SWCA conducts final revisions to materials.

| Forest Plan Component* | Alternatives Not Consistent† | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones Guideline 05 (RMZ-G-05) (forest plan, p. 136) | X | X | | |
| Wildlife, Fish, and Plants Guideline 06 (WFP-G-06) (forest plan, p. 142) | X | X | X | X |
| Wildlife, Fish, and Plants Guideline 07 (WFP-G-07) (forest plan, p. 142) | X | X | X | X |
| Soils Guideline 02 (SL-G-02) (forest plan, p. 147) | X | X | X | X |
| National Trails Management Area Desired Condition 03 (NTMA-DC-03) (forest plan, p. 182) | X | X | X | X |
| National Trails Management Area Desired Condition 06 (NTMA-DC-06) (forest plan, p. 182) | X | X | X | X |
| National Trails Management Area Desired Condition 07 (NTMA-DC-07) (forest plan, p. 182) | X | X | X | X |
| National Trails Management Area Guideline 01 (NTMA-G-01) (forest plan, p. 182) | X | X | X | X |
| National Trails Management Area Guideline 02 (NTMA-G-02) (forest plan, p. 183) | | X | | |
| National Trails Management Area Guideline 08 (NTMA-G-08) (forest plan, p. 154) | X | X | X | X |

* The wording is abridged from the full wording in the forest plan.

† Alternatives that are not consistent with a forest plan component are marked with an X and shaded. Alternatives without shading and an X are consistent with the forest plan component.

# APPENDIX A

Detailed Review of Tonto Forest Plan

**Table A-1. Detailed review of the forest plan and the Resolution Copper Project alternatives***

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **FOREST-WIDE PLAN DIRECTION**<br>**Partnerships and Volunteers** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | DC | PV-DC-01 (p. 26) | Partners and volunteers work effectively to increase capacity for managing forest resources, assist in communicating with and educating the public, and achieve restoration and sustainable recreation goals. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. The project conducted numerous outreach and planning activities that involved partners, Tribes, volunteers, and the general public, which makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See 2021 FEIS, section 1.6. | Same | Same | Same |
| 2 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | DC | PV-DC-02 (p. 26) | Staff and leadership work effectively with partners and local communities, seizing on opportunities to improve natural resource management and recreational experiences. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See response to land management plan (LMP) component #1. | Same | Same | Same |
| 3 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | DC | PV-DC-03 (p. 26) | Open communication with partners about expectations and partnering opportunities exists for growth in relationships. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See response to LMP component #1. | Same | Same | Same |
| 4 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | DC | PV-DC-04 (p. 26) | The Tonto National Forest and its diverse communities and partners are engaged and work to make better decisions and successfully implement programs, conserve the natural environment, and encourage others to enjoy the social, economic, and ecological benefits that the forest provides. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See response to LMP component #1. | Same | Same | Same |
| 5 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | DC | PV-DC-05 (p. 26) | Shared responsibility, stewardship, and strong connections exists between the Tonto National Forest, our partners, and communities on projects leading to greater outcomes and benefits to forest users and the communities we serve. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See response to LMP component #1. | Same | Same | Same |
| 6 | Partnerships and Volunteers (PV) | O | PV-O-01 (p. 26) | Develop at least one new partnership each year with an organization or club who will provide quality long-term volunteer services and projects for the Tonto. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The preferred alternative does not affect the ability to achieve this objective across the | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | forest. | | | | |
| **Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-01 (p. 29) | Recreation contributes to enhanced quality of life for all of our visitors and the communities we serve. Recreation opportunities support healthy lifestyles and local businesses and jobs, contribute to vibrant local economies, and conserve water quality, at-risk species habitat, landscapes, and cultural resources. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. While the FEIS considered impacts across all ownerships, the forest plan applies to only those lands within the NFS (forest plan, p. 15). The eventual decision would authorize only the issuance of special use authorizations (SUAs) for electrical transmission facilities and a tailings pipeline on NFS land, which will largely be co-located.<br><br>The preferred alternative would change the recreational setting of NFS lands near the electrical transmission and pipeline corridor that receive high use dispersed and motorized recreation (2021 FEIS. pp. 635–636). Implementation of the preferred alternative would impact motorized recreation and rock climbing on NFS lands (2021 FEIS, pp. 636–637). Mitigation measures would reduce some impacts (see Mitigation Effectiveness, 2021 FEIS section 3.9.4.9, pp. 638–641; and 2021 FEIS appendix J, mitigation measures FS-SV-01; FS, TA-01; FS-WR-01; FS-WR-02; FS, WR-04, FS-RC-02; FS-RC-03; and FS-WR-04). Overall, the preferred alternative would have relatively minor impacts to recreation on a forest-wide basis and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve this desired condition across the forest or in the long term. | Consistent. Would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. As with Alternative 6, the tailings storage facility would not be located on NFS land. While pipeline and utility corridor differ, effects would be similar to Alternative 6. | Consistent. Would have more of an impact than Alt 6 as linear infrastructure and tailings storage facility will be on NFS lands but would not preclude attainment of forest-wide desired condition. | Same as Alternative 4 |
| 8 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-02 | Recreation and recreation-related projects | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (p. 29) | support the public we serve, and the Tonto National Forest has a reputation of being an "amazing place that you have to visit…" All are invited and feel welcome. | | | alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. See the response to LMP component #7. | | | |
| 9 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-03 (p. 29) | Recreation on the forest is sustainable and responds to changes in science, technology, and best management practices when implementing new projects and updating or upgrading existing infrastructure. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. See the response to LMP component #7. | Same | Same | Same |
| 10 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-04 (p. 29) | The Forest offers a diversity of high-quality developed and dispersed recreation opportunities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. See the response to LMP component #7. | Same | Same | Same |
| 11 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-05 (p. 29) | Recreational opportunities are successfully achieved through cooperative and collaborative engagement with our partners, individuals, organizations, and the communities we serve. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. See the response to LMP component #1. | Same | Same | Same |
| 12 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-06 (p. 29) | Public information about the recreational opportunities on the Forest as well as the rules, regulations, and expectations for visiting them is clear and informative. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not involve and would not affect providing public information recreational opportunities, rules, regulations, and expectations on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 13 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-07 (p. 29) | Conflicts among various recreation users and with other multiple uses are infrequent and easily resolved. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining desired condition. The recreation mitigations included with the alternatives are anticipated to reduce conflicts between recreational use and other uses of the Tonto National Forest or nearby private property (2021 FEIS, p. 623). | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-08 (p. 29) | Recreation sites are managed to standard and free of litter, graffiti, vandalism, theft, illegal activity, and trash dumping to enhance the recreation experience. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not involve and would not affect forest-wide strategies and actions to manage recreation sites. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 15 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-09 (p. 29) | Recreation serves as a gateway to connect visitors and communities to nature and each other. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not involve and would not affect whether recreation serves as a gateway across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 16 | Recreation | DC | Rec-DC-10 (p. 29) | Environmental programs, nature programs, and other guided services, are available locally to connect people with nature, teach new skills, provide challenge and adventure, and instill a lifetime appreciation for public lands and outdoor recreation. Opportunities are available for everyone regardless of socioeconomic status or individual ability. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not involve and would not affect environmental programs, nature programs or guided services across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 17 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-01 (p. 30) | During each 10-year period of the plan, rehabilitate 5 to 7 areas on the Tonto where dispersed recreation is causing erosion, sanitation issues, or other adverse effects on natural resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize and would not affect rehabilitation projects such as those noted in the objective. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 18 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-02 (p. 30) | During the 10-year period following plan approval, implement at least 3 strategies to raise awareness of discouraged practices (e.g., illegal dumping, unsafe shooting practices, driving on closed roads) to promote visitor safety and natural resource protection. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize and would not affect development or implementation of strategies to raise awareness of discouraged recreational practices. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 19 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-03 (p. 30) | Within 10 years of plan approval, develop or modify 1 to 4 systems of sustainable, designated motorized trails (e.g., motorcycle, jeep, and off-highway vehicle trails) to adequately provide for these user groups and reduce user conflicts. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. The implementation of recreation | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | mitigations (2021 FEIS, pp. 132–133) will make progress toward achieving this objective. | | | |
| 20 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-04 (p. 30) | Within 10 years of plan approval, develop or modify 1 to 4 systems of sustainable, designated nonmotorized trails (e.g., mountain biking, equestrian, hiking) to adequately provide for these user groups and reduce user conflicts. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. The implementation of Recreation Mitigations (2021 FEIS, pp. 132–133) will make progress toward achieving this objective. | Same | Same | Same |
| 21 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-05 (p. 30) | Every 5 years take appropriate action (e.g., close, decommission, or convert) on at least 10 miles of motorized and/or nonmotorized trails that may not offer recreational value (e.g., unsustainable, low-use, or have no remarkable destination value) or are not needed for administrative use. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize and would not affect actions taken across the forest to close, decommission, or convert trails. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 22 | Recreation | O | Rec-O-06 (p. 30) | Within five years of plan approval, conduct forest closure for public nudity at all trailheads and developed recreation sites (e.g., campgrounds, camping areas, picnic areas, day use sites, and boating sites). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize and would not affect forest closures for public nudity. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 23 | Recreation | S | Rec-S-01 (p. 30) | Camping on National Forest System lands within the Tonto National Forest will be limited to 14 days within a 30-day period, except as allowed by permit or written authorization. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize and would not affect decisions regarding the length of camping allowed on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 24 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-01 (p. 30) | Trails should be marked consistent with Forest Service marking policies. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent with the guideline. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Trails constructed as part of the preferred alternative will be marked consistent with Forest Service marking policies. | Same | Same | Same |
| 25 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-02 (p. 30) | Kiosks and interpretive signs should be consistent across the Forest and should be designed to suit the scenic and cultural character of the surrounding landscape, unless reviewed and approved by the | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Installation of new kiosks and interpretative signs on NFS lands are not | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | forest. | | anticipated with the alternatives. Interpretive signing associated with mitigation FS-RC-04 will be on private land. | | | | |
| 26 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-03 (p. 31) | Recreation developments and improvements should be planned, designed, and managed for activities and capacities that minimize resource damage (e.g., soil erosion and vegetation trampling) and minimize adverse impacts to scenic character. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Recreation developments and improvements on NFS lands associated with the preferred alternative are limited to recreation mitigation trail construction (2021 FEIS, p. 132). Scenic analysis determined that new planned routes would be compatible with scenic integrity objectives (2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4.2). | Same | Same | Same |
| 27 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-04 (p. 31) | Newly developed and dispersed recreation sites, facilities, and authorized activities should be designed and located in places so as not to degrade water quality, sensitive environments, or prevent wildlife access to water. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Recreation developments and improvements on NFS lands associated with the preferred alternative are limited to recreation mitigation trail construction (see 2021 FEIS, p. 132). The recreation mitigation lands are not anticipated to affect groundwater and surface water quality (2021 FEIS, p. 457); are expected to have beneficial impacts to wildlife and special status species (2021 FEIS, p. 571); and to improve the function of groundwater-dependent ecosystems associated with riparian areas (2021 FEIS, p. 404). | Same | Same | Same |
| 28 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-05 (p. 31) | Information about public safety, fee information, rules, and regulations, should be posted at recreation sites and other high-visitation access points, kept up to date with relevant information, and maintained to be visually appealing. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Postings at recreation sites and/or access points associated with the preferred alternative, if any, will comply with this guideline. | Same | Same | Same |
| 29 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-06 (p. | In recreation areas popular with | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 31) | multilingual visitors, information should be provided in both English and other appropriate languages for multilingual interpretation. | | | alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Postings at recreation sites and/or access points associated with the preferred alternative, if any, will comply with this guideline. | | | |
| 30 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-07 (p. 31) | Land use ethics (e.g., Leave No Trace and pack-it-in pack-it-out) should be promoted for all recreation opportunities and settings. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives have no effect on how land use ethics are or are not promoted across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 31 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-08 (p. 31) | Overnight camping should not be authorized at day use sites, including trailheads, unless posted open. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives make no decisions and have no effect on whether overnight camping is authorized at day use recreational sites. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 32 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-09 (p. 31) | Recreation facilities and improvements should be designed to minimize conflicts between forest users and wildlife (e.g., bear-proof dumpsters or capped pipe used for fences and signposts). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Recreation facilities constructed on recreation mitigation lands are anticipated to have beneficial impacts to wildlife and special status species (2021 FEIS, p. 571). | Same | Same | Same |
| 33 | Recreation | G | Rec-G-10 (p. 31) | All project-level decisions, implementation activities, and management activities should be consistent with or move the area toward the appropriate recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS), or current protocol over the long-term. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The preferred alternative is not consistent with and would not move the area toward the appropriate ROS. Alternative 6 would reduce 166 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to low semiprimitive motorized ROS. See 2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-1. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | Not consistent. Alternatives 5 would reduce 18 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to low semiprimitive motorized ROS. See 2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-1. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would | Not consistent. Alternative 4 would reduce 36 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to low semiprimitive motorized ROS. See 2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-1. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be | Not consistent. Alternatives 2 and 3 would reduce 18 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to low semiprimitive motorized ROS. See 2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-1. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | be required. | required. | |
| **Developed Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Developed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dev-DC-01 (p. 33) | Developed recreation sites provide amenities appropriate to the setting. Amenities (e.g., water systems, fee machines, showers, toilets, grills, dump stations, and fire rings) function as intended with minimum downtime and inconvenience to visitors. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The Alternatives do not construct or affect management of any developed recreation sites on NFS lands. See LMP FEIS, p. 230, for examples of developed recreation sites. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 35 | Developed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dev-DC-02 (p. 33) | Developed recreation provides accessible opportunities and valuable services to the public. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 36 | Developed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dev-DC-03 (p. 33) | The overall capacity of developed sites across the forest meets demand in high use seasons, including the accommodation of large groups where appropriate. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 37 | Developed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dev-DC-04 (p. 33) | Developed campsites provide opportunities for both vehicle-based camping and tent camping. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 38 | Developed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dev-DC-05 (p. 33) | Vegetation in developed sites enhances the recreational setting, scenic value, and user safety. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 39 | Developed Recreation | O | Rec-Dev-O-01 (p. 33) | Within one year of plan approval, complete an occupancy and use order to establish quiet hours within developed campgrounds between 10pm and 6am. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 40 | Developed Recreation | S | Rec-Dev-S-01 (p. 33) | Required amenities (e.g., toilet facilities, trash receptacles) are provided for visitor use at sites where fees are charged. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 41 | Developed Recreation | S | Rec-Dev-S-02 (p. 33) | Developed recreation sites shall be operated at current health and safety standards, as outlined in the Forest Service publication “Cleaning Recreation Sites,” or more recent technical report. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 42 | Developed Recreation | G | Rec-Dev-G-01 (p. 33) | Recreation site overflow areas should be used during periods of high use where the short-term nature of the use is not likely to result in long-term resource damage and will not in conflict with active closure orders. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #34 above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dispersed Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-01 (p. 34) | Dispersed recreation provides visitors with diverse opportunities to recreate on land and water with minimal impacts to other natural resources (e.g., riparian areas, streams, lakes, and wetlands). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. While this alternative would reduce 166 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to semiprimitive motorized (2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-2), the overall changes to recreation opportunities on the forest would be minimal (2025 FEIS, section 3.9). Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. | Consistent. Alternative 5 would reduce 18 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to semiprimitive motorized. Same conclusion as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Alternative 4 would reduce 36 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to semiprimitive motorized. Same conclusion as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Alternatives 2 and 3 would reduce 18 acres of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS to semiprimitive motorized. Same conclusion as Alternative 6. |
| 44 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-02 (p. 34) | Recreation opportunities are available for both nonmotorized and motorized recreation activities throughout the Forest, including hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, rock climbing, off-highway vehicle recreation, hunting, fishing, camping, and other popular recreational uses. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #43. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. |
| 45 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-03 (p. 34) | Dispersed camping sites have minimal improvements and provide a more primitive camping experience. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives make no decisions regarding development or management of dispersed camping sites. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 46 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-04 (p. 34) | Expansion of dispersed sites and evidence of overuse is infrequent. Resource impacts due to recreation use (e.g., soil compaction or lack of vegetation) are minimized. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #45. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 47 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-05 (p. 34) | Motorized and nonmotorized trail systems provide diverse opportunities (e.g., interconnecting loops, connections to other destinations, and varying lengths and challenges). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. While the preferred alternative would impact some motorized and nonmotorized trails in the short-term, diverse opportunities would remain across the forest. See response to LMP component #43. In addition, recreation mitigation would develop new motorized and nonmotorized trails to help mitigate short-term losses resulting from implementation of the preferred alternative. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 132–134 and p. 623. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #43. |
| 48 | Dispersed Recreation | DC | Rec-Dis-DC-06 (p. 35) | Unauthorized user-created trails are not evident on the landscape. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not authorize and would have no effect on the creation of user-created trails or management of existing user-created trails. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 49 | Dispersed Recreation | S | REC-DIS-S-01 (p. 35) | To prevent resource damage and user conflicts, dispersed recreation sites that occur along designated National Forest System trails will be managed to be consistent with respective trail management objectives. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would have no effect on management of dispersed recreation sites. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 50 | Dispersed Recreation | G | REC-DIS-G-01 (p. 35) | Dispersed recreation sites should be closed, or effects mitigated when:<br>a. Preventative and routine maintenance is unsustainable;<br>b. There are persistent user conflicts; and/or<br>c. Damage to natural resources from recreation is occurring and there are | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #49. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | conflicts with other resource (e.g., riparian areas) desired conditions. | | | | | | |
| 51 | Dispersed Recreation | G | REC-DIS-G-02 (p. 35) | Design, construction, realignment, and maintenance of motorized and nonmotorized trails should be consistent with sustainable trail building guidelines, minimize adverse resource impacts (e.g., soil erosion, soil compaction, sedimentation in creeks, and damage to riparian habitats), minimize user conflict, and enhance the recreation experience. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The project or activity is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Trails constructed on NFS land as part of the preferred alternative (recreation mitigation, 2021 FEIS, pp. 132–134) will be consistent with sustainable trail building guidelines, minimize resource impacts, minimize user conflict, and enhance recreational experience. | Same | Same | Same |
| 52 | Dispersed Recreation | G | REC-DIS-G-03 (p. 35) | Newly constructed motorized and nonmotorized trails should not be located in or crossing the riparian management zone (which includes riparian areas, meadows, wetlands, seeps, springs, streams, and connected floodplains supporting riparian vegetation), meadows, sacred sites, or areas with high concentrations of significant archeological sites, unless the purpose is to provide for resource protection. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Motorized and nonmotorized trails constructed as part of recreation mitigation would not be located in or cross the riparian management zone, meadows or sacred sites, or areas with high concentrations of significant archaeological sites. Preliminary trail alignments and trailhead areas were surveyed for cultural resources that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and trail designs were refined to reduce conflict with cultural resources. See 2021 FEIS, p. 781; and "A Mitigation Effectiveness Evaluation of the Superior, Arizona Recreation Project Conceptual Plan (March 2019)" (Rausch and Rasmussen 2020). | Same | Same | Same |
| 53 | Dispersed Recreation | G | REC-DIS-G-04 (p. 35) | National Forest System trails should not be used for management activities (e.g., fire, timber, and range management) that negatively impact trail management objectives, unless alternatives entail greater resource damage. Adverse impacts to trail features should be restored as part of project completion. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not authorize management activities using NFS trails, only crossing. In addition, the pipeline crossings would be restored at the completion of the project (see "Draft Reclamation Plan | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Preferred Alternative" (Tetra Tech 2020)). | | | | |
| **Motorized Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | Motorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-MO-DC-01 (p. 36) | The motorized trail system provides a variety of opportunities, settings, and technical challenges for users while remaining sustainable. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. While some motorized trails would be closed by implementation of the preferred alternative, new trails would be constructed as part of recreation mitigation (2021 FEIS, pp. 132–134). Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. | Same | Same | Same |
| 55 | Motorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-MO-DC-02 (p. 36) | Motorized trailheads and staging areas are located in areas convenient for the public and designed to minimize dust. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives. New motorized trails constructed for Recreation Mitigation would be located in areas more convenient to the public. They are anticipated to reduce conflicts between recreational use and other uses of the Tonto National Forest or nearby private property (2021 FEIS, p. 623). The planned trail system will better employ the currently underdeveloped recreation opportunities of NFS lands located in close proximity to Superior and the Phoenix metropolitan area (2021 FEIS, p. 623). Dust has not been identified as an issue with motorized trails or staging areas to be constructed with the preferred alternative (2021 FEIS, p. 349). | Same | Same | Same |
| 56 | Motorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-MO-DC-03 (p. 36) | Motorized trails and staging areas are sustainable and resource damage (e.g., soil erosion, vegetation trampling, and litter accumulation) related to these recreation | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. Preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | areas is minimized. | | | New motorized trails constructed for recreation mitigation would be consistent with these desired conditions. See 2021 FEIS, p. 227. | | | |
| 57 | Motorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-MO-DC-04 (p. 36) | Motorized use is managed consistent with state laws. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not affect how motorized use is managed on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 58 | Motorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-MO-DC-05 (p. 36) | Airstrips provide aircraft access for dispersed recreation opportunities. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. There are no airstrips on NFS land within the project area; the Alternatives would not affect use or access to airstrips on NFS lands on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 59 | Motorized Recreation | S | REC-DIS-MO-S-01 (p. 37) | Motorized vehicle travel shall be managed to occur only on the designated system of National Forest System roads, motorized trails, and motorized areas per the motor vehicle use map. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not affect how motorized vehicle traffic is managed across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 60 | Motorized Recreation | S | REC-DIS-MO-S-02 (p. 37) | Newly constructed motorized trails will follow current sustainable construction and design standards for motorized trail building principles to mitigate erosion and to promote sustainable design. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. New motorized trails on NFS lands will comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 61 | Motorized Recreation | S | REC-DIS-MO-S-03 (p. 37) | Motorized recreation trailheads that serve as day use staging areas shall be managed for parking and loading or unloading off-highway vehicles. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not address and would not change management of existing motorized recreation trailheads. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 62 | Motorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-MO-G-01 (p. 37) | When natural barriers are not effective or efficient, other barriers and/or signage should be used to control unauthorized use in areas with a high potential for illegal cross-country motorized vehicle operation. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Any efforts to restrict cross-country motorized vehicle operation associated with the preferred alternative would comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 63 | Motorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-MO-G-02 (p. | Motorized use should be actively managed through a set of engineering, monitoring, | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 37) | education, control, partnership, and enforcement strategies which respond to population and visitor use increase. | | address and would not affect how motorized recreation use is managed across the forest. | | | | |
| 64 | Motorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-MO-G-03 (p. 37) | Unsustainable motorized trails that have low use, no remarkable destination value, and/or are duplicate trails to the same destination, should be decommissioned and rehabilitated to improve environmental resource conditions and reduce negative impacts to ecological natural resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The Resolution Copper Project EIS is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing whether motorized trails are or are not sustainable. That is more appropriately addressed during travel management planning. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 65 | Motorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-MO-G-04 (p. 37) | When fences intersect motorized trails, pass-through areas should be provided consistent with managed uses of the trail. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. If any fences are encountered during construction of new motorized trails authorized by the preferred alternative, pass-through areas consistent with this guideline would be provided. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Nonmotorized Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | Nonmotorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-NMO-DC-01 (p. 38) | Nonmotorized trails provide a variety of opportunities for public travel, recreation uses, traditional and cultural uses, and land management and resource protection activities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. While the preferred alternative would impact some existing nonmotorized trails, it would mitigate impacts (2021 FEIS, p. 640, pp. J-27 through J-28). Resulting impacts to nonmotorized recreation would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or in the long-term. | Same | Same | Same |
| 67 | Nonmotorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-NMO-DC-02 | Level of development for trails and trailheads is appropriate to the site | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (p. 38) | conditions, use, and setting. Trails vary in length and challenge, with links that provide "loop" opportunities and connect communities and other public lands. Trailhead locations are appropriate for current and anticipated use levels. | | | progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives. The package of trails that is contained in Mitigation Measure FS-RC-03 (2021 FEIS, pp. J-27 through J-28) was analyzed in "A Mitigation Effectiveness Evaluation of the Superior, Arizona Recreation Project Conceptual Plan (March 2019)" (Rausch and Rasmussen (2020)). Section 4 of that document describes the four nonmotorized trails to be constructed as part of FS-RC-03 (Rausch and Rasmussen 2020:18–19). Tables 2 and 3 also provide information on these trails (Rausch and Rasmussen 2020:15–17). A review of this information clearly shows that these trails comply with these desired conditions. | | | |
| 68 | Nonmotorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-NMO-DC-03 (p. 38) | An adequate sign system provides for traveler orientation, location information, and to promote compliance with rules and regulations. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives. Trail signs associated with the preferred alternative will comply with these desired conditions. | Same | Same | Same |
| 69 | Nonmotorized Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-NMO-DC-04 (p. 38) | Unauthorized permanent fixed anchors for rock climbing and rappelling are not present on the landscape or natural features. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not affect the use of fixed anchors on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 70 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-01 (p. 38) | Trail maintenance and management priorities should be based on user demand and the need to minimize resource damage, provide appropriate and meaningful recreation opportunities, and to accommodate administrative needs. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not affect the maintenance and management program for trails on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 71 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-02 (p. 38) | Where new and existing designated trails encounter springs, trails should be designed and maintained to minimize negative impacts to the spring (e.g., erosion, trampling, compaction, and introduction of invasive species and disease) while still allowing access for wildlife. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The project or activity is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. New trails on NFS land would be constructed to meet this guideline. The preferred alternative would have no effect on the management of existing trails. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 72 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-03 (p. 38) | Nonmotorized system trails should be decommissioned or improved when:<br>a. Trails have deteriorated to the point where they are a hazard to public health and safety;<br>b. There are persistent user conflicts causing public health and safety concerns;<br>c. Unacceptable resource damage is occurring based on other resources' desired conditions; or<br>d. It has become evident that the trail is unsustainable and does not add value to the trail system. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not make decisions on whether to decommission trails based on trail conditions and would have no effect on whether specific trails are or are not decommissioned based upon their condition. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 73 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-04 (p. 39) | Permanent fixed anchors or bolts for rock climbing and rappelling should be allowed where resource conflicts do not exist (e.g., at-risk species, scenic integrity, cultural resources) and removable protection is not practicable for safe ascent or descent for approved routes. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not address the use of fixed anchors or bolts for climbing or rappelling on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 74 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-05 (p. 39) | Infrastructure related to equestrian use (e.g., hitching posts, trailer-accessible parking) should be provided in areas with high demand for horseback recreation as commensurate with other resources. User conflicts with other recreation user groups should be considered when determining an appropriate number of features to install. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not propose installation of equestrian infrastructure, nor would it have any effect on such infrastructure decisions made elsewhere. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 75 | Nonmotorized Recreation | G | REC-DIS-NMO-G-06 (p. 39) | When fences intersect nonmotorized trails, pass-through areas should be provided consistent with managed uses of the trail. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The project or activity is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. If any fences are encountered during construction of new nonmotorized trails authorized by the preferred alternative, pass-through areas consistent with this guideline would be provided. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Water Based Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Water Based Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-WB-DC-01 (p. 40) | Water based recreation provides social, cultural, and economic benefits to the public. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect water-based recreation. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.9. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 77 | Water Based Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-WB-DC-02 | Designated water access points and amenities within developed sites reflect | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (p. 40) | user demands, site capacity, and water accessibility. | | affect designated water access points and amenities within developed sites. | | | | |
| 78 | Water Based Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-WB-DC-03 (p. 40) | Sustainable water-based recreation opportunities are provided on the Tonto, while riparian areas remain largely undisturbed from recreational impacts (e.g., camping and access points) with the exception of the Lakes and Rivers Management Area. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would not result in impacts to riparian areas from recreational activity. See "Effects of Recreation Mitigation Lands," 2021 FEIS, p. 404. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 79 | Water Based Recreation | DC | REC-DIS-WB-DC-04 (p. 40) | Boat launches and/or docks are maintained to standard. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not address and would have no effect on boat launches and/or docks or their maintenance. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 80 | Water Based Recreation | G | REC-DIS-WB-G-01 (p. 40) | Management activities should prevent and/or minimize the spread of invasive species (e.g., Quagga mussel, apple snail, or whirling disease). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives do not include actions that are associated with introduction or spread of these invasive aquatic species. See response to LMP component #503. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Recreational Shooting** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | Recreational Shooting | DC | REC-DIS-RS-DC-01 (p. 41) | Recreational shooting opportunities are available and address user demand while minimizing public safety concerns, environmental impacts, resource damage, and litter. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would have no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. The action alternatives would affect recreational shooting in two ways. It includes measures to avoid new trails near illegal and unauthorized shooting areas (2021 FEIS, p. 623), thus making progress towards attaining desired conditions. However, loss of motorized routes and dispersed camping areas would likely result in more concentrated recreation | Same. | Same | Same. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | levels and congested conditions (including recreational shooting) along remaining low-elevation access points close to U.S. Route 60 (2021 FEIS, p. 624). Overall, the action alternatives would have only a negligible adverse effect on the availability of recreational shooting opportunities. | | | |
| 82 | Recreational Shooting | DC | REC-DIS-RS-DC-02 (p. 41) | Conflicts with other uses are minimal. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would have no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #81. | Same | Same | Same |
| 83 | Recreational Shooting | DC | REC-DIS-RS-DC-03 (p. 41) | Approved target types and other restrictions are clearly communicated to forest users. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would have no effect on management of recreational shooting on the forest, including target types or communication of such to forest users. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 84 | Recreational Shooting | DC | REC-DIS-RS-DC-04 (p. 41) | The shooting of, or targets attached to, natural features (e.g., cacti, trees, and caves), cultural resources, range improvements, or other property of the United States (e.g., signs and structures) does not occur. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The alternatives would have no effect on management of recreational shooting on the forest, including what recreational shooters use as targets. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 85 | Recreational Shooting | DC | REC-DIS-RS-DC-05 (p. 41) | Recreational shooting does not occur in areas where risks to public health and safety and conflicts with other National Forest uses are not able to be mitigated. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would have no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #81. | Same | Same | Same |
| 86 | Recreational Shooting | O | REC-DIS-RS-O-01 (p. 41) | Within two years of plan approval, complete recreational shooting closure on behalf of public safety and in compliance with the Dingell Act, in the following areas: a. Within a minimum of one quarter mile | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Decisions related to closure of shooting areas is outside the scope of this project. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | from developed recreation sites;<br>b. Within a minimum of one quarter mile from occupied private property, residences, or administrative sites;<br>c. Within the Lakes and Rivers Management Area; and<br>d. Within any designated off-highway vehicle areas, including "tot lots," and special recreation permit areas along shorelines as identified in the motor vehicle use map (MVUM). | | | | | | |
| 87 | Recreational Shooting | S | REC-DIS-RS-S-01 (p. 42) | Management of recreational shooting will be consistent with Federal and State laws regarding the use of firearms. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on management of recreational shooting on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 88 | Recreational Shooting | G | REC-DIS-RS-G-01 (p. 42) | An approved list of target types and target shooting restrictions should be posted online and provided at entrances for areas that are frequently used for shooting. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on management of recreational shooting on the forest, including target types or communication of such to forest users. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89 | Recreational Shooting | G | REC-DIS-RS-G-02 (p. 42) | Areas restricted from recreational shooting should be clearly identified and communicated through a variety of outlets, including media and educational materials. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on management of recreational shooting on the forest, including communication of area restrictions to the public. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Wildlife-related Recreation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | Wildlife-related Recreation | DC | REC-WR-DC-01 (p. 43) | Ecological conditions on the Forest support plentiful and diverse opportunities for hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching, and contribute to local economies. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions | Same. | Same. | Same. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | or objectives. Hunting and bird watching were identified as recreational uses in the project area. While hunting opportunities (for both big and small game) could be displaced by mining activities, it would be a minor impact on hunting overall (2021 FEIS, p. 625). Bird watching may be impacted at a local level but would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term. | | | |
| 91 | Wildlife-related Recreation | DC | REC-WR-DC-02 (p. 43) | Access to a range of opportunities for hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching are available. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #90 above. | Same | Same | Same. |
| 92 | Wildlife-related Recreation | DC | REC-WR-DC-03 (p. 43) | Forest visitors have a variety of opportunities to view, experience, appreciate, and learn about the fish and wildlife resources of the Forest. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. The alternatives do not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #90. | Same | Same | Same |
| 93 | Wildlife-related Recreation | G | REC-WR-G-01 (p. 35) | Motorized big game retrieval should be managed to occur only along designated routes open to the public as depicted in the motor vehicle use map (MVUM). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect decisions made during transportation planning or restrictions depicted on the motor vehicle use map. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 94 | Wildlife-related Recreation | G | REC-WR-G-02 (p. 44) | Design elements (e.g., seasonal restrictions, distance buffers, and personnel training) | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives are designed exactly in accord with | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | should be utilized for projects and activities that might negatively affect populations of economically important species. | | | the guideline. They include numerous design features, including mitigation and monitoring measures to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for resource impacts to wildlife (2021 FEIS, section 2.3, p. 130). | | | |
| 95 | Wildlife-related Recreation | G | REC-WR-G-03 (p. 44) | Wildlife connectivity for economically important and other species should be maintained and/or enhanced. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The analysis of wildlife connectivity states there would be a loss of long-term movement habitat along pipeline corridors (2021 FEIS, p. 581), it concludes that potential impacts would likely be limited to impacts at the local level for most species and would not be significant at the population level (2021 FEIS, p. 581). To comply with the revised LMP, the project would need to be modified or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| **Special Uses** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 96 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-01 (p. 45) | Recreational special uses enhance the outdoor experiences of Forest visitors and provide unique opportunities and services. Authorized activities will adhere to regulations that advocate for public safety and reduce impacts to ecological and cultural resources and other Forest users (e.g., carpooling reduces impacts to air quality and crowding at busy parking lots, interpretation and instruction provides protection to sensitive cultural resources and vegetation). Special use activities support the public's need and demonstrated demands for specific recreation and commercial opportunities or services. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. This project does not authorize any recreational special uses, nor would it have any effect on whether authorized recreation special uses adhere to regulations. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 97 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-02 (p. 45) | The number of special use authorizations issued, including outfitters and guides, balances public demand with desired conditions for ecological resources, and augments the variety of suitable outdoor recreation experiences on the Tonto National Forest. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. This project does not authorize any recreational special uses, nor would it have any effect on the number of recreational special use | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | authorizations are issued. | | | | |
| 98 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-03 (p. 45) | Commercial recreation special uses provide an equal opportunity for local businesses to compete for high-demand activities and services. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. This project does not authorize any recreational special uses, nor would it have any effect on the how recreational special use authorizations are issued. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 99 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-04 (p. 45) | User conflicts between outfitting and guiding activities are infrequent. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. This project does not authorize any recreational special uses, nor would it have any effect on conflicts between outfitting and guiding activities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 100 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-05 (p. 46) | The authorization and administration of lands special uses to individuals, companies, groups, other Federal agencies, and State or local governments maintains natural resource values and protects public health and safety. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. The Forest Service special use authorizations (SUAs) would include terms and conditions to minimize damage to the environment, protect the public interest, and require compliance with water and air quality standards (2021 FEIS, pp. 18 and 581). SUAs would be issued to permit the activities associated with the preferred alternative under regulations codified at 36 CFR 251 Subpart B, and permission for road use under regulations codified at 36 CFR 212 Subpart A, and to determine the terms and conditions of such authorizations. Thus, the preferred alternative was determined to minimize damage to the environment and protect the public interest as required by 36 CFR 251 Subpart B. | Same as Alternative 6. | Same for powerlines, other mine features would be under General Plan of Operations, not SUA. | Same for powerlines, other mine features would be under General Plan of Operations, not SUA. |
| 101 | Special Uses | DC | SU-DC-06 (p. | Utility corridors and communications sites | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 46) | are sized to fit the intended use and obsolete or unused facilities are removed and rehabilitated. | | | alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. The utility corridors contained in the preferred alternatives are designed to meet the intended use of the project. There are no obsolete or unused facilities in the area. See 2021 FEIS, p. 72; pp. 77–80; pp. 86–87; and p. 330. | | | |
| 102 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-01 (p. 46) | Activities that include visits to archaeological sites shall identify the site locations in the special use authorization and follow Leave No Trace ethics as outlined in the operating plan. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. If any special use authorization is issued in conjunction with preferred alternatives that includes visits to archaeological sites (associated with cultural resource mitigation), the special use authorization would comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 103 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-02 (p. 46) | Conflicting uses will not be authorized in communication sites, transportation, or utility corridors. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. No conflicting uses have been identified in the utility corridors contained in the preferred alternatives. | Same | Same | Same |
| 104 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-03 (p. 46) | Authorizations for utilities must incorporate an operating plan which describes means of access, requirements for road construction, reconstruction, and maintenance responsibilities and incorporates design elements to minimize resource damage (e.g., dust abatement, preventing the spread of invasive weeds) from these activities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Operating plans or agreements are required for new and reauthorized powerline facilities on NFS lands (36 CFR 251.56 (h)). Special Use Authorizations issued for the preferred alternatives will comply with 36 CFR 251 Subpart B. | Same | Same | Same |
| 105 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-04 (p. 46) | Authorized boat tours for watercraft in excess of 25 feet long shall be limited to one per reservoir. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize or affect boat tours. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 106 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-05 (p. 46) | Requests for new authorizations or expansion of existing services and/or permitted areas will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis using the criteria for | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include authorizations or | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | new commercial public services. Preference will be given to existing permit holders who are in compliance with their existing permits. | | expansions of existing commercial public services. | | | | |
| 107 | Special Uses | S | SU-S-06 (p. 46) | All river-running outfitter and guide authorizations will be restricted to no more than two groups entering the Upper Salt River Canyon Wilderness per day. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize or address outfitter and guide authorizations. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 108 | Special Uses | G | SU-G-01 (p. 46) | Utilities should utilize existing facilities, roads, sites, and corridors unless new sites can provide better social and/or ecological resource benefits. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The LMP lists examples of utilities as "electrical, communication, and internet lines" (LMP, p. 45). For all action alternatives, wherever possible existing roads would be used to construct transmission facilities. See 2021 FEIS, p. 80. | Same. | Same. | Same. |
| 109 | Special Uses | | SU-G-02 (p. 46) | Organized recreation events and noncommercial group uses authorized under special use permit should be limited to designated National Forest System trails and roads, suitable developed sites and group sites, and pre-disturbed areas that can provide safety for participants and the public. Authorizations should promote responsible land use (e.g., Leave No Trace ethics and pack-it-in pack-it-out). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include authorization of organized recreation events and noncommercial groups. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 110 | Special Uses | | SU-G-03 (p. 46) | Special use activities that negatively impact the experience of other visitors should be scheduled outside of high-use periods. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize special use activities (the LMP lists examples of special use activities as research and monitoring, LMP, p. 36). | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 111 | Special Uses | | SU-G-04 (p. 46) | Special use permits should not authorize camping at cultural sites, trailheads (except those trailheads with designated dispersed sites), sensitive species areas, or interpretive sites. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize camping. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 112 | Special Uses | | SU-G-05 (p. 46) | Special use permits should not authorize the use of domestic sheep or goats where | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | there is a risk of contact with bighorn sheep. | | not authorize use of domestic sheep or goats. | | | | |
| 113 | Special Uses | | SU-G-06 (p. 47) | Nonmotorized watercraft uses on the Lower Salt River should be managed to utilize all existing developed water access points and provide equal opportunity to multiple businesses. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize the use of nonmotorized watercraft on the Lower Salt River. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 114 | Special Uses | | SU-G-07 (p. 47) | Utility line corridors should be designed to blend with the existing character of the landscape. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are in place to reduce visual contrast (2021 FEIS, p. 743). In addition, a specific mitigation measure was developed and will be required to minimize visual impacts from transmission lines (see mitigation measure FS-SR-01 in appendix J). | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 115 | Special Uses | | SU-G-08 (p. 47) | Proposals for special uses (e.g., apiaries) that may negatively impact public safety, native fish, wildlife, and plant species (especially at-risk species) should include design elements to mitigate such risks prior to authorization or not be authorized. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize apiaries or similar/related uses. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Energy Production and Delivery** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | Energy Production and Delivery | DC | EG-DC-01 (p. 48) | Energy corridors throughout the planning area improve the delivery of electricity and enhance the western electric transmission grid by improving reliability, reducing congestion, and contributing to the national electrical grid. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Electric power lines included in the project are not part of an energy corridor and would not contribute to the national grid. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 117 | Energy Production and Delivery | DC | EG-DC-02 (p. 48) | Exploration, development, production, and transmission of renewable energy resources contribute social and economic benefits to local communities and are conducted in a manner that minimizes adverse long-term impacts to Tonto resources and uses, ecosystem health, and watershed conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include exploration, development, or production of renewable energy resources. While the transmission lines constructed for this project may transmit renewable energy (see | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 2021 FEIS, p. 79; and RC-AQ-01, 2021 FEIS, p. 363 and appendix J), the Forest Service has no role in determining how electricity transmitted through the lines on NFS lands is produced. | | | | |
| 118 | Energy Production and Delivery | DC | EG-DC-03 (p. 39) | Energy rights-of-way allow for the operation and maintenance of the facilities and infrastructure as well as desired vegetative conditions and land uses. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. Power transmission facilities would allow for the operation and maintenance of the facilities and infrastructure. Soil loss from construction and operations in the pipeline and power line corridor is expected to be minimal after compliance with applicant-committed environmental protection measures (stormwater pollution prevention plans and erosion and sediment controls), and post-closure after reclamation when the surface has stabilized from revegetation (2021 FEIS, p. 255). Desired vegetation conditions would improve over the long-term (2021 FEIS, pp. 246–250). Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve desired vegetative conditions and land uses across the forest or in the long-term. | Same | Same | Same |
| 119 | Energy Production and Delivery | S | EG-S-01 (p. 48) | Conflicting uses of activities in energy corridors will not be authorized. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. No conflicting uses have been identified in the utility corridors. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 120 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-01 (p. 48) | New electrical distribution lines and smaller pipelines, or similar utility, should occur along or within existing road systems or other previously disturbed areas. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #108 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 121 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-02 (p. 48) | Solar energy projects should give priority consideration to previously disturbed sites to prevent unnecessary environmental and scenic disturbances. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize solar energy projects. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 122 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-03 (p. 48) | Energy corridors should be planned to avoid or limit disturbance in or near riparian areas, surface water, shallow groundwater, unstable areas, or wetlands. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The power transmission facilities associated with the action alternative are located to minimize impacts on riparian areas, surface water, shallow groundwater, unstable areas, and wetlands. See response to LMP component #108 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 123 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-04 (p. 48) | New energy facilities and transmission corridors should avoid locations in areas identified as having a demonstrated high risk to at-risk species, cultural resources, or other resources. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative would include electrical transmission lines that could unavoidably impact cultural resources. Specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are incorporated into the project to reduce these impacts (2021 FEIS, p. 781), and numerous mitigations are required for cultural resources (appendix J, mitigation measures FS-CR-01, FS-CR-02, FS-CR-03, FS-CR-05, FS-CR-06, FS-CR-08, FS-SO-02). In addition, 100 percent of the corridor has been surveyed for cultural resources except where prevented by steep or unsafe terrain, and within the transmission line/pipeline corridor micro-siting would be used to avoid any known sites. The project design varies from the exact words of the guideline but is as effective in meeting the purpose of the guideline to contribute to the maintenance or | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | attainment of relevant desired conditions and objectives. | | | |
| 124 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-05 (p. 48) | The Tonto National Forest staff should authorize proposals to use existing energy corridors without alternative-route analysis, subject to site-specific environmental analysis. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize proposals to use existing energy corridors, as such proposals are not feasible for this project. | N/A | Same | Same | Same |
| 125 | Energy Production and Delivery | G | EG-G-06 (pp. 48–49) | New distribution lines and telephone lines should be buried, unless one or more of the following applies:<br>a. scenic integrity objectives of the area can be met using an overhead line;<br>b. burial is not feasible due to geologic hazard, unfavorable geologic conditions, or presence of cultural resources;<br>c. it would result in greater long-term site disturbance; or<br>d. it is not technically feasible. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Burial of all electric distribution lines would result in additional surface disturbance and impacts to cultural resources, as well as additional impact to soil productivity from site disturbance. See 2021 FEIS, p. 789: "Impacts (to cultural resources) cannot be avoided within the areas of surface disturbance)." | Same | Same | Same |
| **Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 126 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | DC | GRZ-DC-01 (p. 51) | Sustainable livestock grazing contributes to the long-term socioeconomic diversity and stability of local communities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. While the preferred alternative would reduce 158 animal unit months (AUMs) on existing grazing allotments on NFS land (2021 FEIS, table 3.16.4-7, pp. 895–896), it would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives across the forest or over the long term. | Consistent. While Alternative 5 would reduce 192 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land (2021 FEIS, table 3.16.4-6, pp. 894–895), it would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or | Consistent. While Alternative 4 would reduce 667 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land (2021 FEIS, table 3.16.4-4, p. 893), it would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives across the | Consistent. While Alternatives 2 and 3 would reduce 627 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land (2021 FEIS, table 3.16.4-2, pp. 892–893), they would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives across the forest or over the long term. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | objectives across the forest or over the long term. | forest or over the long term. | |
| 127 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | DC | GRZ-DC-02 (p. 51) | Rangelands are resilient to disturbances, fluctuations, and extremes in the natural environment (e.g., fire, flooding, drought, climate variability). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. The preferred alternative would not impact the resilience of rangelands. While the preferred alternative would reduce 158 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land, those livestock would be removed from the allotment and would not authorize increases in AUMs elsewhere. See 2021 FEIS, p. 889. | Consistent. Alternative 5 has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. Alternative 5 would not impact the resilience of rangelands. While it would reduce 192 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land, those livestock would be removed from the allotment, and would not authorize increases in AUMs elsewhere. See 2021 FEIS, p. 889. | Consistent. The preferred alternative 4 has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. The Alternative 4 would not impact the resilience of rangelands. While it would reduce 667 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land, those livestock would be removed from the allotment, and would not authorize increases in AUMs elsewhere. See 2021 FEIS, p. 889. | Consistent. Alternatives 2 and 3 have no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. Alternatives 2 and 3 would not impact the resilience of rangelands. While they would reduce 893 AUMs on existing grazing allotments on NFS land, those livestock would be removed from the allotment, and would not authorize increases in AUMs elsewhere. See 2021 FEIS, p. 889. |
| 128 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | DC | GRZ-DC-03 (p. 51) | Livestock grazing allows for healthy, diverse plant communities, satisfactory soil and water conditions, and sustains the quality | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect how | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and quantity of fish and wildlife habitat. | | grazing occurs on allotments and would not affect how grazing affects plant communities, fish and wildlife habitat. See response to LMP component #127. Decisions regarding allotment stocking and grazing strategies are made in grazing-specific analyses and allotment management plans. See forest plan, p. 51. | | | | |
| 129 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | DC | GRZ-DC-04 (p. 51) | Livestock management and range improvements sustain or improve other resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The Preferred action alternatives do not authorize changes in livestock management or implementation of range improvements. Grazing allotment plans, grazing permits, and annual operating instructions are the mechanism for implementing changes in grazing management and range improvements. See forest plan, p. 51. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 130 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | O | GRZ-O-01 (p. 51) | At least 2 water troughs or open storage tanks per ranger district will be fitted with wildlife escape ramps each year until all troughs and tanks have ramps. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not address or include changes to management of water features on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 131 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | O | GRZ-O-02 (p. 22) | At least one vacant allotment will be evaluated for one of the following options every two years, until there are no vacant | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no effect on | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | allotments. If additional allotments become vacant (waived without preference) they will be evaluated for one or a combination of the following options within two years:<br>a. Convert to forage reserves to improve resource management flexibility;<br>b. Grant to current or new permitted livestock producer; or<br>c. Close to permitted grazing, in whole or in part. | | evaluation of vacant grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | | | | |
| 132 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | S | GRZ-S-01 (p. 52) | Livestock use in and around riparian areas will be evaluated on an allotment-specific basis. Design elements (e.g., deferment, herding, and fencing) will be implemented where needed. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management or evaluation on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 133 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-01 (p. 52) | Range improvements should be maintained to specifications to provide their intended function and extend the useful life of the improvement. Range improvements should be removed or decommissioned when no longer needed. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management or range improvement maintenance on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 134 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-02 (p. 52) | Salt or mineral supplements should not be placed near riparian, wetland, karst features, or other areas where livestock concentrations are undesired. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management or the use of sale and mineral supplements on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 135 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-03 (p. 42) | Drought preparedness should be emphasized in allotment management plans and may include flexible stocking rates/livestock classes, flexible rotation schedules, and other strategies for dealing with climate variability. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management planning. See responses to LMP components #128 and | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | #129. | | | | |
| 136 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-04 (p. 52) | Livestock rotations should avoid grazing the same areas during the growing season at the same time, year after year. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. action alternatives would not affect livestock management, including livestock rotation on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 137 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-05 (p. 52) | Wildlife escape ramps should be installed in all livestock water troughs and open storage tanks. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management including escape ramps on water features on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 138 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-06 (p. 52) | Efforts (e.g., coordination with permittees, temporary fencing, increased herding, and herding dogs) should be made to prevent transfer of disease from domestic sheep and goats to bighorn sheep wherever bighorn sheep occur. Allotment conversions from cattle to domestic sheep or goats should not be allowed in areas adjacent to or inhabited by bighorn sheep. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect livestock management of grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 139 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-07 (p. 52) | Allotments and other areas closed to permitted livestock grazing should remain closed. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect decisions on whether areas closed to livestock grazing are opened or remain closed. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 140 | Rangelands, Forage, and Grazing | G | GRZ-G-08 (p. 53) | When unauthorized livestock are found occupying National Forest lands, the owner should be promptly notified to remove them and prevent them from re-entering National Forest lands. If the owner is unknown or uncooperative, impoundment procedures should be initiated. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect actions taken when unauthorized livestock are found to occupy NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 141 | Rangelands, Forage, and | G | GRZ-G-09 (p. | A stock and monitor approach | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grazing | | 53) | incorporating best available science should be used when evaluating stocking rates in grazing decisions. | | preferred alternative would not affect decisions stocking rates on grazing allotments. See responses to LMP components #128 and #129. | | | | |
| **Cultural and Historic Resources** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 142 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-01 (p. 55) | Historic properties, including traditional cultural properties, retain all of the characteristics that qualify the property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and convey its historical significance, including any aspects of the property's integrity (e.g., location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association) that have been identified as supporting its eligibility. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The preferred alternative would impact historic properties (2021 FEIS, pp. 780–781; pp. 785–786). Although it contains several mitigation measures designed to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for resource impacts (2021 FEIS, pp. 787–789 and appendix J, pp. J-36 through J-41), implementation of the preferred alternative would not retain all of the characteristics that qualify the property for listing in the NRHP. The project must be modified, or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. | Not consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. | Not consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. |
| 143 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-02 (p. 55) | Historic properties are not threatened by human disturbances. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The preferred alternative would result in impacts to historic properties from human disturbances. See response to LMP component #142. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. | Not consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. See response to LMP component #142. | Not consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. See response to LMP component #142. | Not Consistent. Same outcome as Alternative 6. Project modification or forest plan amendment required. See response to LMP component #142. |
| 144 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-03 (p. 55) | Access and use of cultural resources important to living communities are available to those communities for cultural practices. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative would result in18 acres changing | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative would result in 36 acres changing from | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative would result in 18 acres changing from semiprimitive nonmotorized to semiprimitive |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | effect on one or more desired conditions. Public access would change on 166 acres from semiprimitive nonmotorized to semiprimitive motorized on NFS lands (2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-2). To mitigate these effects, the Forest Service will facilitate the salvage of resources (e.g., culturally important plants and mineral resources) in the pipeline corridor and other areas (2025 FEIS, section 3.12 and appendix J). The preferred alternative would have impacts to those NFS lands where public access would change, however those areas are limited, access would still be possible, and it would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | from semiprimitive nonmotorized to semiprimitive motorized on NFS lands (2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-2). | semiprimitive nonmotorized to semiprimitive motorized on NFS lands (2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-2). | motorized on NFS lands (2025 FEIS, table 3.9.4-2). |
| 145 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-04 (p. 55) | Heritage-based recreation opportunities are available (e.g., exploration and interpretation opportunities) and continue to provide an ecosystem service on the Tonto. The public has opportunities to learn about, appreciate, and understand cultural resources, as well as resources significant to living communities. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect any known heritage-based recreation across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 146 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-05 (p. 55) | Heritage programs, interpretive presentations, publications, and interactive learning opportunities provide the scientific community and the public with opportunities to learn about, understand, appreciate, and experience the Forest's prehistory and history. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not authorize and would not affect Heritage programs, interpretive presentations, publications, and interactive learning opportunities across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 147 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-06 (p. 55) | Buildings and infrastructure listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) continue to preserve any of the characteristics that qualify the property for listing in the NRHP (e.g., the property's | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Historic buildings eligible for the NRHP are present in Superior that are within the | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association), while also fulfilling their roles as administrative and recreational facilities and other infrastructure functions. | | indirect analysis area and in Globe that are within the atmospheric analysis area. None of these buildings are located on NFS land. | | | | |
| 148 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-07 (p. 55) | Cultural resources (including artifacts) are preserved in place. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. All action alternatives would include data recovery and curation of artifacts. The project must be modified, or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. The project must be modified, or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. The project must be modified, or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. The project must be modified, or an amendment to the forest plan approved. |
| 149 | Cultural and Historic Resources | DC | CUH-DC-08 (p. 45) | The Forest has been inventoried for cultural properties at a level that meets current professional standards. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. Inventories conducted as part of the preferred alternative would meet professional standards. | Same | Same | Same |
| 150 | Cultural and Historic Resources | S | CUH-S-01 (p. 55) | Historic properties will be managed in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and other applicable laws. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Historic properties on NFS lands would be managed in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and applicable laws. | Same | Same | Same |
| 151 | Cultural and Historic Resources | S | CUH-S-02 (p. 56) | Historic properties are considered when working to achieve other resource objectives (ecosystem restoration, rangeland management, recreation). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. See 2025 FEIS, cultural resources section. | Same | Same | Same |
| 152 | Cultural and Historic Resources | G | CUH-G-01 (p. 56) | Sites listed in, nominated to, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and American Indian sacred sites should be managed for avoidance or protection during undertakings, where practicable. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The footprint of the project will be designed to avoid NRHP and American Indian sacred sites to the maximum extent possible. See 2021 FEIS, p. 781. | Same | Same | Same |
| 153 | Cultural and Historic | G | CUH-G-02 | When cultural resources cannot be | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resources | | (p. 56) | preserved in place, artifacts and records should be curated following current professional standards. | | | alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Sites would be avoided and protected where practicable. See 2021 FEIS, p. 781. | | | |
| 154 | Cultural and Historic Resources | G | CUH-G-03 (p. 56) | When human remains or other cultural items, as defined under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, are encountered during cultural resource investigations, affiliated communities should be notified, and appropriate actions taken. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Sites would be avoided and protected where practicable. | Same | Same | Same |
| 155 | Cultural and Historic Resources | G | CUH-G-04 (p. 56) | Forest activities (e.g., dispersed and developed recreation, road construction, and range improvements) should be managed to minimize adverse impacts (e.g., disturbance, damage, movement of, alterations, or removal) to cultural and historic resources, as directed by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Sites would be avoided and protected where practicable. See 2021 FEIS, p. 781. | Same | Same | Same |
| 156 | Cultural and Historic Resources | G | CUH-G-05 (p. 56) | When adverse effects to historic properties occur, known affected communities should be involved in the resolution of adverse effects. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Sites would be avoided and protected where practicable. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 157 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | DC | TRB-DC-01 (p. 58) | Locations identified as important by American Indian tribes are acknowledged and there is an emphasis on the resilience and protection of natural and cultural resources and to preserve the character and use of these places. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. Formal consultation with American Indian Tribes was conducted. Mitigation efforts are focused on achieving these desired conditions to the extent practicable given the nature of the project. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.12. The preferred alternative does not | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. | | | |
| 158 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | DC | TRB-DC-02 (p. 58) | Tribal members have open access to Forest land for traditional activities, including access to traditional resource gathering areas and to places having religious, cultural, and/or historical significance (e.g., traditional cultural properties, sacred sites, shrines, and clan origin places). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #144. | Same | Same | Same |
| 159 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | DC | TRB-DC-03 (p. 58) | Restoration is performed in consideration of tribal values and traditional resources are recognized and acknowledged by the Forest. Tribal and Forest landscape restoration activities complement one another to meet common goals. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. Restoration has been planned in consultation with Tribes, and Tribal members are to be involved with restoration activities. | Same | Same | Same |
| 160 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | DC | TRB-DC-04 (p. 58) | Forest products (e.g., pinon nuts, Emory oak, and acorns) important for traditional needs, subsistence practices, and economic support of tribal communities are available and sustainable. Traditional products are preserved sustainably in place wherever feasible and plant populations of tribally important species are available for traditional uses. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. Forest products important for the purposes stated in the DC have not been specifically identified in the transmission and pipeline corridors on NFS lands. However, to mitigate these effects, the Forest Service will facilitate the salvage of resources (e.g., culturally important plants and mineral resources) in the pipeline corridor and other areas (resource salvage, FS-SV-01, 2025 FEIS, section 3.12 and appendix J). While the preferred alternative could impact forest products | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | important for traditional resource gathering, the potentially impacted areas are limited, and it would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | | | |
| 161 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | DC | TRB-DC-05 (p. 58) | Social, cultural, and economic resources on the Forest provide a setting for educating tribal youth in culture, history, and land stewardship, and for exchanging information between tribal elders and youth. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. The preferred alternative contains measures to fund cultural heritage projects as well as fund scholarships for Tribal members pursuing post-high school education. See FS-CR-06 and FS-CR-08, 2021 FEIS, p. 855 and appendix J. These efforts will contribute toward these desired conditions. | Same | Same | Same |
| 162 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | S | TRB-S-01 (p. 59) | The Forest Service shall maintain the confidentiality of culturally sensitive information provided by tribes, unless permission to share information is given in compliance with the Cultural and Heritage Cooperation Authority (25 USC 32A). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 163 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | S | TRB-S-02 (p. 59) | Tribal interests and concerns are considered in management activities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790 and pp. 820–856. | Same | Same | Same |
| 164 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | S | TRB-S-03 (p. 59) | The forest will ensure traditional cultural properties identified by a tribe and determined eligible under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, receive due consideration in project planning. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790. | Same | Same | Same |
| 165 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | S | TRB-S-04 (p. 59) | The responsible official shall work with American Indian tribes to comply with the Cultural and Heritage Cooperation Authority (25 USC 32A) under which the tribes may request temporary closures of specific areas for traditional cultural purposes. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 166 | Tribal Relations and | G | TRB-G-01 (p. | Sacred sites and areas of tribal importance | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Areas of Tribal Importance | | 59) | should be considered during the project planning process and during the implementation of management activities and permitted uses. | | | alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790 and pp. 820–856. | | | |
| 167 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | G | TRB-G-02 (p. 59) | Tribal access to and availability of traditional medicinal plants and other botanical resources should be considered when authorizing commercial harvesting and special uses. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790 and pp. 820–856. | Same | Same | Same |
| 168 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | G | TRB-G-03 (p. 59) | Ethnographies, oral history studies, and traditional resource surveys should be used to preserve information and inform project management. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790 and pp. 820–856. | Same | Same | Same |
| 169 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | G | TRB-G-04 (p. 59) | The physical and scenic quality of high places (e.g., mountain tops and view sheds) that the tribes regard as sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, or as part of important cultural landscapes should be considered when making project decisions or issuing new special use authorizations. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 678–790 and pp. 820–856. | Same | Same | Same |
| 170 | Tribal Relations and Areas of Tribal Importance | G | TRB-G-05 (p. 59) | Requests for reburial on the Forest of American Indian human remains and/or cultural items should be considered in consultation with the affiliated tribes. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Forestry and Forest Products** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 171 | Forestry and Forest Products | DC | FP-DC-01 (p. 62) | Personal and commercial timber harvest[2] contributes to watershed health, function, and resilience, enhance wildlife habitat, creates small and large businesses and employment opportunities, and provides wood products. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize personal or commercial timber harvest on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 172 | Forestry and Forest Products | DC | FP-DC-02 (p. 62) | Personal and commercial timber harvest supplement other restoration and maintenance treatments in forested vegetation communities at a scale that achieves and maintains landscape desired conditions over time. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize personal or commercial timber harvest on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 173 | Forestry and Forest Products | DC | FP-DC-03 (p. 62) | A sustainable supply of commodities (e.g., timber, fuelwood, boughs, Christmas trees, seeds, and other special forest products), | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize personal | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

[2] Timber harvest is defined as "The removal of trees for wood fiber use and other multiple use purposes (36 CFR 219.19)." LMP FEIS, p. 280. Removal of vegetation necessary to construct, operate, and maintain the power lines and pipelines authorized under the preferred alternative is not considered to be timber harvest.

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | are available to businesses and individuals. | | or commercial timber harvest on NFS lands and would not affect the commodities noted. | | | | |
| 174 | Forestry and Forest Products | DC | FP-DC-04 (p. 62) | Forest products (e.g., Emory oak and pinyon nuts) are available and accessible for tribal communities and culturally important activities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LRM component #160 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 175 | Forestry and Forest Products | DC | FP-DC-05 (p. 62) | Harvest of dead and dying trees balance economic value with the needs of wildlife habitat, soil productivity, and ecosystem functions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not propose and would not authorize harvest of dead and dying trees. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 176 | Forestry and Forest Products | O | FP-O-01 (p. 62) | Provide at least 34,000 CCF (hundred cubic feet) or 15,400 MBF (thousand board feet) of timber every 10 years to contribute to forest product industry. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize commercial timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 177 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-01 (p. 62) | Timber harvest and vegetation manipulation shall only occur where soil, slope, and watersheds will not be irreversibly damaged, and protection must be provided for streams, streambanks, riparian, shorelines, lakes, wetlands, other waterbodies, fish, wildlife, recreation, cave and karst formations, cultural, and aesthetic resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 178 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-02 (p. 63) | No harvest for the purpose of timber production will occur on lands not suited for timber production. Timber harvest may occur on these lands to meet other resource objectives and move toward achieving desired ecological conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 179 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-03 (p. 63) | The regeneration harvest of even-aged stands of trees is limited to stands that generally have reached the culmination of | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | mean annual increment (CMAI) of growth, or stands that are unsustainable due to severe damage or disease. This requirement would apply only to regeneration harvest of even-aged stands on lands identified as suited for timber production and where timber production is the primary purpose for the harvest. | | regeneration harvest of even-aged stands of trees. | | | | |
| 180 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-04 (p. 63) | When openings are created with the intent of regeneration, efforts shall be made to ensure that lands can be adequately restocked within 5 years of final harvest. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The preferred alternative does not authorize regeneration of timber stands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 181 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-05 (p. 63) | Even-aged timber harvest methods shall be used only where a completed interdisciplinary team review (and environmental analysis) determines them to be appropriate, and clearcutting will only be used where it is determined to be the optimum method to manage towards desired conditions over the long term. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize even aged management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 182 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-06 (p. 63) | Even-aged regeneration cuts will be shaped and blended with the natural terrain and provide for the protection of soil, watershed, fish, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetic resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize even aged management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 183 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-07 (p. 63) | Even-aged harvest shall only be used where determined to be appropriate based on project specific conditions and the desired conditions for vegetation, wildlife habitat, scenery, and other resources. Maximum size of openings that may be created in one harvest operation will be limited to 40 acres or less, unless specific conditions require larger openings (e.g., forest health or achieving other desired ecological conditions). Specific projects in which an interdisciplinary review indicate that a larger opening is desired will require Regional Forester approval on a case-by-case basis. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize even aged management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 184 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-08 (p. 63) | The quantity of timber that may be sold is limited to an amount equal to or less than that which can be removed from such forest annually in perpetuity on a sustained | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize selling timber. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | yield basis, unless the departure is justified and approved in accordance with direction found in FSH 1909.12, Chapter 60, section 64.33. This limit may be measured on a decadal basis. [as cited in forest plan] | | | | | | |
| 185 | Forestry and Forest Products | S | FP-S-09 (p. 63) | Harvesting systems shall primarily be selected for their ability to move toward achieving desired conditions (e.g., vegetation, watershed, and riparian) and not for their ability to provide the greatest dollar return or unit output of timber, while remaining as economical as possible. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 186 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-01 (p. 64) | Timber harvests may include uneven-aged or even-aged methods that reflect the scale of natural disturbances and should be designed to move towards achieving, or maintaining, desired conditions (e.g., size class distribution, species composition, patch size, fuel reduction, and pathogens). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 187 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-02 (p. 64) | Timber and firewood harvests should be tailored to meet the needs and capabilities of local industry, businesses, and individuals. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest or firewood harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 188 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-03 (p. 64) | Forest treatments should focus on uneven-aged management consistent with desired conditions for ecological response units. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 189 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-04 (p. 64) | Firewood harvest within woodland ecological response units should be designed to be consistent with maintaining or moving toward ecological desired conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize firewood harvest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 190 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-05 (p. 64) | Timber harvest and mechanical fuels treatments should be designed to develop or manage vegetation and coarse woody debris within the range of the desired conditions (e.g., snags, large woody debris). If these attributes were not present in the stand before the activity, treatments should be designed to help meet those requirements in the future. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize timber harvest or fuels treatment. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 191 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-06 (p. 64) | Log landing areas should be located outside of sensitive environments (e.g., riparian | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | areas, wetlands and natural meadows, archeological sites, karst formations, and sensitive species areas). When landings must be located in these areas, effects to the sensitive resource should be mitigated. | | would not result in log landings. | | | | |
| 192 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-07 (p. 64) | Collection permits should not be authorized for rare plant species, species of conservation concern, or state protected species if the species cannot withstand collection and if the collection will result in significant negative impacts to populations on the Forest. Collection requests should be considered when the results of the research will aid management of the collected species and for traditional tribal uses. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize collection permits. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 193 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-08 (p. 64) | Permits for the removal of agaves stalks should not be authorized. Exceptions may be made for limited research purposes and traditional tribal uses. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize permits for removal of agave stalks. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 194 | Forestry and Forest Products | G | FP-G-09 (p. 65) | When forest product and research collection permits are issued, seed collection and cuttings (rather than whole plant removal) should be the preferred collection methods for rare plants. An exception would be when whole plant removal is required to meet the needs of the permit holder and removal would not have the potential to negatively impact rare plant populations. This guideline does not apply to pre-cleared areas for wilding permits of specific species. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize issuance of forest product or research collection permits. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Scenery** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 195 | Scenery | DC | SC-DC-01 (p. 67) | The forest contains a variety of landscapes representing the desired scenic character that contributes to visitors' sense of place and connection with nature. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. The preferred alternative would have both short and long-term | Same.<br><br>Alternative 5 would reduce 850 acres of high SIO to low SIO; and 282 acres of moderate SIO to low. This represents a | Same.<br><br>Alternative 4 would reduce 4,863 acres of high SIO to very low SIO; 1,386 acres of moderate SIO to very low; and 641 acres | Same.<br><br>Alternatives 2 and 3 would reduce 4,952 acres of high SIO to very low SIO; 264 acres of moderate SIO to very low; and 949 acres of low SIO to very low. This |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | impacts on scenic conditions. Alternative 6 would reduce 516 acres of high Scenic Integrity Objective (SIO) to low SIO; and 345 acres of moderate SIO to low. This represents a change of 0.03 percent of all the high SIO on the forest; and 0.6 percent of all the moderate SIO on the forest. Overall, the residual impacts of the preferred alternative do not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | change of 0.05 percent of all the high SIO on the forest; and 0.5 percent of all the moderate SIO on the forest. Overall, the residual impact of Alternative 5 does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | of low SIO to very low. This represents a change of 0.3 percent of all the high SIO on the forest; 0.2 percent of all the moderate SIO on the forest, and 5 percent of all the low SIO on the forest. Overall, the residual impact of Alternative 4 does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | represents a change of 0.3 percent of all the high SIO on the forest; 0.04 percent of all the moderate SIO on the forest, and 8 percent of all the low SIO on the forest. Overall, the residual impact of Alternatives 2 and 3 does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. |
| 196 | Scenery | DC | SC-DC-02 (p. 67) | The forest appears predominantly natural and includes cultural landscapes valued by forest users and local communities for their scenic and traditional values. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #195. | Same | Same | Same |
| 197 | Scenery | DC | SC-DC-03 (p. 67) | High quality scenery dominates the landscape in areas valued by the public (e.g., state designated scenic routes, major roads, developed recreation sites, wilderness, national scenic trails, and wild and scenic rivers). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The preferred alternative would reduce scenic quality from State Route 60, a state designated scenic route, as well as viewpoints on the Arizona National Scenic Trail. Project modification or | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. Project | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. Project | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. Project modification or amendment of the |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | amendment of the forest plan would be required. | modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | forest plan would be required. |
| 198 | Scenery | DC | SC-DC-04 (p. 67) | Scenery reflects ecosystem diversity, enhances recreation settings, and contributes to the quality of life for local residents and communities, as well as forest users from outside the area. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #195. | Same | Same | Same |
| 199 | Scenery | DC | SC-DC-05 (p. 67) | Scenery is managed for present and future generations, is resilient to changing conditions, and supports ecological, social, and economic sustainability on the forest and in surrounding communities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #195. | Same | Same | Same |
| 200 | Scenery | G | SC-G-01 (p. 67) | Management activities and newly constructed features (e.g., facilities and infrastructure) should minimize visual disturbances and be consistent with or move the area towards achieving scenic integrity objectives (as defined in the Scenery Management System, or similar protocol). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The selected action would not be consistent or move the area towards achieving SIOs. To comply with the revised LMP, the project would need to be modified or the SIOs modified through an amendment to the forest plan. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. The project would need to be modified or the SIOs modified through an amendment to the forest plan. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. The project would need to be modified or the SIOs modified through an amendment to the forest plan. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. | Not consistent. Same outcomes as Alternative 6. The project would need to be modified or the SIOs modified through an amendment to the forest plan. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 201 | Scenery | G | SC-G-02 (p. 67) | Projects should include design elements to address negative impacts to scenic resources. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative contains design elements and mitigations to reduce negative impacts on scenic resources. See additional applicant-committed environmental protection measures, 2021 FEIS, p. 743; FS-SR-01, 2021 FEIS, pp. 765–766 and appendix J. | Same | Same | Same |
| 202 | Scenery | G | SC-G-03 (p. 67) | Management activities that result in short-term impacts inconsistent with the scenic integrity objectives, as defined in the scenery management system or similar protocol, should achieve, or move the project towards, the scenic integrity objectives over the long-term. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #200 above. It is not known whether electrical transmission lines will remain after reclamation has occurred, therefore impacts to scenic resources from the electric line must be considered to be permanent. To comply with the revised LMP, the project would need to be modified or an amendment to the forest plan approved. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. In addition to potential permanent impacts from transmission lines, the tailings storage facility for this alternative is on NFS land and will have permanent impacts to SIOs. The project would need to be modified or an amendment to the forest plan approved. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.11.4. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 4. |
| **Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 203 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | DC | MMAM-DC-01 (p. 70) | Mining and mineral activities comply with law, regulation, and policy in the development of mineral resources. Minimize adverse environmental impacts to surface and groundwater resources, | Forest-wide | Depends on alternative. | Not applicable. Mineral resource law and regulation do not apply to the preferred alternative. Under the preferred alternative, the mine, all processing facilities, and the tailings | Not applicable. Same as Alternative 6. | Applicable and consistent. Mineral resource law | Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | watershed and forest ecosystem health, wildlife and wildlife habitat, scenic character, and other desired conditions applicable to the area. | | | storage facility would be located on private or state lands. The facilities on NFS land are limited to roads, pipeline, authorized by special use permit (SF-299) and under 36 CFR 251.50. See 2021 FEIS, p. 18. | | and regulation apply to this alternative. Mining and mineral activities would comply with this desired condition. | |
| 204 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | DC | MMAM-DC-02 (p. 70) | Reclaimed mining and mineral sites provide for public safety and the protection of forest resources. They possess a resilient forest ecosystem suitable to permanent post mining landform. | Forest-wide | Depends on Alternative. | Not applicable. Reclaimed mining and mineral sites would not occur on NFS lands under the preferred alternative. Reclamation would be the responsibility of the Arizona Mining Engineer. See 2021 FEIS, table 1.5.5-1, p. 25, and p. 31. | Not applicable. Same as Alternative 6. | Applicable and consistent. Mineral resource law and regulation do apply to this alternative. Reclaimed mining sites would comply with this desired condition. | Same as Alternative 4. |
| 205 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | DC | MMAM-DC-02 (p. 70) | Mineral materials on National Forest System lands are available to the public and to local, State, and Federal government agencies where reasonable protection of, or mitigation of effects on, other resources is assured, and where removal is not prohibited. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect availability of mineral materials on NFS lands to the public and local, State, and Federal government agencies. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 206 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | DC | MMAM-DC-04 (p. 70) | Opportunities for rock hounding and mineral collection are available to forest users. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect opportunities for rock hounding and mineral collection on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 207 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | DC | MMAM-DC-05 (p. 70) | Abandoned mines disturbed by past mineral exploration and mine development have been returned to stable conditions and do not pose health, safety, or | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | environmental hazards. | | abandoned mine closure and management. | | | | |
| 208 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | O | MMAM-O-01 (p. 70) | Implement closures of at least ten abandoned mines over the life of the plan. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect abandoned mine closure and management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 209 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | S | MMAM-S-01 (p. 70) | Plans of operation shall be required for all mineral operations that will likely cause significant disturbance of surface resources. | Forest-wide | Depends on Alternative. | Not applicable. The preferred alternative does not require a plan of operation. See response to LMP component #203. | Not applicable. Same as Alternative 6. | Applicable and consistent. Mineral resource law and regulation apply to this alternative, and a plan of operations would be required. | Same as Alternative 4. |
| 210 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | S | MMAM-S-02 (p. 70) | Required reclamation activities shall be designed to establish resilient post-mining ecosystems consistent with the pre-disturbance ecological response unit or to an ecological response unit identified as achievable to the post-mining landscape condition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with this standard. Even though actions on NFS lands would be authorized with special use permits, reclamation would be required (2021 FEIS, p. 127). Required reclamation on NFS land are designed to establish the conditions consistent with pre-disturbance ecological response units (ERUs), or ERUs identified as achievable to the post-mining landscape condition. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.2. | Same as Alternative 6. | Generally, the same as Alternative 6, except the tailings facility on NFS land would be unable to reestablish pre-disturbance ERUs. Reclamation of the tailings facility are designed to establish ERUs identified as achievable to the post-mining landscape condition. See 2025 FEIS, | Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | section 3.3.4.2. | |
| 211 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | S | MMAM-S-03 (p. 70) | All exploration drill/core holes and water production or monitoring wells reasonably incident to mining operations or required design elements and monitoring measures shall be abandoned in accordance with current State and Federal regulations and attested to by a licensed Professional Engineer or Geologist on site during the abandonment. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any water production or monitoring wells on NFS lands authorized by the preferred alternative would comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 212 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | S | MMAM-S-04 (p. 70) | A Notice of Intent shall be submitted to the District Ranger from any person proposing to conduct geophysical investigations (e.g., induced polarization, gravity surveys, magnetic surveys, seismic investigations). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not authorize any geophysical investigations on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 213 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-01 (p. 70) | Mineral materials (e.g., sand and gravel) should not be removed from the riparian management zone without adequate engineering controls to protect surface waters. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. None of the alternatives propose the removal of mineral materials on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 214 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-02 (p. 71) | Requests for personal and commercial mineral material sales should be considered where consistent with other resource desired conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. None of the alternatives propose personal or commercial material sales. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 215 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-03 (p. 71) | Placer mining should avoid damaging riparian vegetation, degrading water quality, and negatively impacting channel stability. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not propose or authorize placer mining on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 216 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-04 (p. 71) | Surface reclamation and revegetation plans for smaller scale mineral activities (e.g., drilling programs or smaller scale open pits), should plan for a natural species succession appropriate to the reclaimed landform and vegetative community for the identified ecological response unit, to include identifying appropriate species to use in revegetation of disturbed areas. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #210. | This alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #210. | This alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #210. | This alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #210. |
| 217 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-05 (p. 71) | Reclamation should be carried out in logical succession throughout the operational | Forest-wide | Depends on alternative. | Not applicable. Mining reclamation would not occur on NFS land with | Not applicable. | Applicable and | Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | sequence, concurrently where feasible. | | | this alternative. See response to LMP component #210 above. | Same as Alternative 6. | consistent. Mineral resource law and regulations apply to this alternative, which is designed in accordance with this guideline | |
| 218 | Mining, Minerals, and Abandoned Mines | G | MMAM-G-06 (p. 71) | Abandoned mine features (e.g., adits, shafts, and stopes) should be closed when a feature poses a danger to the public. If the feature is determined to contain wildlife habitat (e.g., maternity roosts or hibernacula for bats) or contain cultural resources, gating should be considered. Installed gates should conform to bat-friendly standards and be designed in such a way to allow for the safe passage of wildlife. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect abandoned mine closure and management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Roads** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 219 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-01 (p. 73) | The Forest's transportation system and infrastructure accommodate needs for public access, land management, resource protection, and user safety, while contributing to social and economic sustainability. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. Motorized access would increase slightly with this alternative (see response to LMP component #43). Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. | Same as Alternative 6.<br><br>Opportunities for access across the forest would remain. Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in | Same as Alternative 6.<br><br>Opportunities for access across the forest would remain. Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. | Same as Alternative 6.<br><br>Opportunities for access across the forest would remain. Overall, the preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any aspect of the stated desired conditions across the forest or in the long term. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | the long term. | | |
| 220 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-02 (p.73) | The Forest's transportation system is interconnected with Federal, State, and local public roads and trails to facilitate access to lands, infrastructure (e.g., buildings, recreation facilities, water and wastewater systems, reservoirs, electronic and communication sites, and utility lines), and inholdings. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. The preferred alternative does not appreciably affect how or whether the Forest Service's transportation system is interconnected with Federal, State, and local public roads and trails. It requires that public access to the lands in the vicinity of the East Plant Site be maintained via State Route 177 and NFS Road 315 as well as U.S. Route 60 and NFS Road 469 (until access is no longer possible). Realignment of Silver King Mine Road would occur, which is meant to provide through-access to the highlands north of the West Plant Site (2021 FEIS, p. 315). | Same | Same | Same |
| 221 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-03 (p. 73) | Roads provide recreation opportunities and access to a variety of recreation settings and places. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #43, #47, #54, #91, and #219. | Same | Same | Same |
| 222 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-04 (p. 73) | National Forest System roads have minimal adverse environmental impacts to soil, riparian areas, watercourses, native vegetation, and at-risk species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. Any construction, reconstruction or maintenance on NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would comply with Forest Service road standards and meet these desired conditions. | Same | Same | Same |
| 223 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-05 | Unauthorized routes are not apparent on | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (p. 73) | the landscape. | | action alternatives would not affect management of unauthorized routes on NFS lands. | | | | |
| 224 | Roads | DC | RD-DC-06 (p. 73) | Roads have a water drainage system that minimizes delivering sediment and pollutants to water bodies. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. Construction, reconstruction, or maintenance on NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would comply with Forest Service road standards and meet these desired conditions. See response to LMP component #222. | Same | Same | Same |
| 225 | Roads | O | RD-O-01 (p. 73) | Decommission 100 to 600 miles of a combination of unauthorized routes and National Forest System roads identified through the travel management process every ten years. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect management of unauthorized routes on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 226 | Roads | O | RD-O-02 (p. 73) | Grade surfaces and clean culverts and ditches on at least 500 miles of open National Forest System roads annually. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect maintenance of NFS roads on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 227 | Roads | S | RD-S-01 (p. 74) | Motor vehicle use by the public is only authorized as designated by the motor vehicle use map, except as authorized. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Authorization of motorized use of roads on the forest is addressed during transportation planning and preparation of the motor vehicle use map. | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 228 | Roads | S | RD-S-02 (p. 74) | Commercial users must maintain roads commensurate with their use to prevent resource damage and deterioration of the road system. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any maintenance of NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would comply with Forest Service road standards and meet these desired conditions. See response to LMP component #222. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 229 | Roads | S | RD-S-03 (p. 74) | Road construction and maintenance will incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. BMPs for road construction and maintenance would be implemented (2021 FEIS, p. 315). See response to LMP component #222. | Same | Same | Same |
| 230 | Roads | S | RD-S-04 (p. 74) | Temporary roads shall be constructed, decommissioned, and rehabilitated as part of the same project. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No temporary roads would be constructed outside of the tailings storage facility disturbance footprints analyzed in the FEIS for any alternative. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 231 | Roads | G | RD-G-01 (p. 74) | New roads should not be constructed in areas where a primitive recreation opportunity spectrum class (ROS) is desired. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No primitive ROS exists in the analysis (2021 FEIS, table 3.9.3-1, p. 608). | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 232 | Roads | G | RD-G-02 (p. 74) | Construction of temporary roads in areas designated as semiprimitive nonmotorized in the recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) should be avoided unless required by a valid permitted activity or management activity. If authorized, roads should be constructed and maintained at the lowest maintenance level needed for the intended use, then rehabilitated. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No temporary roads would be constructed outside the tailings storage facility disturbance footprints analyzed in the FEIS for any alternative. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 233 | Roads | G | RD-G-03 (p. 74) | Decommissioned roads should be returned to their natural condition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Roads decommissioned under the preferred alternative would be returned to their natural condition. | Same | Same | Same |
| 234 | Roads | G | RD-G-04 (p. 74) | When designing or maintaining bridges, design elements that reduce mortality and are beneficial to wildlife (e.g., habitat connectivity, roost sites) should be incorporated. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The preferred alternative does not propose or authorize any bridge construction or maintenance on NFS roads. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 235 | Roads | G | RD-G-05 (p. 74) | New or reconstructed roads should be located outside of the riparian management zone, or other important water resources (e.g., meadows, wetlands, | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Any new or reconstructed roads on NFS land | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | seeps, and springs), in order to prevent resource damage. If road construction in riparian areas is unavoidable, it should be designed and implemented to minimize effects to natural waterflow, aquatic species, channel morphology, water quality, and native riparian vegetation. The number of stream crossings should be minimized to reduce negative impacts to natural resources. | | | authorized by the preferred alternative would either be located outside riparian management zones or be designed and implemented to minimize effects as stated in the guideline. | | | |
| 236 | Roads | G | RD-G-06 (p. 74) | New or redesigned stream crossings (e.g., bridges and culverts) should be wide enough to pass the bankfull without obstructing or confining the flow. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Any new or reconstructed stream crossings on NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would be wide enough to pass the bankfull flow without obstructing or confining the flow. | Same | Same | Same |
| 237 | Roads | G | RD-G-07 (p. 75) | New or reconstructed roads, culverts, and other water crossing infrastructure should be designed and located to allow for passage of aquatic species and the naturally occurring sediment and debris transported by the stream. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Any new or reconstructed stream crossings on NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would be designed and located to allow for passage of aquatic species and the naturally occurring sediment and debris transported by the stream. | Same | Same | Same |
| 238 | Roads | G | RD-G-08 (p. 75) | Roads should be closed, or impacts mitigated if geologic hazards (e.g., landslides, rock falls, or flooding) or hazard trees occur. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. There are no known geologic hazards on NFS roads in the analysis that would require this action. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 239 | Roads | G | RD-G-09 (p. 75) | When temporary roads are necessary, stream crossings should be designated to mitigate sedimentation and gradient changes and impacts to channel stability. These crossings should be designated by the appropriate resource specialists and installed and removed while protecting existing adjacent features. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No temporary roads would be constructed outside the tailings storage facility disturbance footprints analyzed in the FEIS for any alternative. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 240 | Roads | G | RD-G-10 (p. 75) | Reconstruction and rehabilitation of existing roads should be prioritized over | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | new construction. | | | accord with the guideline. Under the preferred alternative, existing roads would be used if they provide the required access. | | | |
| 241 | Roads | G | RD-G-11 (p. 75) | Construction of new and relocated roads should avoid areas with high mass wasting potential, (e.g., high landslide prone areas). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Any construction, reconstruction or maintenance on NFS roads authorized by the preferred alternative would comply with Forest Service road standards and meet these desired conditions. See response to LMP component #222. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Facilities** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 242 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-01 (p. 76) | Forest facilities (e.g., buildings, campgrounds, water and wastewater systems, and dams) provide for health and safety of forest users. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize construction or maintenance of the types of facilities listed in this desired condition, or specified in the LMP (which gives the following description of applicable facilities: "administrative facilities (e.g., offices, warehouses, employee housing, and fire facilities) and public recreational facilities (e.g., visitor centers, campground or picnic area restrooms, and storage buildings), associated water and wastewater treatment systems, dams, road and trail bridges, and electronic and communication towers," LMP, p. 76.) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 243 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-02 (p. 76) | The construction and operation of facilities has minimal long-term impacts to | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | surrounding soil and vegetation. | | component #242. | | | | |
| 244 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-03 (p. 76) | Surrounding vegetation conditions and building materials aid in the protection of infrastructure from wildfires and do not consist of invasive vegetation. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 245 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-04 (p. 763) | Facilities are energy-efficient, durable, well maintained, and serve their intended use category. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 246 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-05 (p. 76) | Facilities are in compliance with applicable accessibility guidelines and current building or occupancy standards. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 247 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-06 (p. 76) | Recreation and administrative sites complement the forest's scenery desired conditions and do not cause damage to ecologically sensitive environments. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 248 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-07 (p. 76) | Developed recreation facilities (e.g., campgrounds and picnic areas) provide a range of visitor needs; most areas have simple facilities (e.g., picnic tables and vault toilets), while some offer additional amenities (e.g., paved roads, flush toilets, and shower facilities). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 249 | Facilities | DC | FC-DC-08 (p. 76) | Developed recreation and dispersed recreation sites are capable of supporting appropriate visitor use. The number, layout, and size of constructed facilities are appropriate for the use level and activity types that occur at each site. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 250 | Facilities | S | FC-S-01 (p. 76) | All infrastructure with employee, volunteer, and public occupancy shall be subject to the Occupational Safety and Health Administrative standards. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not contain and would not affect infrastructure with employee, volunteer, and public occupancy. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 251 | Facilities | G | FC-G-01 (p. 76) | Emerging technologies and sustainable design concepts should be incorporated in new facility design and maintenance and renovation of existing facilities. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 252 | Facilities | G | FC-G-02 (p. 76) | Construction of new facilities in sensitive environments (e.g., floodplains, wetlands) should be avoided or area of disturbance minimized, where practicable. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 253 | Facilities | G | FC-G-03 (p. 76) | Facility design and construction should consider measures to minimize negative impacts to wildlife, fish, and rare plants (e.g., no reflective surfaces that would cause confusion and collision by birds or accommodate appropriate movement for fish and other aquatic organisms). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 254 | Facilities | G | FC-G-04 (p. 77) | Facilities should be planned, designed, and managed to prevent resource damage and not adversely impact the surrounding scenic character. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 255 | Facilities | G | FC-G-05 (p. 77) | Excess facilities should be transferred to other uses or ownerships or decommissioned in efforts to reduce maintenance backlog and infrastructure deterioration and to protect public health and safety. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would have no effect of disposal of excess facilities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 256 | Facilities | G | FC-G-06 (p. 77) | Landscape maintenance around facilities should focus on vegetation that poses a threat to the facility and its function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #242. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Lands and Access** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 257 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-01 (p. 78) | Land ownership adjustments (e.g., purchase, donation, exchange, or other authority) improve management activities (e.g., consolidating ownership, reducing wildlife-human conflicts, providing for wildlife habitat connectivity, improving public access, protection of cultural resources, and retaining or acquiring key lands for fish, wildlife, and rare plants). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The land exchange contained described in the FEIS was directed by Congress. There is no Forest Service decision regarding the exchange of these lands. See 2021 FEIS, p. 49. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 258 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-02 (p. 78) | The landownership pattern supports forest land and resource goals and objectives, reduces future management costs, responds to urban and community needs, protects critical resource areas, increases recreation opportunities, and improves legal public access. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LRM component #257. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 259 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-03 (p. 78) | Land status records facilitate the resolution of landownership cases related to title claims, trespass, and unauthorized uses and to protect public access and achieve effective management of National Forest System lands. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not involve land status records. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 260 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-04 (p. 78) | Forest boundaries and designated areas (e.g., wilderness areas) are clearly and appropriately marked. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not address and would not affect forest boundary marking. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 261 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-05 (p. 78) | Occupancy trespass on Tonto National Forest lands does not exist. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no bearing on occurrence or management of occupancy trespass. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 262 | Lands and Access | DC | LA-DC-06 (p. 78) | Road and trail authorizations provide access to and/or across National Forest System land are available where needed. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. The preferred alternative contains a road use permit to provide access and use of NFS lands. | Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. While Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would authorize activities and actions under a General Plan of Operations instead of a Special Use Authorization, they would achieve the desired condition by providing access to/across NFS land as needed. | Same as Alternative 4. |
| 263 | Lands and Access | S | LA-S-01 (p. 78) | Authorize a single road access to private property or to a road user association, regardless of subdivision, when the proposal meets the requirements of law, regulation, and policy. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not propose authorizing road access to private property or to a road user association and does not involve any subdivisions. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 264 | Lands and Access | G | LA-G-01 (p. 79) | When there are opportunities to acquire or convey non-federal lands by purchase or exchange, where lands are valuable for National Forest System purposes, the | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LRM component #257. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Forest Service should consider whether:<br>a. The conveyance or acquisition would reduce Forest Service administrative costs and improve management efficiency (e.g., reducing miles of landline boundaries and numbers of corners, special uses, title claims, rights-of-way grants and easements, numbers of allotments, and intermingled-ownership livestock pastures);<br>b. The conveyance or acquisition would reduce conflicts between Forest Service and private-landowner objectives, especially when conflicts are adversely impacting National Forest System management;<br>c. Lands with important characteristics (e.g., cultural resources, riparian and wildlife habitat, and watershed protection) would enhance National Forest mission, including access;<br>d. Lands would improve administration and reduce trespass;<br>e. Lands would add significantly to available National Forest goods and services;<br>f. Lands in mineralized areas have low potential for a future patent and the mineral estate would be donated to the United States (only applicable to acquisition by exchange); or<br>g. Lands consist of surface waters that would benefit the economic and social interests of the public. | | | | | |
| 265 | Lands and Access | | LA-G-02 (p. 79) | The Forest should proactively respond to threats to federally owned property rights (e.g., encroachment, trespass). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not address and would have no effect on response to encroachment and trespass on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Vegetation and Ecological Response Units** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 266 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-01 (p. 84) | At the landscape scale, a mosaic of different vegetation conditions (structure and composition) and diversity of landscape features (e.g., openings and | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6, but | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6, but | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6, but disturbance on NFS lands could |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | water bodies) promote resiliency and ecosystem function. These heterogeneous conditions also create natural fire breaks, thereby reducing the severity and extent of uncharacteristic or undesirable fire effects. | | | conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. While the preferred alternative would result in impacts vegetation communities on NFS lands (2021 FEIS, pp. 252–256), the amount would be minimal when considered on a forest-wide basis. Total disturbance of upland ERUs with the preferred alternative is 2,057 acres of NFS land. This is 0.07 percent of the 2,760,923 acres of upland ERU in the Tonto National Forest (LMP, table 2). This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole. Additionally, vegetation recovery would occur over the long term (2021 FEIS, pp. 246–247). None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP components #463–#482. Overall, this alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | disturbance on NFS lands could total 2,520 acres of upland ERU. This is 0.09 percent of the 2,760,293 acres of upland ERU in the Tonto National Forest. | disturbance on NFS lands could total 7,7,29 acres of upland ERU. This is 0.28 percent of the 2,760,293 acres of upland ERU in the Tonto National Forest. | total 6,977 acres of upland ERU. This amounts to 0.25 percent of the 2,760,293 acres of upland ERU in the Tonto National Forest. |
| 267 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-02 (p. 84) | A diversity of seral states are present and approach desired seral state distributions by ecological response unit. Seral state proportions, per the Region 3 Seral State Proportions Supplement, are applied at the landscape scale, where low overall departure from reference proportions is a positive indicator of ecosystem condition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #266. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266. |
| 268 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-03 (p. 84) | Old growth within woodland and forested ecological response units (ponderosa pine forest, ponderosa pine-evergreen oak, mixed conifer–frequent fire, pinyon-juniper grass and juniper grass, pinyon-juniper woodland, pinyon-juniper evergreen shrub, | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative could impact | Consistent. Same as Alternative 5. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 5. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Madrean Encinal woodland and Madrean pinyon oak) occurs throughout the landscape, generally in small areas as individual old growth components, or as clumps of old growth. Old growth components include old trees, dead trees (snags), downed wood (coarse woody debris) and structural diversity. The location of old growth shifts on the landscape over time as a result of succession and disturbance (tree growth and mortality). Desired conditions for wet mixed conifer/mixed conifer with aspen differ somewhat from the other forested ecological response units listed here, and can be found under Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for wet mixed conifer/mixed conifer with aspen. | | | authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. The only ERU listed in this desired condition that exists in the analysis area is juniper grass. A total of 147 acres of juniper grass could be impacted by this alternative, which is less than 0.1 percent of the juniper grassland on the forest. (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). Overall, this amount of impact to juniper grass ERU would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | up to 166 acres of juniper grass, which is less than 0.1 percent of the juniper grass ERU on the forest. | | |
| 269 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-04 (p. 84) | At the landscape scale, overall plant composition similarity to site potential (FSH 2090.11) averages greater than 66 percent, but can vary considerably at the fine- and mid-scales owing to a diversity of seral conditions. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. While impacts to vegetative communities may contribute to changes in similarity to site potential, the amount would be minimal when considered on a forest-wide basis. See response to LMP component #266 above. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266 above. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266 above. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #266 above. |
| 270 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-05 (p. 84) | Terrestrial ecological response units are functioning properly and are resilient to the frequency, extent, intensity, and severity of disturbances (e.g., insects, diseases, and fire). Natural and human disturbances provide desired overall plant density, species composition (mix of species), structure, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LRM component #266. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 271 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-06 (p. 84) | Fire frequency and severity are within, or trending towards, characteristic ranges, with some exceptions in the wildland-urban interface as described below. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. While the preferred alternative would result in changes in fuel loading or risk of accidental ignition (presence of powerline, 2021 FEIS, pp. 707), risks are expected to be substantially mitigated by vegetation management along power lines (2021 FEIS, pp. 706–707) and through adherence to a fire plan that requires mine employees to be trained for initial fire suppression and to have fire tools and water readily available (2021 FEIS, p. 711). None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP components #463–#482. The resulting change would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | Same | Same | Same |
| 272 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-07 (p. 84) | Fire interacts with other disturbances, such as insects, drought, wind, and other weather-related events to create spatial and temporal patterns that maintain an ecosystem within a characteristic range of conditions, with some exceptions in the wildland-urban interface. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271 above. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |
| 273 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-08 (p. 84) | Patch sizes are at or trending towards the characteristic range of patch size for each | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ecological response unit. | | | any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271 above. | | | |
| 274 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-09 (p. 84-85) | Vegetative ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values characteristic for each ecological response unit. In areas of high vulnerability to climate change, based on 100-year climate projections (Triepke et al. 2016), tree basal area is restored or maintained at the low end of the desired range to mitigate water stress. In these areas, early-mid seral species dominate over late-seral species, given the adaptations of many early-mid species for warmer and drier conditions. Encroaching species characteristic of lower life zones are maintained. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 275 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-10 (p. 85) | Ecosystem function is supported by native plant communities, and have little or no invasive species. If invasive or exotic species are present, they are not detrimental to natural diversity, or ecosystem function for any ecological response unit. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. Currently, there are 31 species of invasive plants in the preferred alternative analysis area (2021 FEIS, p. 223). While each action alternative would increase the risk of invasive species establishment and spread (2021 FEIS, pp. 242–246 and pp. 250–258) measures have been developed to reduce this risk (2021 FEIS, pp. 226–228, pp. 256–258, pp. 568–569, and appendix J). Additionally, these impacts would be minimized on Tonto National Forest–administered lands with the implementation of the Resolution | Consistent. In the Alternative 5 analysis area (2021 FEIS, p. 223) there are 26 species of invasive plants. Impacts to ecosystem function would be similar to Alternative 6. Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the | Consistent. In the Alternative 4 analysis area (2021 FEIS, p. 223) there are 38 species of invasive plants. Impacts to ecosystem function would be similar to Alternative 6. Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions | Consistent. In the Alternatives 2 and 3 analysis area (2021 FEIS, p. 223) there are 33 species of invasive plants. Impacts to ecosystem function would be similar to Alternative 6. Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019; 2021 FEIS, pp. 233–234 and p. 246; 2021 DROD, p. 13). Overall effects from the preferred alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | across the forest or over the long term. | |
| 276 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-11 (p. 85) | Upland vegetation and riparian zones are ecologically connected based on natural patterns that are consistent with landforms and topography, and provide for upland and aquatic species movements and genetic exchange. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. Regarding wildlife movement, the preferred alternative would affect 85 acres of habitat block 1; and would affect 1,330 acres of NFS land in habitat block 2 (total of access road, pipeline corridor, transmission line corridor acres) (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). Remaining areas of impact on habitat block 2 do not involve NFS lands. All action alternatives contain measures designed to reduce impacts (2021 FEIS, p. 591, pp. 597–599, appendix J), yet some adverse impacts cannot be avoided or completely mitigated, including changes in habitat fragmentation and disruption of dispersal and migration patterns through animal movement corridors (2021 FEIS, p. 599). Overall effects from the preferred alternative would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | Consistent. Alternative 5 would have no effects on habitat block 1; and would affect 118 acres of NFS land in habitat block 2 (total of access road, pipeline corridor, transmission line corridor acres) (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | Consistent. Alternative 4 would have no effects on habitat block 1; and would affect 4,753 acres of NFS land in habitat block 2 (total of access road, pipeline corridor, transmission line corridor, tailings facility and fence line acres) (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | Consistent. Alternatives 2 and 3 would have no effects on habitat block 1; and would affect 1,332 acres of NFS land in habitat block 2 (total of access road, pipeline corridor, transmission line corridor, tailings facility and fence line acres) (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). Overall effects would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. |
| 277 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-12 (p. 85) | Transition zones or ecotones between riparian areas, forests, woodlands, | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | shrublands, and grasslands are intact and shift in time and space due to factors affecting site conditions (e.g., fire or climate). | | | opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271, #275, and #276 above. | | | |
| 278 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-13 (p. 85) | Vegetative cover and litter are distributed across the soil surface in adequate amounts to limit erosion and contribute to soil deposition and development. Soil cover and herbaceous vegetation protect soil, regulate moisture infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and support ecological integrity, though the cover may fluctuate occasionally within the natural fire regime. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP Components #266–#271, #275, and #276 above. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |
| 279 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-14 (p. 85) | Ecological conditions for habitat quality, distribution, and abundance contribute to self-sustaining populations of native terrestrial and aquatic plants and animals. Conditions provide for the life history, distribution, and natural population fluctuations of plant and animal species within the capability of the ecosystem. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271, #275, and #276 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 280 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-15 (p. 85) | Based off site potential, native plants provide nectar, floral diversity, and pollen throughout the seasons that pollinator species are active. Site conditions promote pollinator success and survival. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP components #266–#271, #275, and #276 above. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 281 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | DC | ERU-DC-16 (pp. 85–86) | In the wildland-urban interface, or where private lands or infrastructure are adjacent to National Forest System lands:<br>a. Wildland fires in the wildland-urban interface do not result in the loss of life or property.<br>b. Wildland fires in the wildland-urban interface are mostly low intensity/low severity surface fires. Firefighters are able to safely and efficiently suppress wildfires in the wildland-urban interface.<br>c. In forested vegetation communities, the percent of the area occupied by interspace with grass/forb/shrub vegetation is on the upper end of, or above, the range given in the vegetation community desired conditions. Trees within groups may be more widely spaced with less interlocking of the crowns than desirable in adjacent forest lands. Interspaces between tree groups are of sufficient size to discourage isolated group torching from spreading as a crown fire to other groups. The tree basal area in the wildland-urban interface is on the lower end of the range given in the vegetation community desired conditions. When wildland-urban interface intersects vegetation types with a mixed or high-severity fire regime, such as interior chaparral, characteristic ecosystem function is modified to promote low intensity/low severity surface fires.<br>d. Higher fuel loading or tree densities may be desired in areas where it provides for important fine scale habitat structure, as long as it meets the overall intent of protecting wildland-urban interface values.<br>e. Ladder fuels are nearly absent.<br>f. Logs and snags, which often pose fire control problems, are present in the wildland-urban interface, but at the lower end of the range given in the appropriate vegetation community desired conditions.<br>g. Dead and down fuel load is between 1 and 40 tons per acre, depending on ecological response unit, with lower amounts in frequent fire-adapted ecological response units, and higher | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP components #266–#271, #275, and #276 above. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | amounts in infrequent fire types. This light fuel load applies even in vegetation types with higher reference fuel loads, such as wet mixed conifer, to provide improved fire protection to human developments deemed to have special significance.<br>h. When wildland-urban interface intersects vegetation types with a mixed or high-severity fire regime, characteristic ecosystem function is modified to promote low intensity / low severity fire, but with sufficient cover to meet the needs of a variety of wildlife species. | | | | | | |
| 282 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | O | ERU-O-01 (p. 86) | In frequent-fire forested ecological response units (ponderosa pine forest, ponderosa pine-evergreen oak, and mixed conifer-frequent fire), emphasize treatments within the ponderosa pine-evergreen oak ecological response unit by treating:<br>a. 50,000 to 122,000 acres over a 10-year period with both mechanical treatments and fire. About 22 percent would be treated with prescribed fire, with the expectation that the rest would be treated with wildfire.<br>b. 105,000 to 325,000 acres over a 10-year period with only fire (no mechanical treatment). About 22 percent of these acres would be treated with prescribed fire, with the expectation that the rest would be treated with wildfire. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions and would have no effect on mechanical or fire treatments. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 283 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | O | ERU-O-02 (pp. 86–87) | In woodland ecological response units, emphasize treatments within the frequent fire woodlands (pinyon-juniper grass, juniper grass, and Madrean pinyon oak) as follows:<br>a. 400 to 2,000 acres over a 10-year period with both mechanical treatments and fire. About 22 percent would be treated with prescribed fire, with the expectation that the rest would be treated wildfire.<br>b. 20,000 to 200,000 acres with only fire (no mechanical treatments) over a 10-year period. About 22 percent would be treated with prescribed fire, with the expectation that the rest would be treated by wildfire. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions and would have no effect on mechanical or fire treatments. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 284 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | O | ERU-O-03 (p. 87) | Restore at least 500 acres of semi-desert grasslands, over a 10-year period. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions and would have no effect on restoration activities in semi-desert grasslands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 285 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | O | ERU-O-04 (p. 87) | Survey, inventory, or treat 10,000 to 15,000 acres of invasive species (e.g., buffelgrass, fountain grass, and red brome) in desert ecological response units (Sonoran Desert plant communities and Sonora-Mojave mixed-salt desert scrub) over a 10-year period. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more of the plan's desired conditions or objectives even if the project or activity would have an adverse but negligible effect on other desired conditions. Under the preferred alternative, an assessment will be conducted to locate invasive species occurring on NFS lands prior to ground-disturbing activities (Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:3)). Newly reclaimed areas on Tonto National Forest will be monitored for weeds and invasive plants for the first 5 years after reclamation. Infestations of invasive species would be treated as soon as they are identified, or as soon as weather conditions are appropriate for treatment (2021 FEIS, p. 228); Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:3). Once an invasive species is identified, a plan of action will be created and best management practices will be implemented for its control (Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:4)). These surveys, inventories and treatments would contribute toward meeting these desired conditions. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 286 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-01 (p. 87) | Naturally ignited fires should be allowed to function in their natural ecological role in fire-adapted ecological response units when burning conditions facilitate progress toward desired conditions. Where it can be done safely, wildfire should be actively suppressed when the expected effects do not facilitate progress towards desired conditions or where necessary to protect life, property, and threatens identified values. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions and would have no effect on management of naturally ignited fires. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 287 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-02 (p. 87) | When seeding is desirable for restoration, seeding with native species appropriate for the area (or similar in elevation, soil type, and ecosystem) should be prioritized. Use of desirable, non-native weed-free plant materials (e.g., sterile barely) may be allowed where native plant materials are unavailable, cost-prohibitive, insufficient to address site-specific problems, and the non-native plant materials do not impede re-establishment of native species or degrade ecological integrity. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. On NFS lands, seed mixes used in reclamation will be certified free of seeds listed on the Forest Service's noxious weed list and contain only species native to the project area. Seed mixes will be developed from a native species seed list approved by the Forest Service (2021 FEIS, p. 228). | Same | Same | Same |
| 288 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-03 (p. 87) | Ground-disturbing activities that increase the risk of invasion by exotic and invasive plant species should include measures to eradicate or limit the spread of these species before, during and/or following the activity and implement measures to limit the potential for spread into unoccupied areas. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative contains measures to measures to eradicate or limit the spread of these species before, during and/or following the activity and implement measures to limit the potential for spread into unoccupied areas. See response to LMP component #285. | Same | Same | Same |
| 289 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-04 (p. 87) | In areas within woodland and forest ecological response units where there is little understory and mechanical treatments are proposed, slash treatments (e.g., lop and scatter and mastication) should be used to move herbaceous vegetation growth, watershed condition, soil productivity towards desired conditions, and minimize long-term impacts from invasive species. Desired and potential fire behavior and severity, soil burn severity, firefighter safety, and wildlife | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect slash treatments. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and livestock movement should inform any decision to leave slash on site. | | | | | | |
| 290 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-05 (p. 87) | In forest and woodland ecological response units, the development of old-growth conditions should be encouraged in areas where old growth is lacking. Uneven-aged vegetation treatments should be designed such that replacement structural stages and age classes are proportionally present to assure continuous representation of old-growth characteristics across the landscape over time. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect vegetation treatments associated with developing old growth conditions, including uneven-aged treatments. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 291 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-06 (p. 88) | In forest and woodland ecological response units, hand piles should be retained across the landscape for several years, rather than immediately being burned, to increase small mammal occupancy in areas where coarse woody debris is deficient and to provide nesting habitat and cover for birds, small mammals, reptiles, and invertebrates. The number and distribution of retained hand piles should be balanced with potential threats from bark beetles and fire concerns. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect management of slash piles, including hand piles. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 292 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-07 (p. 88) | In woodland and forest ecological response units, large accumulations of green material (e.g., slash and wind-thrown trees) should be managed to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic bark beetle outbreaks. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect management of slash and wind-thrown trees. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 293 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-08 (p. 88) | Even-aged silvicultural practices may be used as a strategy for achieving the desired conditions over the long term, such as bringing mistletoe infection levels to within a sustainable range. Treatments should mimic desired conditions for patch sizes. Treatments for mitigating adverse impacts should not completely eliminate mistletoe but, rather, they should typically be aimed at reducing infection levels across the stand and increasing host vigor. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect silvicultural practices, including even-aged practices. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 294 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-09 (p. 788) | Vegetation management activities should retain old trees, snags, and downed logs in and near stream channels and riparian areas to provide for wildlife habitat and | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | recruitment of large woody material. | | vegetation management activities that would affect old trees, snags, and downed logs in and near stream channels and riparian areas. | | | | |
| 295 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-10 (p. 88) | The removal of the majority of the overstory may be required where it is determined through site-specific analysis to be the optimum method for a particular area to make progress toward desired conditions. e.g., clear cutting better mimics the kind of fire that is typical in chaparral or pinyon-juniper evergreen shrub than thinning. In woodland or grassland ecosystems, removal of encroaching woody growth would be an effective treatment in moving those areas towards desired conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives are not a site-specific analysis to determine methods for achieving desired conditions for Upland ERUs, nor would it affect such an analysis. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 296 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-11 (p. 88) | In forested ecological response units where Gambel oak or other native hardwoods are desirable to retain for diversity, treatments should improve vigor and growth and enhance tree-form structure of these species. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include “treatments” that would affect vigor and growth of Gambel oak or other native hardwoods. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 297 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-12 (p. 88) | In forested and woodland ecological response units, strategies developed for re-establishing desired conditions should include snags, downed logs, and other woody components that collect drifting seeds, provide shade, cooler temperatures, moisture retention, and protection from ungulate herbivory. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not address and would not affect strategies for reestablishing desired conditions. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 298 | All Upland Ecological Response Units | G | ERU-G-13 (p. 88) | The primary objectives of first, second, and sometimes third entry burns in frequent fire ecological response units from which fire has been withheld for several cycles should be to restructure the fuel profile so it can support the kind/s of fire that the ecological response unit evolved with. Fire effects, fire behavior, and emissions in these initial burns may not be within the historic range of variability, and seasonality | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would not affect maintenance burns. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td>299</td><td>Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-DES-DC-01 (p. 90-91)</td><td>and timing is less important than for maintenance burns.<br><br>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the Mojave Sonoran desert scrub ecological response unit are as presented in table 5. On a landscape scale, patch size should be between about 4,212 and 8,125 acres. Vegetative ground cover should average about 10 percent, though it can be less than 1 percent on barren rocky substrate.<br><br>Table 5. Mojave Sonoran Desert scrub ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><br>Seral Stage Percent of ERU | Seral Stage Description | Canopy Cover | Structure Class<br>5 | Annual grasses and forbs | 10-25 percent | Open<br>20 | Cacti and perennial grasses | 10-25 percent | Open<br>75 | Cacti and shrubs | over 60 percent | Closed<br>under 1 | Exotic annual and perennial grasses | under 1 percent | Absent-sparse</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Applicable.</td><td>For desert ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). The preferred alternative impacts 1,316 acres of desert ecosystem ERU. Therefore landscape-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-DEC-DC-01 through 07) while mid-scale desired conditions do not apply (ERU-DEC-DC-08 through 12).<br><br>Consistent. Analysis indicates that the preferred alternative would impact about 0.2 percent of Mojave Sonoran Desert scrub on the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). Given this percentage, the preferred alternative would not substantially affect patch size or average ground cover, and does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term.</td><td>Alternative 5 impacts 1,751 acres of desert ecosystem ERU. Therefore landscape-scale desired conditions apply and mid-scale desired conditions do not apply.<br><br>Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative is projected to impact 0.2 percent of Mojave Sonoran Desert scrub on the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). Given this percentage, this alternative would not substantially affect patch size or average ground cover, and does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain</td><td>Alternative 4 impacts 5,783 acres of desert ecosystem ERU. Therefore landscape scale desired conditions apply and mid-scale desired conditions do not apply.<br><br>Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. This alternative is projected to impact 0.7 percent of Mojave Sonoran Desert scrub on the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). Given this percentage, this alternative would not substantially affect patch size or average ground cover, and does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of</td><td>Alternatives 2 and 3 impact 6,245 acres of desert ecosystem ERU. Therefore landscape-scale desired conditions apply and mid-scale desired conditions do not apply.<br><br>Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. These alternatives are projected to impact 0.8 percent of Mojave Sonoran Desert scrub on the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). Given this percentage, this alternative would not substantially affect patch size or average ground cover, and does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term.</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | |
| 300 | Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-02 (p. 91) | The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub ecological response unit are as presented in table 6. Patch size was not assessed for this ecological response unit. Vegetative ground cover should average about 10 percent.<br>**Table 6. Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions**<br>**Seral Stage Percent of ERU** / **Seral Stage Description** / **Canopy Cover** / **Structure Class**<br>15 / Perennial grass, sparse shrub / 10-25 percent / Open<br>85 / Shrubs and perennial grasses / 10-25 percent / Open<br>under 1 / All exotic vegetation / under 1 percent / Absent-sparse | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub ERU is not present on NFS lands in the preferred alternative analysis area. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 301 | Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-03 (p. 91) | Fires are infrequent and localized, with mean fire return intervals estimated at over 200 years. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions. Sonoran Desert scrub in the analysis area currently has an average fire return interval of 103 to 1,428 years (2021 FEIS, p. 698). Implementation of the preferred alternative is not predicted to modify fire intervals. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 705–707 and 710–712. Also see response to LMP | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | components #463–#482 below. | | | |
| 302 | Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-04 (p. 91) | The presence of non-native species does not significantly affect native species richness or the habitat of native flora and fauna. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See responses to LMP components #275 and #285 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 303 | Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-05 (p. 91) | There are few signs of compaction or accelerated erosion and the ability of soil to maintain resource values and sustain outputs are high. Soil condition and erosion hazards are within the natural range of variability (e.g., the majority of soils, greater than 66 percent on average are rated as functioning properly). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Total disturbance of desert ecosystem ERU on NFS lands with the preferred alternative is limited to 1,316 acres, resulting primarily from construction, operation and maintenance of powerlines and a pipeline (these and a road use permit are the only actions authorized on NFS lands). Soil loss from construction and operations in the pipeline and power line corridor is expected to be minimal after compliance with applicant-committed environmental protection measures (stormwater pollution prevention plans and erosion and sediment controls), and post-closure after reclamation when the surface has stabilized from revegetation (2021 FEIS, p. 255). | Consistent. This alternative is similar to Alternative 6, in that it would result in total ground disturbance of 1,751 of desert ecosystem ERU on NFS lands, primarily from construction and operations in the pipeline and power line corridor. | Consistent. This alternative differs from Alternatives 5 and 6 in that the tailings facility is located on NFS land. Analysis indicates that 5,783 acres of desert ecosystem ERU on NFS lands would be disturbed with this alternative. During operations applicant-committed environmental protection measures (stormwater pollution prevention plans and erosion and sediment controls) would | Consistent. These alternatives are similar to Alternative 4 in that the tailings facility is located on NFS land. Approximately 6,245 acres of desert ecosystem ERU on NFS land would be disturbed. Impacts would be similar to those described for Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | prevent erosion hazards. The tailings facility would be revegetated and would recover productivity to some extent (2021 FEIS, p. 246). While sustained outputs would likely not remain high on disturbed areas, revegetation would prevent soil degradation and erosion over the long-term, within the natural range of variability. | |
| 304 | Desert Ecosystems Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-06 (p. 91) | Arroyos and gullies with accelerated erosion in desert ecological response units are stabilizing and recovering. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Accelerated erosion of arroyos and gullies was not identified as an issue in the analysis area, nor would the action alternatives cause such erosion or affect actions to correct such erosion. See discussion of existing soil conditions and impacts to soils at 2021 FEIS, pp. 201–203, pp. 207–209, pp. 224–250, and pp. 252–259. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 305 | Desert Ecosystems | DC | ERU-DES- | Saguaros, mesquite trees, and other | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Consistent. | Consistent. | Consistent. Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | | DC-07 (p. 91) | vegetation large enough to sustain cavity nesting birds are present across the landscape (measured from species-specific needs/requirements during project planning). | | | alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. Lack of cavity habitat was not identified as a limiting factor in the analysis of wildlife for the FEIS, including cavity nesting birds. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 559–600. Specifically see "Impacts Common to All Action Alternatives – Birds," pp. 571–579. Additionally, applicant committed environmental protection measures include avoiding large trees where possible (2021 FEIS, p. 573). Trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236). | Alternative 5 would have similar impacts and results as Alternative 6. | While Alternative 4 would impact more acres of NFS lands that Alternatives 5 and 6 due to the location of tailings facilities, trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236). This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term. | as Alternative 4. |
| 306 | Desert Ecosystems Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-08 (p. 91) | Large and old Saguaros are healthy and present on the landscape based on their site potential. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. |
| 307 | Desert Ecosystems Midscale Desired | DC | ERU-DES-DC-09 (p. | Plants form beneficial relationships with soil microbes and cryptogrammic soil crusts | Forest-wide | Not applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP | Mid-scale desired | Mid-scale desired | Mid-scale desired conditions not |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conditions | | 91) | are intact in all desert ecological response units. Roots are covered with soil and there is little evidence of plants perched above the soil with exposed roots (pedestalling). | | | component #299. | conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | applicable. See response to LMP component #299. |
| 308 | Desert Ecosystems Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-10 (p. 91) | Native and iconic desert plant species (such as the saguaro cactus) are present in natural patterns of abundance and density, and regenerating successfully in all desert ecological response units. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. |
| 309 | Desert Ecosystems Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-11 (p. 92) | Important desert plant communities are present across the forest based of the ecological response unit and site potential (based off similarity to site potential measured from terrestrial ecological unit inventory data or other suitable scientific protocol or method). Descriptions of specific desert plant communities and the associated ecological conditions are described in the "description" section above. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. |
| 310 | Desert Ecosystems Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-DES-DC-12 (p. 92) | Habitat is preserved and remains suitable for federally listed animal and plant species, other endemic and rare plant and animal species and species of conservation concern associated with desert ecological response units. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #299. |
| 311 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-01 (p. 93) | The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the semi-desert grassland ecological response unit are as presented in table 7.<br>**Table 7. Semi-Desert Grassland ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions**<br>**Seral Stage** **Seral Stage Description** **Canopy Cover** **Structure Class** | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not applicable.<br>For semi-desert grassland ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). The preferred alternative impacts 74.2 acres of semi-desert grassland ecosystem ERU. Therefore, fine-scale desired conditions apply; | Not applicable.<br>For semi-desert grassland ecosystems, landscape-scale is 1,000 | Applicable and consistent.<br>For semi-desert grassland ecosystems, landscape | Not applicable.<br>For semi-desert grassland ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Percent of ERU**<br>20 – 25 Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts Shrub, Tree under 10 percent Sparse<br>70 – 75 Majority of vegetation is late successional herbaceous perennial grasses Shrub, Tree under 10 percent Sparse<br>0 – 5 Shrub and tree encroachment and herb dominance (includes departure states) Shrub, Tree 10-30 percent Open<br>0 Closed shrub/tree, with herb layer dominated by early seral vegetation, ruderal Shrub over 30 percent Closed<br>0 Herb layer dominated by exotics – namely grasses Shrub, Tree under 10 percent Open | | | however, there are no fine-scale desired conditions for this ERU. | to 10,000 acres, midscale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine-scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 193.9 acres of semi-desert grassland ecosystem ERU. Therefore mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-SDG-DC-08 and 09).<br><br>This alternative would impact 0.4 percent of semi-desert grasslands across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). It is likely to achieve desired future conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands: "Under optimal conditions, and with sufficient revegetation | scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, midscale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 1,372.2 acres of semi-desert grassland ecosystem ERU. Therefore, landscape-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-SDG-DC-01 through 07). | and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 158.4 acres of semi-desert grassland ecosystem ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-SDG-DC-08 and 09). |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | efforts and resource inputs (e.g., soil amendments and watering), many native grasses would return within a few years to a few decades. Tree and shrub canopy cover can be limited with management intervention. Managing non-native vegetation cover to limit the intensity of uncharacteristic fires may not be possible on the landscape scale. Because many important grass species would recover in the short-term, much of the habitat function of these ecosystems would be likely to return" (2021 FEIS, p. 248). Any impacts to Semi-Desert Grasslands | |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | from this alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 312 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-02 (p. 93) | Grasslands are connected based on the distribution of soils with most occurring on Aridisols, and some minor inclusions of Vertisols. Entisols support desert grasslands at valley plains and drainages where fluvial processes are taking place. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. The existing soils within the footprint of the tailings facility would be lost, replaced by growth media. As noted in response to LMP component #311 (Alternative 4), these soils would still be capable of sustaining grasslands after revegetation, despite change in the nature of the underlying soil. This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 313 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-03 (p. 93) | Native herbaceous vegetation and ground cover provides fine fuels that support stand replacement fires, with fire return intervals ranging from 2 to about 30 years, but usually averaging between 2.5 - 10 years (Wahlberg et al. 2017 (in draft), Schussman and Gori 2004, Mau-Crimmins et al. 2005). Vegetative ground cover averages around 28 percent, with some variability relating to soils, topography, and time since fire. Fire maintains productivity and reduces encroachment by woody species. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP components #463–#482 below. This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | Landscape scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |
| 314 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-04 (p. 93) | Patch size averages about 1,000 acres, with some site-specific variability relating to soils and topography. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. As noted in response to LMP component #311 (Alternative 4), the desired vegetation conditions are anticipated to be met after revegetation efforts and thus is not anticipated to restrict patch | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | size in the area of the tailings facility. This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 315 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-05 (p. 93) | The presence of non-native species does not affect fire behavior or effects, and does not increase the potential for uncharacteristic or undesirable fire behavior and effects. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. None of the action alternatives are expected to modify fire regimes. See response to LMP components #463–#482 below. This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |
| 316 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-06 (p. 93) | The presence of non-native species does not significantly affect native species diversity and composition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP | Consistent. This alternative contains measures to eradicate or limit the | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | component #311. | spread of these species before, during and/or following the activity and implement measures to limit the potential for spread into unoccupied areas. See response to LMP component #285. This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 317 | Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-07 (p. 93) | A mix of cool and warm season understory species, of varying heights and density, provide food and cover for invertebrates and wildlife based off site potential (terrestrial ecological unit inventory data or other suitable scientific protocol or method). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. As noted in response to LMP component #311 (Alternative 4), the desired vegetation conditions are anticipated to be met after revegetation efforts, with vegetation of varying heights and densities. This | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 318 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-08 (p. 94) | While a number of subclasses or types exists within the semi-desert grassland ecological response unit, the Piedmont subclass is well represented on the Forest based off site potential. This subclass is found at mountain fronts along alluvial fans (cone shaped deposit of sediment) with dominant grasses such as black grama, bush muhly, and desert fluffgrass. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Consistent. This alternative would impact 0.1 percent of semi-desert grasslands across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). It is likely to achieve desired future conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands: "Under optimal conditions, and with sufficient revegetation efforts and resource inputs (e.g., soil amendments and watering), many native grasses would return | Mid-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #311. | Same as Alternative 5. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | within a few years to a few decades. Tree and shrub canopy cover can be limited with management intervention. Managing non-native vegetation cover to limit the intensity of uncharacteristic fires may not be possible on the landscape scale. Because many important grass species would recover in the short-term, much of the habitat function of these ecosystems would be likely to return" (2021 FEIS, p. 248). This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions | | |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | across the forest over the long term. | | |
| 319 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | DC | ERU-SDG-DC-09 (p. 94) | Arroyos and gullies are stabilizing and recovering. Water infiltration is at natural rates, which reduces arroyos and gullies and prevents head cuts from forming in drainages. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Accelerated erosion of arroyos and gullies was not identified as an issue in the analysis area, nor would the action alternatives cause such erosion or affect actions to correct such erosion. See discussion of existing soil conditions and impacts to soils at 2021 FEIS, pp. 201–203, pp. 207–209, pp. 224–250, and pp. 252–259. | Not applicable. | Not applicable. | Not applicable. | Not applicable. |
| 320 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Semi-Desert Grasslands | G | ERU-SDG-G-01 (p. 94) | Maintenance of intact perennial grasslands (areas with abundant native grasses and productive soils) should be prioritized over areas with high shrub encroachment and degraded soil conditions during restoration projects. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not make decisions regarding projects or activities to restore perennial grasslands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 321 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-01 (p. 96) | The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the interior chaparral ecological response units are as presented in table 8.<br>**Table 8. Interior Chaparral ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions**<br>**Seral Stage Percent of ERU** / **Seral Stage Description** / **Canopy Cover** / **Structure Class**<br>2 / Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts / Shrub under 10 percent / Sparse-Open | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not applicable.<br><br>For interior chaparral ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). The preferred alternative impacts 520.2 acres of interior chaparral ecosystem ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-IC-DC-08 and 09). | Not applicable.<br><br>For interior chaparral ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 408.6 | Not applicable.<br><br>For interior chaparral ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 408.6 | Not applicable.<br><br>For interior chaparral ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 100 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 100 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 408.6 acres of interior chaparral ecosystem ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 5 Dominated by shrub resprouts, grasses and forbs present Shrub Open 10-30 percent<br>93 Mature shrubland, closed canopy, limited herbaceous vegetation Shrub Closed over 60 percent | | | | acres of interior chaparral ecosystem ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-IC-DC-08 and 09). | acres of interior chaparral ecosystem ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-IC-DC-08 and 09). | (ERU-IC-DC-08 and 09). |
| 322 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-02 (p. 96) | Interior chaparral vegetation supports fire regime IV where stand-replacing fires at 35-to-100-year fire return intervals creates patches between 1,000 and 2,000 acres, with some site-specific variability relating to soils and topography. Native fire-adapted species re-sprout vigorously after fire, helping to prevent excessive erosion. The presence of non-native plants does not alter the fire regime, or increase the potential for uncharacteristic or undesirable fire behavior and effects. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 323 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-03 (p. 96) | The presence of non-native species does not significantly affect native species diversity and composition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 324 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-04 (p. 96) | Vegetative ground cover averages around 54 percent, with some variability relating to soils, topography, and time since fire. Fire maintains productivity and reduces encroachment by trees from adjacent ecological response units. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 325 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired | DC | ERU-IC-DC-05 (p. 96) | Species composition varies considerably depending on site conditions, but shrub live | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP | Landscape-scale desired | Landscape-scale desired | Landscape-scale desired conditions |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conditions | | | oak (Quercus turbinella) associations tend to be the most common, dominant shrub within chaparral vegetation (Carmichael et al. 1978). [as cited in forest plan] | | | component #321. | conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 326 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-06 (p. 96) | Fire (severity and frequency) encourages important obligate seeders (Wright's silktassel and hollyleaf buckthorn), facultative seeders (sugar sumac), and obligate resprouters (e.g., shrub live oak), with some variability based on site potential (based off similarity to site potential measured from Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other suitable scientific protocol or method). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 327 | Interior Chaparral Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-07 (p. 97) | Vegetation and litter cover protects soil from accelerated erosion. Annual litter production varies substantially with some areas reaching up to 46,200 kg per hectare (about 20 tons per acre). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 328 | Interior Chaparral Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-08 (p. 97) | Shrub canopy cover varies from less than 40 percent on dry sites to more than 80 percent on the wetter sites. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Consistent. This alternative would impact 0.2 percent of interior chaparral across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). It is likely to achieve desired future conditions for interior chaparral as this alternative primarily involves pipeline, road, and powerline corridors: "Interior Chaparral: Under optimal conditions, and with sufficient revegetation efforts and resource inputs (e.g., soil amendments and watering), recovery of shrubs (particularly shrub live oak, see Tirmenstein (1999)), shrub litter, and regeneration of grasses and forbs should be achievable over decades to centuries on most disturbance types other than the tailings storage | Same as Alternative 6, but this alternative would impact 0.1 percent of interior chaparral across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4).<br><br>This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve | Same as Alternative 6, but this alternative would impact 0.4 percent of interior chaparral across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4).<br><br>With respect to the tailings facility, trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish | Same as Alternative 6, but this alternative would impact 0.1 percent of interior chaparral across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4).<br><br>With respect to the tailings facility, trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | facility" (2021 FEIS, p. 249). This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236).<br><br>This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236).<br><br>This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. |
| 329 | Interior Chaparral Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-09 (p. 97) | Important plant associations are present across the forest based of site potential (based off similarity to site potential measured from Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other suitable scientific protocol or method). Descriptions of specific plant associations and the associated ecological conditions are described in the "description" section above. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #328. | Same | Same | Same |
| 330 | Interior Chaparral Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-10 (p. 97) | At smaller extents, locally important species such as hollyleaf buckthorn, Stansbury cliffrose, desert olive, and singleleaf ash, are present based on site potential (determined by Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other appropriate ecological data) | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. |
| 331 | Interior Chaparral Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-IC-DC-11 (p. 97) | Important forage species for wildlife, such as Wright's buckwheat and desert ceanothus, are well-represented and | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #321. | Fine-scale desired conditions | Fine-scale desired conditions not | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>distributed based on site potential and capability (determined by Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other appropriate ecological data).</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>not applicable. See response to LMP component #321.</td><td>applicable. See response to LMP component #321.</td><td>response to LMP component #321.</td></tr>
<tr><td>332</td><td>Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJO-DC-01 (p. 98)</td><td>Pinyon-juniper woodlands is characterized by even-aged patches of pinyons and junipers that at the landscape scale form multi-aged woodlands.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>333</td><td>Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJO-DC-02 (p. 98)</td><td>Fire as a disturbance is less frequent and variable due to differences in ground cover, though some sites are capable of carrying surface fire. The fires that do occur are mixed to high severity and conditions promote a fire regime similar to reference conditions (Fire Regime III, IV, and V).</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>334</td><td>Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJO-DC-03 (p. 98)</td><td>Snags and older trees (some older than 300 years) with dead limbs and/or tops are scattered across the landscape. Snags 8 inches and above at diameter at root collar average 5 snags per acre, while snags 18 inches and above average 1 snag per acre. Coarse woody debris increases with succession and averages 2 to 5 tons per acre.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>335</td><td>Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJO-DC-04 (p. 98)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the pinyon-juniper woodland ecological response unit are as presented in table 9.<br>Table 9. Pinyon-Juniper Woodland ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts</td><td>Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>over 30 percent</td><td>Closed</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 5 Dominated by trees 0 - 9.9 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>10 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>60 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter over 30 percent Closed | | | | | | |
| 336 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland | DC | ERU-PJO-DC-05 (p. 98) | Tree density and canopy cover are high, shrubs are sparse to moderate, and herbaceous cover is low and discontinuous. The amount of shrub cover depends on the terrestrial ecological unit inventory. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 337 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland | DC | ERU-PJO-DC-06 (p. 98) | Trees occur in even-aged patches ranging from young to old, where patch size of these woodlands ranges from 10s to 100s of acres. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 338 | Midscale Desired Conditions for Pinyon-Juniper Woodland | DC | ERU-PJO-DC-07 (p. 982) | Ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 15 percent (based on terrestrial ecological unit or other suitable scientific protocol or method). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Pinyon-juniper woodland ERUs on NFS land would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 339 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-01 (pp. 99–100) | The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass ecological response units are as presented in table 10.<br>**Table 10. Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass ecological response units (ERU) desired vegetation conditions**<br>**Seral Stage Percent of ERU** / **Seral Stage Description** / **Canopy Cover** / **Structure Class**<br>5 Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts Tree under 10 percent Sparse-Open<br>10 Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 over 30 Closed | Forest-wide | Applicable | Not applicable.<br>For juniper grass ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 10 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 10 acres (LMP, p. 81). The preferred alternative impacts 146.6 acres of juniper grassland ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-PJJUG-DC-03 through 06). | Not applicable.<br>For juniper grass ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 10 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 10 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative | Not applicable.<br>For juniper grass ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 10 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 10 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative | Not applicable.<br>For juniper grass ecosystems, landscape scale is 1,000 to 10,000 acres, mid-scale is 10 to 1,000 acres, and fine scale is less than 10 acres (LMP, p. 81). This alternative impacts 165.6 acres of juniper grassland ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | inches diameter percent<br>25 Dominated by trees 0 - 9.9 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>50 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>10 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter over 30 percent Closed | | | | impacts 165.7 acres of juniper grassland ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-PJJUG-DC-03 through 06). | impacts 165.6 acres of juniper grassland ERU. Therefore, mid-scale desired conditions apply (ERU-PJJUG-DC-03 through 06). | (ERU-PJJUG-DC-03 through 06). |
| 340 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-02 (p. 100) | Fires are typically frequent and low-severity (fire regime I). | Forest-wide | Applicable | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Landscape-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. |
| 341 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-03 (p. 100) | Snags are scattered, with snags 8 inches and above at root collar diameter averaging 5 snags per acre, while snags 18 inches and above average 1 snag per acre (Weisz and Vandendriesche 2011). Coarse woody debris increases with succession and averages 1-3 tons per acre. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. This alternative would impact less than 0.1 percent of juniper grass across the forest (2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4). It is likely to achieve desired future conditions for forest as this alternative primarily involves pipeline, road, and powerline corridors: “Pinyon-Juniper Woodlands: Under optimal conditions, reestablishment of multi-aged woodlands with complex structure and sparse ground cover of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs would be achievable with management intervention and resource inputs for most disturbance types, with the exception of the tailings storage facility. However, very old trees would take centuries to reestablish. Support of low-intensity ground fires should be possible with management intervention. Habitat structure would return for most generalist wildlife species but would likely require decades to centuries” | Same as Alternative 6. | Same as Alternative 6.<br><br>With respect to the tailings facility, trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236). This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or | Same as Alternative 6.<br><br>With respect to the tailings facility, trees and shrubs are anticipated to establish naturally after project decommissioning but may be planted if revegetation success criteria are not met (2021 FEIS, p. 236).<br><br>This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | (2021 FEIS, p. 249). This alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | | achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest over the long term. | |
| 342 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-04 (p. 100) | Scattered shrubs and a dense herbaceous understory including native grasses, forbs and annuals are present to support frequent surface fires. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. See response to LMP component #341 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 343 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-05 (p. 100) | Ground cover consists primarily of perennial grasses and forbs capable of carrying surface fire, with basal vegetation values averaging between about 10 and 30 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986) cover. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. See response to LMP component #3419 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 344 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-06 (p. 100) | Shrubs average less than 30 percent canopy. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. See response to LMP component #341 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 345 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-07 (p. 100) | Pinyon-juniper grass and juniper grass are generally uneven aged and open in appearance. Trees occur as individuals, but occasionally in smaller groups, and range from young to old. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. |
| 346 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJJUG-DC-08 (p. 100) | Patch sizes of woodlands range from individual trees and clumps that are less than one-tenth acre, to tree groups of approximately an acre. Occasionally patches of even-aged woodland structure are present, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment. A small percentage may be predisposed to larger even-aged patches, based on physical site conditions that favor mixed-severity and stand replacement fire and other disturbances. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. | Fine-scale desired conditions not applicable. See response to LMP component #339. |
| 347 | Pinyon-Juniper Grass and Juniper Grass | G | ERU-PJJUG-G-01 (p. 100) | Multiple characteristics of the site should be considered to determine mitigation and management to prevent long term damage | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. See response to LMP component #303 above with respect to soil protections. | Same | Same | Same |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>to Mollisols.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>348</td><td>Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-MEWMPO-DC-01 (p. 101)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the Madrean Encinal Woodland ecological response unit are as presented in table 11.<br>Table 11. Madrean Encinal Woodland ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>20</td><td>Recently disturbed, sparsely vegetated, grass, forbs, and shrub resprouts</td><td>Shrub under 10 percent Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>40</td><td>Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>over 30 percent</td><td>Closed</td></tr><tr><td>25</td><td>Dominated by trees 0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter</td><td>over 30 percent</td><td>Closed</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-Juniper Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak ERUs do not occur in the analysis area for the preferred alternative. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>349</td><td>Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-MEWMPO-DC-02 (p. 101-102)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the Madrean pinyon-oak ecological response unit are as presented in table 12.<br>Table 12. Madrean Pinyon-Oak ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts</td><td>Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Seedling/sapling; resprouter dominated</td><td>Varies</td><td>Open-Closed</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. Pinyon-Juniper Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak ERUs do not occur in the analysis area for the preferred alternative. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 13 Young with grass understory Varies Open<br>3 Young with grass understory Varies Closed<br>60 Medium to large, old w/grass understory Varies Open<br>15 Old with grass understory Varies Closed | | | | | | |
| 350 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-03 (p. 102) | Declining trees are a component and provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris, all well-distributed throughout the landscape. Snags 8 inches or greater at diameter breast height (dbh) average 4 snags per acre, while snags 18 inches or greater average 1 snag per acre. Large oak snags (over 10 inches) are a well-distributed component. Coarse woody debris increases with forest succession and averages 2 to 3 tons per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 351 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-04 (p. 102) | The Madrean types are relatively homogenous in structure, generally uneven-aged and open, with occasional patches of even-aged structure. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and 349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 352 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-05 (p. 102) | Grasses, forbs, shrubs, and needle cast (fine fuels), and small trees help to maintain the natural fire regime. Litter cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and to ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 353 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-06 (p. 102) | Frequent, primarily low severity fires (Fire Regime I and III) burn on the forest floor and do not typically spread between trees as crown fire. Mixed-severity fires occur less frequently and over smaller spatial extents than low severity fires. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 354 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-07 (p. 102) | The amount of shrub cover depends on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 355 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean | DC | ERU-MEWMPO- | The majority of woodland is in open condition with tree cover averaging | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | | DC-08 (p. 102) | between 10 and 40 percent depending on site productivity and past disturbance, with tree cover in canyons and drainage bottoms nearer the upper end of this range. A lesser amount is in closed canopy condition characteristic of the reference condition. Patch sizes range from less than 1 acre to 10s of acres, applicable at both mid and fine scales. | | components #348 and #349. | | | | |
| 356 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-09 (p. 102) | The size, shape, and number of trees per group, and number of groups per mid-scale unit are variable. Tree groups vary in size and number depending on climate, soil type, and past disturbance. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 357 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-10 (p. 102) | Mixed-severity fire and other disturbance occasionally favor the development of even-aged patches at both the mid and fine scales. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 358 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-11 (p. 102) | Snags 8 inches or greater at dbh average 4 snags per acre, while snags 18 inches or greater average 1 snag per acre (Weisz et al. 2011). Large oak snags (over 10 inches) are a well-distributed component. Coarse woody debris increases with forest succession and averages 2 to 3 tons per acre. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 359 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-12 (p. 103) | All structural stages of oak are present with old trees occurring as dominant individuals, and small groups occurring typically within openings. Denser overall tree conditions exist in some locations such as north facing slopes and canyon bottoms. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 360 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-13 (p. 103) | Shrubs occur in low to moderate densities which does not inhibit tree regeneration. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 361 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Midscale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-14 (p. 103) | Ground cover consists of perennial grasses and forbs capable of carrying surface fire, with basal vegetation values between about 1 and 20 percent (based on Terrestrial Ecological Unit or other suitable scientific protocol or method). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 362 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-15 (p. 103) | At the fine-scale, forest arrangement is in individual trees, small clumps, and groups of trees interspersed within variably sized openings of grass/forbs/shrub vegetation associations similar to historic patterns. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 363 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-16 (p. 103) | Tree groups vary in size and number depending on climate, soil type, and past disturbance. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per acre, as a result patch sizes can vary from less than 1 acre to 10s of acres. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 364 | Madrean Encinal Woodland and Madrean Pinyon-Oak Fine Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-MEWMPO-DC-17 (p.1036) | Trees typically occur in small groups in which they are variably spaced with some tight clumps. Crowns of trees within the mid- to old-age groups are interlocking or nearly interlocking. Interspaces between tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of a grass/forb/shrub mix. Some natural openings contain individual trees, including large open-grown oaks. Trees within groups are of similar or variable ages and may contain species other than oak, juniper, and pinyon pine. The size of tree groups is typically 1 acre or less. Groups at the mid- to old-age stages consist of 2 to approximately 40 trees. Interspaces between tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of a grass/forb/shrub mix. Some natural openings contain individual trees, including large open-grown oaks. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See responses to LMP components #348 and #349. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 365 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-01 (p. 1047) | The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the pinyon juniper evergreen shrub ecological response unit are as presented in table 13.<br>**Table 13. Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions**<br>**Seral Stage Percent of ERU** / **Seral Stage Description** / **Canopy Cover** / **Structure Class**<br>5 / Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts / Tree under 10 percent / Sparse-Open | Forest-wide | Not applicable. Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub ERU on NFS lands would not be impacted by any of the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 0 Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter over 30 percent Closed<br>55 Dominated by trees 0 - 9.9 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>40 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter 10-29.9 percent Open<br>0 Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter over 30 percent Closed | | | | | | |
| 366 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-02 (p. 104) | Pinyon-juniper evergreen shrub is a mix of trees and shrubs that occurs as a series of vegetation states that move from herbaceous-dominated to shrub-dominated to tree-dominated over time. Pinyon trees are occasionally absent, but one or more juniper species is always present. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 377 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Landscape Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-03 (p. 104) | Fires are typically mixed-severity with a moderate frequency (fire regime III). Some evergreen shrub types exhibit occasional high severity fires (fire regime IV). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 368 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-04 (p. 104) | Snags and old trees with dead limbs/tops are scattered, with snags 8 inches and above at root collar diameter averaging 3 snags per acre, while snags 18 inches and above average 1 snag per acre (Weisz and Vandendriesche 2011). Large dead wood is present, and coarse woody debris averages 2 to 4 tons per acre. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 369 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-035(p. 104) | The understory is dominated by low to moderate density shrubs depending on successional stage, overall averaging greater than 30 percent canopy cover. The shrub component consists of one or a mix of evergreen oak, manzanita, mountain mahogany, sumac, and other shrub species, which are well-distributed. Native perennial grasses and annual and perennial forbs are present in the interspaces. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 370 | Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Midscale Scale Desired Conditions | DC | ERU-PJC-DC-06 (p. 104) | Ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 15 percent depending on the Terrestrial | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan]</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>371</td><td>Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Fine Scale Desired Conditions</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJC-DC-07 (p. 8105)</td><td>Trees occur as individuals or in smaller groups ranging from young to old. Typically, groups are even-aged in structure with all ages represented across the landscape for an overall uneven-aged grouped appearance.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>372</td><td>Pinyon-Juniper Evergreen Shrub Fine Scale Desired Conditions</td><td>DC</td><td>ERU-PJC-DC-08 (p. 8105)</td><td>The patch size of woodlands ranges from 1 to 10s of acres, and can include patches of even-aged woodland structure, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #365.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>373</td><td>Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-PPE-PG-DC-01 (p. 106)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the ponderosa pine-evergreen oak ecological response unit are as presented in table 14.<br>Table 14. Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak (includes perennial grass and shrub subclasses) ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts</td><td>Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>over 30 percent</td><td>Closed</td></tr><tr><td>24</td><td>Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr><tr><td>60</td><td>Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Dominated by trees over 10.0 inches diameter</td><td>over 30 percent</td><td>Closed</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Dominated by trees 0 - 4.9 inches diameter</td><td>over 10 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. There is no Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak ERU affected by the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>374</td><td>Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-PPE-PG-DC-02 (p.s 106)</td><td>The ponderosa pine-evergreen oak perennial grasses sub-type is composed of trees from structural stages ranging from</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | young to old. Forest appearance is variable but generally uneven- aged and open at landscape scales (though can appear even-aged within tree groups); occasional larger areas of even-aged structure are present. | | | | | | |
| 375 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-03 (p. 106) | The forest arrangement is in individual trees, small clumps and groups of trees interspersed within variably sized openings of grass/forbs/shrub vegetation associations similar to historic patterns. Shrubs occur in low densities which do not inhibit ponderosa pine regeneration. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 376 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-04 (p. 106) | Size, shape, number of trees per group, and number of groups per area are variable across the landscape. All structural stages of oak are present, with old trees occurring as dominant individuals, and small groups occurring typically within openings. Denser overall tree conditions exist in some locations such as north facing slopes and canyon bottoms. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 377 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-05 (p. 106) | The ponderosa pine-evergreen oak perennial grasses sub-type is composed predominantly of vigorous trees, but declining trees are a component and provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris (over 3-inch diameter), all well-distributed throughout the landscape. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 378 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-06 (p. 107) | Dwarf-mistletoe occurs in less than 15 percent of host trees in uneven-aged forest structures and less than 25 percent in even-aged forest structures. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 379 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-07 (p. 107) | Grasses, forbs, shrubs, and needle cast (fine fuels), and small trees maintain the natural fire regime. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 380 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-08 (p. 107) | Organic ground cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and to ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 381 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-09 (p. 107) | Shrubs average less than 30 percent cover. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 382 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-10 (p. 107) | Frequent, primarily low severity fires (Fire Regime I) are characteristic. Natural and anthropogenic disturbances are sufficient to maintain desired overall tree density, structure, species composition, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 383 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-11 (p. 107) | The ponderosa pine-evergreen oak perennial grasses sub-type is characterized by variation in the size and number of tree groups depending on elevation, soil type, aspect, and site productivity. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per area. Openness typically ranges from 10 percent in more productive sites to 70 percent in the less productive sites. Tree density within forested areas generally ranges from 20 to 80 square foot basal area per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 384 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-12 (p. 107) | The mosaic of tree groups generally comprises an uneven-aged forest with all age classes and structural stages present, though tree groups and patches may be relatively even-aged. Occasionally patches of even-aged forest structure are present, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment. A small percentage of the landscape may be predisposed to larger even-aged patches, based on physical site conditions that favor mixed-severity and stand replacement fire and other disturbances. The mix of natural disturbances sustains the overall age and structural distribution. Patch sizes range from less than 1 acre to 10s of acres. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 385 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-13 (p. 107) | Ponderosa pine snags are typically 18 inches or greater at dbh and average 1 to 2 snags per acre, while snags greater than 8 inches average 5 snags per acre (Weisz et al. 2011). Large oak snags (over 10 inches) are a well-distributed component. Downed logs (over 12-inch diameter at mid-point, over 8 feet long) average 3 logs per acre. Coarse woody debris, including downed logs, ranges from 3 to 10 tons per acre. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 386 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-14 (p. 107) | Ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 15 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). Fires burn primarily on the Forest floor and do not typically spread between tree groups as crown fire. Mixed-severity fires occur at less frequency and over smaller spatial extents than low severity fires occur. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 387 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-15 (p. 108) | Forest conditions in goshawk post-fledging family areas (PFAs) are similar to general forest conditions except these forests contain 10 to 20 percent higher basal area in the mid- to old-age tree groups than goshawk foraging areas and the general forest. Goshawk nest areas have forest conditions that are multi-aged but are dominated by large trees with relatively denser canopies than other areas in the ponderosa pine-evergreen oak type. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 388 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak Perennial Grass Subclass | DC Fine Scale | ERU-PPE-PG-DC-16 (p. 108) | At the fine-scale in the ponderosa pine-evergreen oak perennial grasses sub-type, trees typically occur in small groups in which they are variably spaced with some tight clumps. Crowns of trees within the mid- to old-age groups are interlocking or nearly interlocking. Interspaces between tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of a grass/forb/shrub mix. Some natural openings contain individual trees, including large open-grown oaks. Trees within groups are of similar or variable ages and may contain species other than ponderosa pine. Size of tree groups typically is less than 1 acre. Groups at the mid-to old-age stages consist of 2 to approximately 40 trees. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 389 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-01 (p. 108) | The ponderosa pine-evergreen shrub sub-type is composed of trees from structural stages ranging from young to old. Forest appearance is variable but generally uneven-aged and open; areas of even-aged structure are present. The forest arrangement is in small clumps and groups | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | of trees interspersed within variably sized openings of moderate to high density shrubs and limited grass cover. Size, shape, number of trees per group, and number of groups per acre are variable across the landscape. All structural stages of oak are present, with old trees occurring as dominant individuals or in small groups. Denser tree conditions exist in some locations such as north facing slopes and canyon bottoms. | | | | | | |
| 390 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-02 (p. 108) | The ponderosa pine–evergreen shrub sub-type is composed predominantly of vigorous trees and shrubs, but declining trees and shrubs are a component. Declining trees provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris (over 3-inch diameter), all well-distributed throughout the landscape. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 391 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-03 (p.1080) | The composition, structure, and function of vegetative conditions are resilient to the frequency, extent and severity of disturbances and climate variability. Dwarf-mistletoe occurs in less than 15 percent of host trees in uneven-aged forest structures and less than 25 percent in even-aged forest structures. Limited grasses, forbs, and a moderate density of shrubs, needle cast, and small trees maintain the natural fire regime. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 392 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-04 (p. 108) | Organic ground cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and to ecosystem function. Shrubs average greater than 30 percent canopy cover. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 393 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Landscape | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-05 (p. 109) | Low to mixed-severity fires (fire regimes I and III) are characteristic in this type. Natural and anthropogenic disturbances are sufficient to maintain desired overall tree density, structure, species composition, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 394 | Ponderosa Pine- | DC | ERU-PPE-SS- | The ponderosa pine-evergreen shrub sub- | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Evergreen Shrub Subclass | Landscape | DC-06 (p. 109) | type is characterized by variation in the size and number of tree groups depending on elevation, soil type, aspect, and site productivity. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per area. Openness typically ranges from 10 percent in more productive sites to 70 percent in the less productive sites. Tree density within forested areas generally ranges from 20 to 80 square foot basal area per acre. | | response to LMP component #373. | | | | |
| 395 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-07 (p. 109) | The mosaic of tree groups comprises a mix of even-aged and uneven-aged patches with all age classes and structural stages present. The mix of natural disturbances sustains the overall age and structural distribution. Patch sizes range from less than 1 acre to 10s of acres. Occasionally patches of even-aged forest structure are present, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment. A small percentage of the landscape may be predisposed to larger even-aged patches, based on physical site conditions that favor mixed-severity and stand replacement fire and other disturbances. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 396 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-08 (p. 109) | Ponderosa pine snags are typically 18 inches or greater at dbh and average 1 to 2 snags per acre, while snags greater than 8 inches average 5 snags per acre (Weisz et al. 2011); large oak snags (over 10 inches) are a well-distributed component. Downed logs (over 12-inch diameter at mid-point, over 8 feet long) average 3 logs per acre. Coarse woody debris, including downed logs, ranges from 3 to 10 tons per acre. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 397 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-09 (p. 109) | Ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 15 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 398 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-10 (p. 109) | Fires are of low to mixed-severity burning on the forest floor as well as in the overstory. Crown fires occur in small | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | patches. | | | | | | |
| 399 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Midscale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-11 (p. 109) | Forest conditions in goshawk post-fledging family areas (PFAs) are similar to general forest conditions except these forests contain 10 to 20 percent higher basal area in the mid- to old-age tree groups than goshawk foraging areas and the general forest. Goshawk nest areas have forest conditions that are multi-aged but are dominated by large trees with relatively denser canopies than other areas in the ponderosa pine-evergreen shrub type. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 400 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | DC Fine Scale | ERU-PPE-SS-DC-12 (p. 109) | Trees typically occur individually or in small groups in which they are variably spaced with some tight clumps. Crowns of trees within mid- to old-age groups are interlocking or nearly interlocking. Interspaces between tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of shrubs and limited grass cover. Some natural openings may contain a high density of shrubs and/or individual trees, including large oaks. Trees within groups are of similar or variable ages and may contain species other than ponderosa pine. Size of tree groups typically is less than 0.5 acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 401 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | G | ERU-PPE-G-01 (p. 110) | Large Emory oak, Arizona oak, and Gambel oak trees and snags should be sustained to promote old-growth attributes. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 402 | Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub Subclass | G | ERU-PPE-G-02 (p. 110) | Management activities should leave an average of 1 to 2 snags greater than 18 inches per acre, when these components exist on the landscape prior to treatment. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #373. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 403 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Landscape | ERU-PPF-DC-01 (p. 110) | The ponderosa pine forest vegetation community is composed of trees from structural stages ranging from young to old. Forest appearance is variable but generally uneven-aged and open; occasional areas of even-aged structure are present. The forest arrangement is in individual trees, small clumps, and groups of trees interspersed within variably sized openings of grass/forbs/shrubs vegetation associations similar to historic patterns. Size, shape, number of trees per group, and number of | Forest-wide | Not applicable. There is no Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Shrub ERU affected by the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>groups per area are variable across the landscape. In the Gambel oak sub-type, all sizes and ages of oak trees are present. Denser tree conditions exist in some locations such as north facing slopes and canyon bottoms.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>404</td><td>Ponderosa Pine Forest</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-PPF-DC-02 (p. 110-111)</td><td>The ponderosa pine forest vegetation community is composed predominantly of vigorous trees, but declining trees are a component and provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris (over 3-inch diameter), all well-distributed throughout the landscape.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>405</td><td>Ponderosa Pine Forest</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-PPF-DC-03 (p. 111)</td><td>Frequent, low severity fires (Fire Regime I) are characteristic in this type. Natural and anthropogenic disturbances are sufficient to maintain desired overall tree density, structure, species composition, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>406</td><td>Ponderosa Pine Forest</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-PPF-DC-04 (p. 111)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the ponderosa pine forest ecological response unit are as presented in table 15.<br>Table 15. Ponderosa Pine Forest ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Recently disturbed, grass and forbs, and shrub resprouts</td><td>Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open</td></tr><tr><td>80</td><td>Dominated by trees 10.0 - 20.0 inches or greater diameter</td><td>10-29.9 percent</td><td>Open, multi-storied</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Dominated by trees 0 - 4.9 inches diameter</td><td>10-30 percent or greater</td><td>Open and Closed</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2 Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter over 30 percent Closed<br>12 Dominated by trees 10.0 - 20.0 inches or greater diameter over 30 percent Closed, Multi-storied | | | | | | |
| 407 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Landscape | ERU-PPF-DC-05 (p. 111) | Dwarf-mistletoe occurs in less than 15 percent of host trees in uneven-aged forest structures and less than 25 percent in even-aged forest structures. Grasses, forbs, shrubs, and needle cast (fine fuels), and small trees maintain the natural fire regime. Organic ground cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and to ecosystem function. The amount of shrub cover depends on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 408 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Midscale | ERU-PPF-DC-06 (p. 111) | The ponderosa pine forest vegetation community is characterized by variation in the size and number of tree groups depending on elevation, soil type, aspect, and site productivity. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per area, resulting in less space between groups. Openness typically ranges from 52 percent in more productive sites to 90 percent in less productive sites. In areas with high fine-scale aggregation of trees into groups, mid-scale openness ranges between 78-90 percent. Tree density within forested areas generally ranges from 22 to 89 square foot basal area per acre (Reynolds et al. 2013). Ground cover consists primarily of perennial grasses and forbs capable of carrying surface fire, with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 20 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 409 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Midscale | ERU-PPF-DC-07 (p. | The mosaic of tree groups generally comprises an uneven-aged forest with all | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 111-112) | age classes present. Occasionally patches of even-aged forest structure are present, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment. A small percentage of the landscape may be predisposed to larger even-aged patches, based on physical site conditions that favor mixed-severity and stand replacement fire and other disturbances. Disturbances sustain the overall age and structural distribution. | | component #403. | | | | |
| 410 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Midscale | ERU-PPF-DC-08 (p. 112) | Ponderosa pine snags are typically 18 inches or greater at dbh and average 1 to 2 snags per acre. In the Gambel oak subtype, large oak snags (over 10 inches) are a well-distributed component. Downed logs (over 12-inch diameter at mid-point, over 8 feet long) average 3 logs per acre. Coarse woody debris, including downed logs, ranges from 3 to 10 tons per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 411 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Midscale | ERU-PPF-DC-09 (p. 112) | Fires burn primarily on the forest floor and do not spread between tree groups as crown fire. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 412 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Midscale | ERU-PPF-DC-10 (p. 112) | Forest conditions in goshawk post-fledging family areas (PFAs) are similar to general forest conditions except these forests contain 10 to 20 percent higher basal area in mid- to old-age tree groups than in goshawk foraging areas and the general forest. Goshawk nest areas have forest conditions that are multi-aged but are dominated by large trees with relatively denser canopies than other areas in the ponderosa pine type. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 413 | Ponderosa Pine Forest | DC Fine Scale | ERU-PPF-DC-11 (p. 112) | Trees typically occur in irregularly shaped groups and are variably spaced with some tight clumps. Crowns of trees within the mid- to old-age groups are interlocking or nearly interlocking. Interspaces surrounding tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of a grass/forb/shrub mix. Some natural openings contain individual trees. Trees within groups are of similar or variable ages and may contain species other than ponderosa pine. Size of tree groups | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>typically is less than 1 acre, but averages 0.5 acres. Groups at the mid- to old-age stages consist of 2 to approximately 40 trees per group.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>414</td><td>Ponderosa Pine Forest</td><td>G</td><td>ERU-PPF-G-01 (p. 112)</td><td>Management activities should leave an average of 1 to 2 snags greater than 18 inches per acre.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #403.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>415</td><td>Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-MCD-DC-01 (p. 113)</td><td>The dry mixed conifer forest vegetation community is composed predominantly of vigorous trees, but declining trees are a component and provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris (over 3-inch diameter), all well-distributed throughout the landscape.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. There is no Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire ERU affected by the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>416</td><td>Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-MCD-DC-02 (p. 113)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the mixed conifer-frequent fire ecological response unit are as presented in table 16.<br>Table 16. Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br>Seral Stage Percent of ERU | Seral Stage Description | Canopy Cover | Structure Class<br>9 | Early development, all structures from Recently disturbed, grass and forbs to 0 - 4.9-inch trees | Tree under 10 percent | Sparse-Open<br>3 | Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches diameter | Over 30 percent | Closed<br>3 | Dominated by trees 5.0 - 9.9 inches or greater diameter | 10-29.9 percent | Open, multi-storied<br>60 | Dominated by trees 10 - 20 inches diameter | 10-29.9 percent or greater | Open, multi-Storied<br>25 | Dominated by trees 10 - 20 inches diameter | over 30 percent | Closed<br>0 | Historically rare, | 10-29.9 | Open, 1-2</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Dominated by percent storied trees 10.0 - 20.0 inches or greater diameter | | | | | | |
| 417 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Landscape | ERU-MCD-DC-03 (p. 113) | The dry mixed conifer vegetation community is a mosaic of forest conditions composed of structural stages ranging from young to old trees. Forest appearance is variable but generally uneven-aged and open; occasional patches of even-aged structure are present. The forest arrangement is in small clumps and groups of trees interspersed within variably sized openings of grass/forb/shrub vegetation associations similar to historic patterns. Size, shape, number of trees per group, and number of groups per area are variable across the landscape. Where they naturally occur, groups of aspen and all structural stages of oak are present. Denser tree conditions exist in some locations such as north facing slopes and canyon bottoms. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 418 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Landscape | ERU-MCD-DC-04 (p. 114) | Dwarf-mistletoe occurs in less than 15 percent of host trees in uneven-aged forest structures and less than 25 percent in even-aged forest structures. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 419 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Landscape | ERU-MCD-DC-05 (p. 114) | Grasses, forbs, shrubs, needle cast (e.g., fine fuels), and small trees maintain the natural fire regime. Organic ground cover (e.g., leaf litter/needle cast) and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and to ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 420 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Landscape | ERU-MCD-DC-06 (p. 114) | The amount of shrub cover depends on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 421 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Landscape | ERU-MCD-DC-07 (p. 114) | Frequent, low severity fires (fire regime I) are characteristic. Natural and anthropogenic disturbances are sufficient to maintain desired overall tree density, structure, species composition, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 422 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Midscale | ERU-MCD-DC-08 (p. | The dry mixed conifer forest vegetation community is characterized by variation in | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 114) | the size and number of tree groups depending on elevation, soil type, aspect, and site productivity. The more biologically productive sites contain more trees per group and more groups per area. Openness typically ranges from 50 percent in more productive sites to 90 percent in the less productive sites. Tree density within forested areas generally ranges from 30 to 125 square foot basal area per acre. | | component #415. | | | | |
| 423 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Midscale | ERU-MCD-DC-09 (p. 114) | The mosaic of tree groups generally comprises an uneven-aged forest with all age classes and structural stages. Occasionally small patches (generally less than 60 acres) of even-aged forest structure are present, based upon disturbance events and regeneration establishment. A small percentage of the landscape may be predisposed to larger even-aged patches, based on physical site conditions that favor mixed-severity and stand replacement fire and other disturbances. Disturbances sustain the overall age and structural distribution. Snags are typically 18 inches or greater at dbh and average 3 per acre. Smaller snags, 8 inches and above at dbh, average 8 snags per acre. Downed logs (over 12-inch diameter at mid-point, over 8 feet long) average 3 per acre within forested areas. Coarse woody debris, including downed logs, ranges from 5 to 15 tons per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 424 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Midscale | ERU-MCD-DC-10 (p. 114) | Ground cover consists primarily of perennial grasses and forbs capable of carrying surface fire, with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 20 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). Fires burn primarily on the forest floor and do not spread between tree groups as crown fire. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 425 | Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire | DC Midscale | ERU-MCD-DC-11 (p. 114) | Forest conditions in goshawk post-fledging family areas (PFAs) are similar to general forest conditions except these forests contain 10 to 20 percent higher basal area | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

<table>
<tr><th>#</th><th>Plan Section</th><th>Component Type</th><th>Component Number and LMP Location</th><th>Land Management Plan Text</th><th>Scale</th><th>Is It Applicable?</th><th>Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred</th><th>Alternative 5 – Peg Leg</th><th>Alternative 4 – Silver King</th><th>Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>in mid- to old-age tree groups than in goshawk foraging areas and in the general forest. Goshawk nest areas have forest conditions that are multi-aged but are dominated by large trees with relatively denser canopies than other areas in the dry mixed conifer type.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>426</td><td>Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire</td><td>DC Fine Scale</td><td>ERU-MCD-DC-12 (p. 115)</td><td>Trees typically occur in irregularly shaped groups and are variably spaced with some tight clumps. Crowns of trees within the mid- to old-age groups are interlocking or nearly interlocking. Interspaces surrounding tree groups are variably shaped and comprised of a grass/forb/shrub mix. Some natural openings contain individual trees or snags. Trees within groups are of similar or variable ages and one or more species. Size of tree groups typically is less than 1 acre. Groups at the mid- to old-age stages consist of 2 to approximately 50 trees per group.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>427</td><td>Mixed Conifer–Frequent Fire</td><td>G</td><td>ERU-MCD-G-01 (p. 115)</td><td>Management activities should leave an average of 1 to 2 snags greater than 18 inches per acre.</td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. See response to LMP component #415.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>428</td><td>Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen</td><td>DC Landscape</td><td>ERU-MCW-DC-01 (p. 115)</td><td>The desired seral states, canopy cover, and structural states for the wet mixed conifer–mixed conifer with aspen are as presented in table 17.<br>Table 17. Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen ecological response unit (ERU) desired vegetation conditions<br><table><tr><th>Seral Stage Percent of ERU</th><th>Seral Stage Description</th><th>Canopy Cover</th><th>Structure Class</th></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>Early development, all structures from Recently disturbed, grass and forbs to 0 - 4.9-inch trees</td><td>Tree under 10 percent</td><td>Sparse-Open</td></tr><tr><td>21</td><td>All Aspen and deciduous tree mix, all size classes</td><td>Varies</td><td>All storied-ness</td></tr></table></td><td>Forest-wide</td><td>Not applicable. There is no Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen ERU affected by the action alternatives. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 18 Dominated by trees 0.0 - 9.0 inches or greater diameter; 10-30 percent or greater; All storied-ness<br>14 Dominated by trees 10 - 20 inches diameter; over 30 percent; Closed<br>40 Dominated by trees 20 inches or greater diameter; over 30 percent; Closed, 3 or more stories | | | | | | |
| 429 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-02 (p. 116) | The wet mixed conifer forest vegetation community is a mosaic of structural and seral stages ranging from young trees through old (table 17). The landscape arrangement is an assemblage of variably sized and aged patches of trees and other vegetation associations similar to historic patterns. Tree patches are comprised of variable species composition depending on forest seral stages. Patch sizes vary but are frequently in the hundreds of acres, with rare disturbances in the thousands of acres. Canopies are generally more closed than in dry mixed conifer. An understory consisting of native grass, forbs, and/or shrubs is present. The amount of shrub cover depends on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 430 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-03 (p. 116) | Old growth generally occurs over large areas as stands. Old growth includes old trees, dead trees (snags), downed wood (coarse woody debris) and structural diversity. The location of old growth shifts on the landscape over time as a result of succession and disturbance (tree growth and mortality). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 431 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-04 (p. 116) | Snags 18 inches or greater at dbh range from 1 to 5 snags per acre, with the lower range of snags of this size associated with early seral stages and the upper range associated with late seral stages. Snag density in general (over 8 inches dbh) averages 20 per acre. Coarse woody debris, including downed logs, vary by seral stage, with averages ranging from 5 to 20 tons per acre for early-seral stages; 20 to 40 tons | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | per acre for mid-seral stages; and 35 tons per acre or greater for late-seral stages. | | | | | | |
| 432 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-05 (p. 116) | The wet mixed conifer forest vegetation community is composed predominantly of vigorous trees, but older declining trees are a component and provide for snags, top-killed, lightning- and fire-scarred trees, and coarse woody debris, all well-distributed throughout the landscape. Number of snags and the amount of downed logs (over 12-inch diameter at mid-point, over 8 feet long) and coarse woody debris (over 3-inch diameter) vary by seral stage. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 433 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-06 (p. 116) | Organic ground cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection of soil, regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 434 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Landscape | ERU-MCW-DC-07 (p. 116) | Mixed-severity fire (fire regime III) is characteristic, especially at lower elevations of this type. High severity fires (fire regime IV and V) rarely occur and are typically at higher elevations of this type. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 435 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Midscale | ERU-MCW-DC-08 (p. 116) | The size and number of groups and patches vary depending on disturbance, elevation, soil type, aspect, and site productivity. Groups and patches of tens of acres or less are relatively common. A mosaic of groups and patches of trees, primarily even-aged, and variable in size, species composition, and age is present. Openness and prevalence of some species (e.g., aspen) is dependent on seral stages. Grass, forb, shrub openings created by disturbance, may comprise 10 to 100 percent of the mid-scale area depending on the disturbances and on time since disturbance. Aspen is occasionally present in large patches. Density ranges from 20 to 180 or greater square foot basal area per acre based upon age and site productivity, and depending upon time since disturbance and seral stages of groups and patches. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 436 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with | DC Midscale | ERU-MCW-DC-09 (p. | Fire severity is mixed or high, with a fire return interval of 35 to 200 or more years | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Aspen | | 117) | (fire regimes III, IV, and V). Fires and other disturbances maintain desired overall tree density, structure, species composition, coarse woody debris, and nutrient cycling. Under wetter conditions, fires exhibit smoldering low-intensity surface behavior with some passive crown fire (single tree and isolated group torching). Under drier conditions, fires exhibit passive to active crown fire behavior with conifer tree mortality up to 100 percent across mid-scale patches. In areas with more contiguous high elevations, high severity fires in Wet Mixed Conifer-Mixed Conifer with Aspen generally do not exceed 1,000-acre patches of mortality. | | component #428. | | | | |
| 437 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Midscale | ERU-MCW-DC-10 (p. 117) | To improve the sustainability of this ecological response unit, desired conditions for wet mixed conifer–mixed conifer with aspen on the Tonto National Forest will be for high severity fires that generally do not exceed 250-acre patches of mortality.57 Other smaller disturbances occur more frequently. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 438 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Midscale | ERU-MCW-DC-11 (p. 117) | Ground cover consists of shrubs, perennial grasses, and forbs with basal vegetation values ranging between about 5 and 20 percent depending on the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory unit (USDA Forest Service 1986). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 439 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Midscale | ERU-MCW-DC-12 (p. 117) | Forest conditions in goshawk post-fledging family areas (PFAs) are similar to general forest conditions except these forests typically contain 10 percent or greater tree density (basal area) relative to PFAs than goshawk foraging areas and the general forest. Nest areas have forest conditions that are multi-aged but are dominated by large trees with relatively denser canopies than other areas in the wet mixed conifer type. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 440 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Fine Scale | ERU-MCW-DC-13 (p. 117) | In mid-aged and older forests, trees are typically variably spaced with crowns interlocking (grouped and clumped trees) or nearly interlocking. Trees within groups can be of similar or variable species and | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ages. Small openings are present as a result of disturbances. | | | | | | |
| 441 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | DC Fine Scale | ERU-MCW-DC-14 (p. 117) | Organic ground cover and herbaceous vegetation provide protection for soil and regulate infiltration, and contribute to plant diversity and ecosystem function. Due to presence of ladder fuels, fires usually burn either with low intensity, or transition rapidly in the canopy as passive or active crown fire. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 442 | Wet Mixed Conifer–Mixed Conifer with Aspen | G | ERU-MCW-G-15 (p. 117) | Management activities should leave an average of 1 to 5 snags greater than 18 inches per acre. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #428. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 443 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-01 (p. 119) | Riparian plant communities consist mostly of native species, provide habitat, and help maintain temperatures necessary for maintaining populations and dispersal of both aquatic and terrestrial species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. There are 92,268 acres of Riparian within the forest. Actions associated with this alternative would impact 0.1 percent of Riparian ERUs on the forest. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. This level of potential impact would result in only a negligible effect on the attainment of this desired conditions across the forest. | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. Actions associated with this alternative would impact 0.1 percent of Riparian ERUs on the forest. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. This level of potential impact would result in only a negligible effect on the attainment of this desired conditions across the forest. | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. Actions associated with this alternative would impact 0.3 percent of Riparian ERUs on the forest. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. This level of potential impact would result in only a negligible effect on the attainment of this desired conditions across the forest. | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6. Actions associated with this alternative would impact 0.3 percent of Riparian ERUs on the forest. See 2025 FEIS, section 3.3.4. This level of potential impact would result in only a negligible effect on the attainment of this desired conditions across the forest. |
| 444 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-02 (p. 119) | At the landscape scale, overall plant composition similarity to site potential (FSH 2090.11) averages greater than 66 percent for riparian areas, but can vary considerably at the fine- and mid- scales owing to a diversity of seral conditions. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | | | |
| 445 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-03 (p. 119) | Ground cover (includes herbaceous and woody plants) is present in adequate abundance to promote and maintain ecological integrity (measured based on site potential; Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other suitable scientific data). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 446 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-04 (p. 119-120) | A diversity of seral states are present and approach desired seral state distributions by Riparian Ecological Response Unit. Seral state proportions, per the R3 Seral State Proportions Supplement, are applied at the landscape scale, where low overall departure from reference proportions is a positive indicator of ecosystem condition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 447 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-05 (p. 120) | Well-established mesquite stands and forests, or bosques, generally located at abandoned channels (a former stream channel that is no longer part of the active channel) or terraces, are retained and connected to upland vegetation where the potential exists (based on riparian ecological response unit, Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other suitable dataset). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 448 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-06 (p. 120) | Riparian areas include a mix of species that indicates maintenance of riparian soil moisture characteristics (based on Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory or other suitable scientific protocol or method). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | #443 above. | | | |
| 449 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-07 (p. 100) | Riparian areas provide functional soil and water resources, consistent with their flood regime and flood potential, and provide diverse habitats for native species. Riparian areas are in or trending toward proper functioning condition or other suitable scientific protocol or method. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 450 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-08 (p. 120) | Invasive species (e.g., tamarisk, Russian olive, exotic forbs, and grasses) are not degrading ecological conditions. Invasive species are treated where site conditions can support native riparian plant communities. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 451 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-09 (p. 120) | Upland vegetation is not encroaching on riparian vegetation at uncharacteristic levels (a natural level of upland vegetation within the riparian zone) does intergrade. The riparian vegetation has achieved its potential extent and exhibits low departure from reference conditions. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 452 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-10 (p. 101) | Periodic flooding (frequency and magnitude) and scouring promotes diverse riparian plant communities consisting of emergent, herbaceous, shrub, and tree species of all ages and size classes (based on site potential; Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory or other suitable scientific data), and provide conditions necessary for the recruitment and natural succession of riparian dependent species. Flooding and scour occur at a frequency and magnitude that at least support regeneration of | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | phreatophyte vegetation common to each ecological response unit. | | | | | | |
| 453 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-11 (p. 120) | Fires typically burn infrequently, with mixed severity, and are generally localized. Fire frequency is related to that of adjacent cover types, but is less frequent in riparian areas because of higher fuel moisture, vegetation that is not flammable as often as adjacent vegetation, and soil moisture. Most acres in the surrounding watershed exhibits low departure from reference conditions, unless that would pose a threat to lives, property, infrastructure, or resources. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |
| 454 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-12 (p. 121) | The risk of undesirable fire behavior and effects is low (low departure from reference conditions) in the adjacent uplands (riparian corridor), reducing the likelihood of increased flooding, run-off, and damage to nearby riparian areas. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. Also see response to LMP components #463–#482 below. | Same | Same | Same |
| 455 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-13 (p. 121) | Annual and perennial grasses, forbs, shrubs, and trees are present based on site potential (based on Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory or other suitable scientific protocol or method) and exhibits low departure from reference conditions. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 456 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-14 (p. 121) | Riparian vegetation is healthy (e.g., few signs of stress, wilting or disease and have high reproductive output), or improving with limiting signs of compacted and degraded soils. Most soils (greater than 66 percent) are rated as satisfactory. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | | | |
| 457 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-15 (p. 121) | Woody species and herbaceous vegetation are present in adequate abundance/density to promote stream bank stability, specifically at stream systems most sensitive to loss of vegetation (e.g., Rosgen C-type streams). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 458 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | DC | RERU-DC-16 (p. 121) | The amount of coarse woody debris is similar to reference condition (low departure) and is adequately recruited to sustain replacement. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. See response to LMP component #443 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 459 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | G | RERU-G-01 (p. 121) | Vegetation management (e.g., timber harvest, invasive species, and prescribed fire) should not result in long-term degradation to riparian ecological response units. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative does not propose timber harvest or prescribed fire. A number of mitigation measures would be required which will reduce the impact of invasive species. See responses to LMP components #104, #275, #285, #443, and #440. | Same | Same | Same |
| 460 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | G | RERU-G-02 (p. 121) | Livestock management practices should allow riparian vegetation to recover. Plant development or recovery sufficient to sustain healthy riparian areas should occur following each livestock use period. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect how grazing occurs on allotments and would not affect how grazing affects plant communities, fish and wildlife habitat. See | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | response to LMP component #127. Decisions regarding allotment stocking and grazing strategies are made in grazing-specific analyses and allotment management plans. See LMP, pp. 50–51. | | | | |
| 461 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | G | RERU-G-03 (p. 121) | Projects and activities should be designed and implemented to promote a diversity of age classes and natural succession of native riparian and wetland obligate species (e.g., cottonwood, willow, sycamore, ash, alder, sedges, grasses, and other wetland plants). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives presented in the FEIS respond to direction from congress to analyze the impacts of a proposed mine and a Congressionally directed land exchange (2021 FEIS, pp. 1–3). Projects and activities to promote a diversity of age classes and natural succession of native riparian and wetland obligate species are outside the scope of the FEIS. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 462 | Riparian Ecological Response Units | G | RERU-G-04 (p. 121) | Large mature Freemont and narrowleaf cottonwood and Arizona sycamore trees should be protected from management activities. Projects occurring in these areas should incorporate restoration goals to ensure persistence of cottonwood and sycamore communities/forests. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative would require implementation of FS-WI-01: Revised Wildlife Management Plan). This measure requires avoiding when possible large trees (greater than 12 inches in diameter), including Fremont cottonwood (2021 FEIS, p. 573; Wildlife Management Plan (Resolution Copper 2020a:7). Also see 2021 FEIS, pp. 598–599 and appendix J. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Fire and Fuels** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 463 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-01 (p. 122) | Firefighter and public safety is the first priority in all fire management activities. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not make decisions | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | authorizing fire management activities, nor do they affect decisions regarding fire management priorities. | | | | |
| 464 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-02 (p. 123) | Fire management activities do not result in loss of life, damage to property or infrastructure, or degraded ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not make decisions regarding fire management activities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 465 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-03 (p. 123) | Wildland fires in the wildland-urban interface are mostly low intensity/low severity surface fires as ladder fuels are nearly absent. Firefighters are able to safely and efficiently suppress wildfires in the wildland-urban interface if needed. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. There are several designated wildland urban interface areas within the analysis area for the action alternatives (see 2021 FEIS, pp. 702-704). Overall, across all areas within the analysis area (including wildland urban interfaces), wildland fire risks are expected to be substantially mitigated through adherence to a fire plan that requires mine employees to be trained for initial fire suppression and to have fire tools and water readily available (2021 FEIS, p. 711). | Same | Same | Same |
| 466 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-04 (p. 123) | In fire-adapted ecosystems, wildland fire improves, maintains, and/or protects public safety, ecosystem function, vegetation composition and structure, property and infrastructure, wildlife habitat, and socio-economic values. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #465 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 467 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-05 (p. 123) | Wildfire behavior and effects are within the natural range of variability unless it poses a threat to public safety, property, infrastructure, habitat, watersheds, or other values. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #465 above. | Same | Same | Same |
| 468 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-06 (p. 123) | Wildland fire is recognized and understood, both internally and externally, as a | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | necessary disturbance process integral to the sustainability of the Tonto National Forest's fire-adapted vegetation types. | | make no decisions that would affect how wildland fire is recognized or understood. | | | | |
| 469 | Fire and Fuels | DC | FF-DC-07 (p. 123) | In vegetation types that are fire adapted, wildland fire (both planned and unplanned) plays a natural ecological role in designated and recommended wilderness areas. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no role in determining response to wildland fires in designated and recommended wilderness areas. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 470 | Fire and Fuels | S | FF-S-01 (p. 123) | Wildfires shall be managed to meet resource objectives where and when expected fire effects and behavior would be beneficial and would not threaten lives, property, infrastructure, or resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no role in determining wildfire management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 471 | Fire and Fuels | S | FF-S-02 (p. 123) | Managers must use a decision support process (e.g., the Wildfire Decision Support System) to guide and document wildfire management decisions. The process will provide situational assessment, analyze hazards and risk, identify values at risk, define implementation actions, and document decisions and rationale for those decisions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions that would affect the process used in making wildfire management decisions. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 472 | Fire and Fuels | S | FF-S-03 (p. 123) | Project design for prescribed burns and strategies for wildfires shall incorporate emission reduction techniques, such as those listed in Arizona Administrative Code R18-2 Article 15, to reduce negative impacts to air quality, subject to economic constraints, technical feasibility, safety criteria, and land management objectives. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions regarding prescribed burning and would not affect the strategies for wildfire management. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 473 | Fire and Fuels | S | FF-S-04 (p. 123) | Prescribed fires must be designed to move the area burned towards a natural fire regime that will increase the likelihood that future wildfires can be managed to achieve resource benefits, unless doing so threatens highly valued resources (e.g., natural resources, cultural resources, communities, infrastructure, and other values that could be affected by wildland fire). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions regarding prescribed burning. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 474 | Fire and Fuels | S | FF-S-05 (p. 123) | Where the natural fire regime is high severity fire, fire planning will include consideration of first and second order fire effects outside of the area that is expected to burn (e.g., flooding, debris flows, invasive species infestations). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decisions regarding wildfire planning. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 475 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-01 (pp. 123–124) | Where wildland fires on National Forest System lands could pose a threat to communities and community assets, particularly within the wildland-urban interface (e.g., power lines, communication towers, developed recreation sites, adjacent private land, and structures), fuels should be manipulated to reduce the potential for undesirable fire behavior and effects. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative (and other action alternatives) requires actions to reduce impacts on fuels and fire management (2021 FEIS, pp. 708–709). | Same | Same | Same |
| 476 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-02 (p. 124) | When wildfires occur, response strategies should be developed based on the threat to lives, public and firefighter safety, and potential resource impacts. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decision regarding wildfire response strategies. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 477 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-03 (p. 124) | All wildland fire activities should be conducted in a manner that minimizes disturbance to at-risk species, cultural resources, and other highly valued or at-risk resources, while keeping safety and risk management as a priority. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decision and would not affect how wildland fire activities are conducted. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 478 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-04 (p. 124) | Temporary fire facilities (e.g., incident bases, camps, staging areas, helispots, and retardant batch plants) should be placed to minimize negative impacts in cultural sites and sensitive species areas (e.g., designated critical habitat, owl packs, at-risk plant sites, and riparian areas). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives make no decision and would not affect location of temporary fire facilities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 479 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-05 (p. 124) | In advance of wildfire or prescribed fire, or as projects are being implemented, excessive fuel accumulation should be reduced around streams, springs, seeps, wetlands, and riparian areas to protect them from uncharacteristic or damaging fire effects. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. No existing excessive fuel accumulations were identified during project planning. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 698–704. | Same | Same | Same |
| 480 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-06 (p. 124) | Slash piles should not be placed within 300 feet of perennial or intermittent streams or within 100 feet of ephemeral streams | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. Slash piles would not be placed within 300 feet of perennial or intermittent streams or within 100 feet of ephemeral streams | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | unless local conditions suggest otherwise. | | | unless local conditions suggest otherwise. | | | |
| 481 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-07 (p. 124) | Ignitions should be located outside riparian management zones, unless local conditions suggest that ignitions within the riparian management zones would produce more desirable effects. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize ignition of planned fires. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 482 | Fire and Fuels | G | FF-G-08 (p. 124) | Within designated wilderness areas, wildfire management activities should minimize residual evidence of management activities. Fire management tactics (e.g., digging hand lines, limbing, and thinning) should be implemented outside of designated wilderness, unless approved by a qualified Agency Administrator. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize wildfire management activities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Watersheds and Water Resources** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 483 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-01 (p. 127) | Watersheds support multiple uses (e.g., timber, recreation, grazing, cultural) with no long-term decline in ecological conditions as measured by the Watershed Condition Framework or an equivalent method and provide high-quality water for downstream communities dependent on them. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. The LMP applies to only those lands within the NFS (LMP, p. 15). Analysis conducted for the FEIS indicates that impacts to watersheds and water resources from implementation of the preferred alternative are primarily derived from existing groundwater pumping, from cave blocking from the mine itself, located on private land, and the tailing facility, located on state and private land (2021 FEIS, pp. 404–412). Neither of the mine nor the tailings facilities are authorized by the Forest Service, and existing groundwater pumping is ongoing across multiple ownerships and not under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Activities authorized on NFS lands by this decision are limited to pipeline and electrical transmission facilities and associated roads (2021 FEIS, p. 18). Impacts to watersheds | Consistent. Like Alternative 6, this alternative would authorize only pipeline and electrical transmission line on NFS land. The tailings facility would not be located on NFS land. This alternative would have no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. | Consistent. Alternative 4 would have more of an impact than Alternative 6 as the tailings facility, are located on NFS lands. However, analysis of potential impacts to watersheds do not indicate that long-term decline in ecological conditions would occur. See 2021 FEIS, section 3.7. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | and water resources from activities authorized by the preferred alternative will have only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See analysis of impacts to watersheds and water resources for the preferred alternative located in the 2021 FEIS as follows: "Groundwater Quality and Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems," pp. 403–412; "Impacts Specific to the Preferred Alternative," p. 418; "Cumulative Effects," pp. 418–419; "Mitigation Effectiveness," pp. 419–422; and "Unavoidable Adverse Effects," p. 422. | | | |
| 484 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-02 (p. 127) | Surface water and groundwater quality, meets or exceeds applicable state water quality standards, fully supports designated beneficial uses, maintains or moves ecological conditions to low departure from reference conditions, and meets the needs of downstream water users. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 485 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-03 (p. 127-128) | Watersheds are functioning properly (based on criteria provided in the Watershed Condition Framework or similar current protocol) and they exhibit high geomorphic, hydrologic, and biotic integrity relative to their potential condition. They support the magnitude, frequency, timing, and duration of runoff within a natural range of variability and the movement of water and sediment from the surrounding uplands through the channel system sustains the health and function of the channel and riparian corridors as measured by the Watershed Condition Framework, National Riparian Core Protocol (Merritt et al. 2017) or another equivalent method. [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 486 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-04 (p. 128) | Ecological components of the watershed (e.g., soil, vegetation, and fauna) are resilient to human activities and natural disturbances (e.g., fire, drought, flooding, | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of | Consistent. See response to LMP component | Consistent. See response to LMP component | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | wind, grazing, insects, disease, and pathogens), and maintain or improve water quality and riparian and aquatic species habitat as measured by the Watershed Condition Framework or another equivalent method. | | | applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | #483. | #483. | |
| 487 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-05 (p. 128) | The effects of climate variability and change are moderated by watershed conditions that support important ecosystem services (e.g., clean water, groundwater recharge, long-term soil productivity, and base flows in streams, springs, and wetlands). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 488 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-06 (p. 128) | Watersheds provide for recharge of aquifers and sustain groundwater quantity and quality. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 489 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-07 (p. 128) | Groundwater discharge maintains water table elevation, supports base flows and water temperature in streams, seeps, fens, springs, and other wetland resources, maintains site productivity and soil moisture characteristics for riparian vegetation, and sustains the function of surface and subsurface aquatic ecosystems. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 490 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-08 (p. 128) | Surface waters provide habitat for aquatic species and riparian species, contribute to connectivity for wildlife across the landscape, provide for local and urban potable water supplies, agricultural uses (e.g., livestock watering and irrigation), and recreation. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #483. |
| 491 | Watersheds and Water Resources | DC | WAT-DC-09 (p. 128) | Water rights to support ecosystem water needs on the Forest have been acquired. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would it affect acquisition of water rights on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 492 | Watersheds and Water Resources | O | WAT-O-01 (p. 128) | Implement at least one essential project identified in the Watershed Restoration Action Plan for each priority watershed every year. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect implementation of | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | projects from the Watershed Restoration Action Plan. | | | | |
| 493 | Watersheds and Water Resources | O | WAT-O-02 (p. 128) | Improve or maintain watershed condition class of at least one 6th code (HUC12) watershed every 5 years, as defined in the Watershed Condition Framework. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect actions to improve or maintain watershed condition class of 6th code watersheds. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 494 | Watersheds and Water Resources | O | WAT-O-03 (p. 128) | Improve soil and water condition of at least 10,000 acres annually. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect projects to improve or soil and water conditions across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 495 | Watersheds and Water Resources | O | WAT-O-04 (p. 128) | Complete at least four aquatic habitat restoration projects (e.g., increase pool quantity, provide stream cover, and bank stabilization) every 10 years. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect aquatic habitat restoration projects across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 496 | Watersheds and Water Resources | O | WAT-O-05 (p. 129) | Apply for state-based water rights for instream flow use for at least two streams threatened with dewatering, supporting highly valued resources (e.g., threatened or endangered species, species of conservation concern, river-based recreation) or containing unique qualities (e.g., a perennial stream in the Sonoran Desert) within each ten-year period. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect application for state-based water rights on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 497 | Watersheds and Water Resources | S | WAT-S-01 (p. 129) | Project-specific best management practices (BMPs) shall be incorporated in land use and project plans as a principal mechanism for controlling non-point pollution sources, to meet soil and watershed desired conditions, and to protect beneficial uses. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. BMPs are incorporated into the design of this project and are expected to reduce, control, or otherwise mitigate potential impacts. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 227, 315, 465, 540, and 545. | Same | Same | Same |
| 498 | Watersheds and Water Resources | S | WAT-S-02 (p. 129) | New authorizations for wells and pipelines on National Forest System lands shall only | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | be considered where the water removed and/or transported by these facilities would not adversely impact springs, wetlands, riparian areas, surface flows, and other groundwater dependent ecosystems on National Forest System lands. | | | accord with the standard. The preferred alternative would authorize new wells on NFS land as part of mitigation FS-WR-01. This applies only to the wells/pipelines considered under mitigation measure FS-WR-01. With respect to mine water withdrawals, the mine facilities are not authorized by the Forest Service, and existing groundwater pumping is ongoing across multiple ownerships and not under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. The intent of this mitigation is "to ensure that groundwater supported flow that is lost due to mining activity is replaced and continues to be available to the ecosystem" (2021 FEIS, pp. 420–421 and appendix J). An unknown number of new wells could be drilled to pump supplemental groundwater that can be used to augment flow (2021 FEIS, p. 421). This mitigation is expected to maintain water flow, riparian ecosystems, and associated terrestrial and aquatic habitat (2021 FEIS, p. 422). The preferred alternative also authorizes pipelines that will carry water. However, the pumping of water transported by these pipelines are not expected to adversely impact springs, wetlands, riparian areas, surface flows, and other groundwater dependent ecosystems on NFS land; this water is recycled water returning from the tailings storage facility for reuse at the West Plant Site. See response to LMP component #483. | | | |
| 499 | Watersheds and Water Resources | S | WAT-S-03 (p. 129) | Water rights, to support uses other than those supported by Federal reserved rights, will be secured through State of Arizona water rights procedures. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize, nor would they affect application for state-based water rights on | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | the forest. | | | | |
| 500 | Watersheds and Water Resources | S | WAT-S-04 (p. 129) | Activities in and around surface waters will use decontamination procedures that prevent the spread of detrimental parasites, pathogens (e.g., fungi, bacteria, protozoa), and invasive species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any activities in and around surface waters will use decontamination procedures. | Same | Same | Same |
| 501 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-01 (p. 129) | When existing groundwater wells on National Forest System lands are proposed for improvement that increase the amount of water pumped or deepen the well, adverse impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems (e.g., wetlands, riparian areas, springs, streams, and fens) should be evaluated, and measures to eliminate, mitigate, or reduce impacts should be implemented. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. None of the action alternatives include improvement of groundwater wells on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 502 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-02 (p. 129) | When additional water supplies are necessary for Forest Service uses, existing infrastructure that could provide the supply should be evaluated for repairs or improvement prior to developing new sources of supply. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. None of the action alternatives propose additional water supplies for Forest Service use. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 503 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-03 (p. 129) | New wells on National Forest System lands and new pipelines across National Forest System lands should avoid adversely impacting nearby wells on adjoining private lands. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Construction, use and maintenance of the pipeline authorized on NFS land will not impact nearby wells on private land. See 2021 FEIS, pp. 410–411. Also see response to LMP component #498. Note that the only wells anticipated on NFS land are associated with mitigation FS-WR-01; any dewatering wells associated with the mine operations would be located on private land. Even so, mitigation FS-WR-01 includes mitigation for private wells if impacted. | Same | Same | Same |
| 504 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-04 (p. 129) | New water supply needs for Forest Service uses (e.g., livestock watering and recreation uses) should be met with groundwater supplies, provided that this development does not adversely impact | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize new water supply for Forest Service use. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | groundwater dependent ecosystems or surface water resources. | | | | | | |
| 505 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-05 (p. 130) | Activities that could impact groundwater or surface water quality should be located outside Source Water Protection Areas to prevent potential impacts. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Source Water Protection Areas are areas that contribute water to wells or surface water intakes that are used for public water supply (LMP FEIS, p. 130). Impacts to such areas have not been identified from activities authorized on NFS land by the preferred alternative. See response to LMP component #483. | Same | Same | Same |
| 506 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-06 (p. 130) | New or reconstructed roads and motorized routes, infrastructure, recreation sites, or similar constructed facilities should not be located within floodplains or within 300 feet of water resource features (e.g., perennial and intermittent streams, springs, wetlands, and riparian areas), except where necessary for stream crossings or to provide for resource protection to avoid the long-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and water resource features. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Constructed facilities on NFS land authorized by the preferred alternative would not be located within floodplains or within 300 feet of water resource features except where necessary for stream crossings or to provide for resource protection to avoid the long-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and water resource features. The preferred alternative was modified between the DEIS and FEIS specifically to reduce disturbance to water resources from pipelines (2021 FEIS, pp. 117–118).<br>Also see Mineral Creek pipeline crossing, 2021 FEIS, p. 457; mitigation FS-PH-03, 2021 FEIS, p. 528 and appendix J. | Same | Same | Same |
| 507 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-07 (p. 130) | Consistent with existing water rights; permitted water uses, water diversions, or obstructions should allow sufficient water to pass downstream to preserve minimum levels of water flow that maintain riparian and aquatic desired conditions. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See response to LMP component #483. | Same | Same | Same |
| 508 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-08 (p. 130) | Watershed condition classification (using the Watershed Condition Framework or | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The selected alternative | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | similar protocol) should be updated after large-scale disturbance events (e.g., wildfire). | | would have no effect on whether watershed condition classification is updated after large-scale disturbance events. | | | | |
| 509 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-09 (p. 130) | To enhance the protection of human health and safety, watershed treatments should be implemented where protection of people, structures, and community infrastructure (e.g., roads, bridges, power corridors, and water supply) are at risk. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on when and whether watershed treatments are implemented. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 510 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-10 (p. 130) | Watershed condition improvement projects should be integrated with other project activities. Prioritize projects that require minimal maintenance (e.g., cost of maintenance and time required for maintenance) and improve resiliency to climate change. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on when and whether watershed treatments are implemented. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 511 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-11 (p. 130) | Where stressors degrading watershed condition can be identified, they should be eliminated or reduced, where feasible. Natural recovery of watershed conditions should be prioritized where it can be expected to occur. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on when and whether stressors degrading watershed condition are treated. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 512 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-12 (p. 130) | Applications to the state by entities other than the Forest Service for water rights on National Forest System and adjacent lands should be evaluated where they could adversely affect National Forest System water rights. State procedures should be followed if adverse effects to those rights could occur. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on whether applications for state-based water rights on NFS land are evaluated and subsequent procedures followed. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 513 | Watersheds and Water Resources | G | WAT-G-13 (p. 120) | Where Forest Service management contributes to designation of a water body as impaired, the Forest Service should implement recommendations in Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) assessments and, where feasible, complete watershed improvement projects in impaired or non-attaining water bodies without completed TMDL assessments. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would have no effect on whether TMDL assessments are conducted, or watershed improvement projects are completed. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 514 | Watersheds and Water | G | WAT-G-14 | Groundwater and surface water on | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Resources | | (p. 131) | National Forest System lands should be managed as one hydrologically connected system. | | action alternatives would have no effect on how groundwater and surface water systems on NFS land are managed. | | | | |
| **Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 515 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-01 (p. 135) | Riparian areas (including streams, seeps, springs, and wetlands) exhibit low departure from reference conditions, are properly functioning, and therefore are resilient to disturbances. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. The forest plan applies to only those lands within the NFS (LMP, p. 15). Impacts to riparian areas, seeps, springs, and wetlands from implementation of the preferred alternative are primarily derived from existing groundwater pumping, cave blocking from the mine itself, located on private land, and the tailing facility, located on state and private land (2021 FEIS, pp. 404–412). Neither of the mine nor the tailings facilities are authorized by the Forest Service, and existing groundwater pumping is ongoing across multiple ownerships. Activities authorized on NFS lands by this decision are limited to pipeline and electrical transmission facilities and associated roads (2021 FEIS, p. 18). Impacts to riparian areas, seeps, springs, and wetlands are primarily addressed in "Groundwater Quantity and Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems" (2021 FEIS, pp. 394–423). The analysis found that, with implementation of required mitigation, the preferred alternative would result in no net loss of riparian ecosystems or aquatic habitat on the landscape, | Consistent. Alternative 5 is similar to Alternative 6 in that activities authorized on NFS lands by this decision are limited to pipeline and electrical transmission facilities and associated roads. | Not consistent. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would have more of an impact than Alternatives 5 and 6 for two reasons. First, a portion of the watershed on NFS lands is encumbered by the tailings facility, which will change runoff characteristics and reduce stormflow in downstream waters. Two additional springs will be disturbed from direct tailings facility ground disturbance. It is questionable whether all riparian areas would remain properly | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | although the exact nature and type of ecosystems would change to adapt to new water sources (2021 FEIS, p. 422). These impacts have only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions on NFS lands. See analysis of impacts to watersheds and water resources for the preferred alternative are located in the 2021 FEIS as follows: "Groundwater Quality and Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems," pp. 403–412; "Impacts Specific to the Preferred Alternative," p. 418; "Cumulative Effects," pp. 418–419; "Mitigation Effectiveness," pp. 419–422; and "Unavoidable Adverse Effects," p. 422. | | functioning with these alternatives. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | |
| 516 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-02 (p. 135) | Within their potential, riparian areas protect and enrich soils, stabilize banks and shorelines, and improve water quality by filtering and capturing sediment, filtering contaminants, and dissipating stream energy from flows. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 517 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-03 (p. 135) | Protective litter and plant cover is present in adequate abundance (based on reference conditions and site potential; Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory data or other suitable dataset) to allow higher stream terraces and floodplains to recycle nutrients, and resist erosion and compaction. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 518 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-04 (p. 135) | Livestock grazing does not impact the long-term health of riparian vegetation. Vigor and diversity maintains or moves riparian vegetation as represented by Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory site potential and other suitable references to low departure from desired conditions for riparian vegetation types. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not make decisions regarding grazing allotments, stocking levels, or response to impacts from grazing. However, all of the action alternatives are expected to result in a reduction of available grazing on NFS | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | allotments (2021 FEIS, pp. 892–896). | | | | |
| 519 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-05 (p. 135) | Forest activities (e.g., vehicle use, recreation, ungulate and livestock grazing) do not negatively impact and move riparian areas away from desired conditions for vegetation, soils, and water (e.g., increase sedimentation and erosion, alter plant communities, or impair streambanks). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 520 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-06 (p. 135) | Stream flow regimes and sediment movement characteristics reflect the natural range of variability, maintain riparian ecosystems, channel and floodplain morphology, groundwater recharge, and water quality. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 521 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-07 (p. 135) | Riparian ecosystems exhibit connectivity between and within aquatic systems, riparian areas, and uplands that provide for movement and dispersal of species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The transmission line would be overhead and would not interfere with connectivity between aquatic systems, riparian areas, and uplands. The pipeline has been designed to span Devil's Canyon and bore under Mineral Creek, and thus would not interfere with connectivity between aquatic systems, riparian areas, and uplands. | Consistent. The pipeline route for Alternative 5 requires crossing of the Gila River but would be anticipated to be bored under the river or cross overhead. It would thus not interfere with connectivity between aquatic systems, riparian areas, and uplands. | Not consistent. The placement of the tailings storage facility on NFS land would necessarily block ephemeral drainages and xeroriparian areas. | Not consistent. The placement of the tailings storage facility on NFS land would necessarily block ephemeral drainages and xeroriparian areas. |
| 522 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | DC | RMZ-DC-08 (p. 135) | Spring recharge areas maintain or improve spring discharge. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 523 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, | DC | RMZ-DC-09 | Streambeds contain less than 30 percent | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Consistent. | Not | Not consistent. See |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | | (p. 135) | fines (e.g., sand, silt, and clay) in riffle habitat (a rocky or shallow part of a stream or river with rough water) in cold water streams and less than 50 percent fines reach wide (generally 0.25 miles) in warm water streams for aquatic species. | | | alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | See response to LMP component #515. | consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | response to LMP component #515. |
| 524 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | O | RMZ-O-01 (p. 135) | Complete active and passive restoration projects on at least 125 miles of streams every 10 years to improve the ecological integrity of perennial and intermittent riparian ecosystems rated as nonfunctioning and functioning-at-risk. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would have no effect on active and passive stream restoration projects on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 525 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | O | RMZ-O-02 (p. 136) | Improve 10 to 15 individual springs during each 10-year period. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and would have no effect on spring improvement projects on NFS lands. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 526 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | S | RMZ-S-01 (p. 136) | All projects in riparian areas shall identify and delineate the riparian management zone. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any activities that occur within riparian areas on NFS lands will identify and delineate the riparian management zone. | Same | Same | Same |
| 527 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | S | RMZ-S-02 (p. 136) | Refueling, maintaining equipment, and storing fuels or other toxicants shall not occur in riparian management zones, except in the Lakes and Rivers Management Area. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any activities that occur within riparian areas on NFS lands will not allow refueling, equipment maintenance or storing fuels or other toxicants in the riparian management zone. | Same | Same | Same |
| 528 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | S | RMZ-S-03 (p. 136) | Projects within the riparian management zone that use herbicides or pesticides will establish application buffer areas based on project objectives, the size of the project area, characteristics of the chemicals to be used, and application methods. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the standard. Any projects that occur within riparian management zone on NFS lands will establish application buffer areas in accordance with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 529 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-01 (p. 136) | New spring developments and redeveloped springs (not including maintenance) should employ the strategies outlined in RMRS-GTR 40574 or the best available science | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. Any new spring development on NFS land | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | associated with spring development (Forest Service 2020). [as cited in forest plan] | | | will comply with this standard. | | | |
| 530 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-02 (p. 136) | Projects affecting perennial streams should be designed and constructed to allow for natural instream movement of aquatic species, except where barriers are necessary to preclude the movement of nonnative species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. Analysis conducted for the FEIS does not identify negative impacts to natural instream movement of aquatic species on NFS lands from any of the action alternatives. | Same | Same | Same |
| 531 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-03 (p. 136) | In riparian management zones, projects and management activities should be designed and implemented to maintain or restore long-term natural streambank stability, native vegetation, floodplain, and soil function (for activities within the Lakes and Rivers Management Area, reference guideline MA-LRMA-G-03). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. All activities in riparian management zones on NFS lands authorized by the preferred alternative will comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 532 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-04 (p. 136) | Downed woody material in stream channels should be left in place where appropriate (e.g., to create pools for fish habitat), except where it poses a risk to health and safety (e.g., debris jams). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. All activities on NFS lands authorized by the preferred alternative will comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 533 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-05 (p. 136) | Activities that modify stream channels currently in proper functioning condition (evaluated using Proper Functioning Condition Assessment or similar protocol) that would result in a non-functioning system should not be authorized. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions. See response to LMP component #515. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. | Not consistent. See response to LMP component #515. |
| 534 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-06 (p. 137) | When drafting or moving water, measures should be taken to prevent movement of invasive and/or non-native aquatic species (e.g., pump intake screens, decontamination, and coordination with state and tribal agencies). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. All activities on NFS lands authorized by the preferred alternative will comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |
| 535 | Riparian Areas, Seeps, Spring, Wetlands, and Riparian Management Zones | G | RMZ-G-07 (p. 137) | Project planning and activities affecting riparian and aquatic ecosystems should consider the desired conditions specified in the current Regional Riparian and Aquatic Ecosystem Strategy (USDA Forest Service 2019). [as cited in forest plan] | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. All activities on NFS lands authorized by the preferred alternative that could affect riparian and aquatic ecosystems will comply with this standard. | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Specifically, the standard states, "Implement actions that will result in "desired conditions" for riparian and aquatic systems, founded on site potential (geomorphology, hydrologic regime, soil characteristics, vegetation types, etc.) and based on the best available science to better inform management of riparian and aquatic systems."<br><br>There are numerous applicant-committed environmental protection measures that would prevent project impacts from physical disturbance near riparian areas (such as pipeline crossings). This includes directional drilling beneath Mineral Creek, overhead crossing of Devil's Canyon, and the measures specified in the "Summary of Applicant-Committed Environmental Protection Measures" subsections in sections 3.3, 3.7.2, and 3.7.3. In addition, impacts to riparian systems could occur due to mine operations on private land (drawdown from dewatering) are also addressed by mitigation measure FS-WR-01 (see appendix J). | | | |
| **Wildlife, Fish, and Plants** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 536 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC-01 (p. 140) | Ecological conditions contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened and endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species, maintain viable populations of species of conservation concern, and sustain both common and uncommon native species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with findings of not likely to adversely affect the endangered Gila chub (Gila intermedia) and southwestern willow flycatcher and their designated critical habitat; the threatened northern Mexican gartersnake; and the threatened yellow-billed cuckoo and its | Alternative 5 is similar to the preferred alternative and would likely have similar effects species included in this desired condition. However, the FEIS includes consultation | Alternative 4 differs from Alternatives 5 and 6 in that it locates the tailings storage facility on NFS land and could have impacts to species that are greater than | Same as Alternative 4. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | proposed critical habitat (2021 FEIS, appendix P, p. 1); is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Arizona hedgehog cactus (2021 FEIS, appendix P, p. 53). The preferred alternative will have no effect on the acuña cactus, desert pupfish, Little Colorado spinedace, loach minnow, spikedace, Colorado pikeminnow, Chiricahua leopard frog, razorback sucker, woundfin, Mexican spotted owl and their critical habitat, and Nichol's turk's head cactus, Apache trout, Gila trout, Gila topminnow, Sonoran pronghorn, Mexican wolf, and ocelot (2021 FEIS, appendix P, p. 1).<br><br>The above relates to federally listed threatened and endangered species. With respect to other sensitive species, the EIS concludes that no impacts to population viability will occur (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). In addition, required mitigations will address wildlife impacts (see appendix J, mitigation measures FS-WI-01 through FS-WI-04), as will numerous applicant-committed environmental protection measures (see 2025 FEIS, section 3.8). | with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service only on the preferred alternative. If this alternative were selected for implementation, consultation would be reinitiated and a Biological Opinion prepared that addresses this alternative. | Alternatives 5 and 6. If this alternative were selected for implementation, consultation would be reinitiated and a Biological Opinion prepared that addresses this alternative. | |
| 537 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC-02 (p. 141) | Habitats are sufficiently resilient to withstand foreseeable levels of disturbance and redundant enough to maintain species diversity, enabling species to adapt to changing environmental conditions (e.g., climate change). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives.<br>Impacts to biological resources and their habitat from implementation of the preferred alternative (and other alternatives) can be found in the 2021 FEIS, pp. 570–600. | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 2,702 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.09 percent of the 2,965,716- | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 7,910 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is less than 0.3 percent of the 2,965,716- | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 7,239 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.2 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest. This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Analysis determined that implementation of the preferred alternative would not detrimentally impact the viability of any species. See response to LMP component #536 above. Total disturbance with the preferred alternative on NFS land is expected to be 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel. This is less than 0.09 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest. This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | acre Tonto National Forest. This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | acre Tonto National Forest. This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. |
| 538 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC-03 (p. 141) | Habitat condition, distribution, and abundance contribute to self-sustaining populations of plant and animal species, including at-risk species, rare, and endemic species. | Forest-wide | Applicable | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #536. | Same | Same | Same |
| 539 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC-04 (p. 141) | A diversity of habitat features, including biotic and abotic, are available at the appropriate spatial, temporal, compositional, and structural levels to provide adequate opportunity for critical life history needs (e.g., breeding, feeding, and nesting) of species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #536. | Same | Same | Same |
| 540 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC-05 (p. 141) | Habitats within and adjacent to the forest are sufficiently interconnected in order to | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | allow for necessary movements and dispersal of native animal and plants, as well as promote species interactions. Habitats are connected at a landscape scale that includes adjacent lands. | | | opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #536. | | | |
| 541 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC--06 (p.1417) | Locations, status, and life histories (e.g., population trend, threats, and habitat requirements) of at-risk, rare, and endemic species are known and better understood. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect knowledge of or understanding of at-risk, rare, and endemic species. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 542 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC--07 (p. 141) | Human-wildlife conflicts and human disturbances are minimal, as are adverse impacts to vital life history functions (e.g., breeding, feeding, and rearing young) of wildlife, fish, and rare plants. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #536. | Same | Same | Same |
| 543 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | DC | WFP-DC--08 (p. 141) | Unique plant communities and landscape features (e.g., limestone cliffs, calcareous soils, margins of seeps and springs, canyons/cliffs, hanging gardens) are present to maintain well-distributed populations of associated native, endemic, and rare plant species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions or objectives over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #536. | Same | Same | Same |
| 544 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | O | WFP-O--01 (p. 141) | Implement at least 20 activities (e.g., habitat improvement projects, collaborative agreements, wildfire management) that contribute to the recovery of at-risk species every 10 years. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect planning and implementation of listed activities across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 545 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | O | WFP-O-02 (p. 141) | Complete at least 20 products or activities that educate the public about wildlife, fish, and rare plants every 2 years (e.g., educational signs and brochures, website pages, species checklists, presentations, and field trips). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect planning and implementation of listed products or activities across the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 546 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-01 (p. 141) | Activities occurring within federally listed species habitat should apply habitat management objectives and species protection measures from approved recovery plans. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See Biological Opinion, 2021 FEIS, appendix P. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. |
| 547 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-02 (p. 141) | Where the Forest Service has entered into a signed conservation agreement that provides guidance on activities or actions to be carried out by the Forest, those activities or actions should be undertaken consistent with the guidance found within the conservation agreement. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include a conservation agreement. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 548 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-03 (p. 141) | The best available science and/or conservation measures should be used to contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened and endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species, and maintain viable populations of species of conservation concern and rare endemic species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See Biological Opinion, 2021 FEIS, appendix P, for conservation measures related to federally listed threatened and endangered species. With respect to other sensitive species, the EIS concludes that no impacts to population viability will occur (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). In addition, required mitigations will address wildlife impacts (see appendix J, mitigation measures FS-WI-01 through FS-WI-04), as will numerous applicant-committed environmental protection measures (see 2025 FEIS, section 3.8). | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. |
| 549 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-04 (p. 142) | Projects and activities that may negatively impact at-risk species and rare endemic pant species should consider protections and design elements to address impacts, especially considering the timing and location of vulnerable life history processes (e.g., reproduction, molting, migration, and | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See Biological Opinion, 2021 FEIS, appendix P, for conservation measures related to federally listed threatened and endangered | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. | Consistent. See response to LMP component #536. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | hibernation). Examples of design elements and protections could include but are not limited to timing restrictions, adaptive percent utilization levels, distance buffers and avoidance (e.g., physical removal/damage of plants). | | | species. With respect to other sensitive species, the EIS concludes that no impacts to population viability will occur (2025 FEIS, section 3.8). In addition, required mitigations will address wildlife impacts (see appendix J, mitigation measures FS-WI-01 through FS-WI-04), as will numerous applicant-committed environmental protection measures (see 2025 FEIS, section 3.8). | | | |
| 550 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G--05 (p. 142) | New or reconstructed features (e.g., fences, vent pipes, stock tanks, and culverts) should be designed, constructed, and maintained to minimize wildlife mortality (e.g., capped fence posts and escape ramps). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. New and reconstructed features authorized by the preferred alternative on NFS lands will comply with this guideline. | Same | Same | Same |
| 551 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-06 (p. 142) | Landscape and vegetation alterations that significantly contribute to uncharacteristic habitat fragmentation should be avoided. Project design should provide for movement and dispersal of species between treated and untreated areas. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The analysis of wildlife connectivity states there would be a loss of long-term movement habitat along pipeline corridors (2021 FEIS, p. 581), it concludes that potential impacts would likely be limited to impacts at the local level for most species and would not be significant at the population level (2021 FEIS, p. 581). To comply with the revised LMP, the project would need to be modified or an amendment to the forest plan approved. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 552 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-07 (p. 142) | New infrastructure or constructed features (e.g., fences, roads, recreation sites, facilities, drinkers, and culverts) should be designed and maintained to minimize negative impacts to the movement and dispersal of wildlife, fish, and rare plants. Infrastructure and constructed features already present that negatively impact movement and dispersal should be modified or removed when no longer in use in order to improve connectivity. Barriers may be used to protect native species or prevent movement of nonnative | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. The analysis of wildlife connectivity states there would be a loss of long-term movement habitat along pipeline corridors (2021 FEIS, p. 581), it concludes that potential impacts would likely be limited to impacts at the local level for most species and would not be significant at the population level (2021 FEIS, p. 581). To comply with the revised LMP, the project would need to be modified or an amendment to the | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | species. | | | forest plan approved. | | | |
| 553 | Wildlife, Fish, and Plants | G | WFP-G-08 (p. 142) | Projects and activities that may negatively impact Sonoran Desert tortoises should apply mitigations from the Arizona Interagency Desert Tortoise Team's Recommended Standard Mitigation. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. See 2021 FEIS, p. 572; and mitigation measure FS-WI-02: Reptile and Sonoran desert tortoise, 2021 FEIS, pp. 599 and appendix J. | Same | Same | Same |
| **Invasive Species** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 554 | Invasive Species | DC | INS-DC-01 (p. 144) | Invasive species do not disrupt ecological functionality, affect the sustainability of native species, cause economic harm, or negatively impact human health. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. The analysis of impacts for the preferred alternative concluded that ground disturbance could result in an increased likelihood of noxious weeds becoming established or spreading (2021 FEIS, pp. 243–245, p. 250). While impacts would be minimized on Tonto National Forest–administered lands with the implementation of the Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019; 2021 FEIS, p. 246), the spread of noxious and invasive weeds would be unavoidable (2021 FEIS, p. 258).<br><br>Total disturbance of NFS land with the preferred alternative is estimated at 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel. This is 0.9 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest (LMP FEIS, p. 1). This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 2,702 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is less than 0.9 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest (LMP FEIS, p. 1). This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 7,910 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.27 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest (LMP FEIS, p. 1). This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. | Consistent. Similar to Alternative 6 but would disturb up to 7,2390 acres of NFS land, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.25 percent of the 2,965,716-acre Tonto National Forest (LMP FEIS, p. 1). This constitutes a minor potential change on the forest as a whole and would not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | applicable desired conditions across the forest or over the long term. Note that aquatic invasive species were not identified in the FEIS analysis. | term. | | |
| 555 | Invasive Species | DC | INS-DC-02 (p. 144) | Ground disturbing management activities are not introducing or spreading invasive species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. All action alternatives would increase the potential for noxious and invasive weed establishment (2021 FEIS, p. 242). Specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures have been incorporated into the project that would reduce these impacts (2021 FEIS, p. 228), and includes the implementation of a noxious weed and invasive species plan (2021 FEIS, p. J-2). The preferred alternative ground disturbance on NFS lands with the preferred alternative is limited to 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.9 percent of the forest. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 556 | Invasive Species | O | INS-O-01 (p. 144) | Treat and control invasive species on 200 to 1,500 acres annually. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not determine where or how many acres of invasive species are treated annually on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 557 | Invasive Species | O | INS-O-02 (p. 144) | Treat and control invasive species on 2 to 10 stream reaches every five years. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not determine where or how aquatic invasive species are treated annually on the forest. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 558 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-01 (p. 144) | Equipment and materials should not be stored or staged in areas infested with | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | invasive species. | | | accord with the guideline. Equipment and materials storage on NFS lands will comply with this guideline. | | | |
| 559 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-02 (p. 144) | Certified weed-free materials (e.g., seed, forage, mulch, and fill) should be selected for all seeding and mulching projects to restore natural species composition and ecosystem function to the disturbed area, and to ensure that invasive species are not introduced during projects or emergency implementation. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative will use a reclamation seed mix of weed-free native species consistent with surrounding vegetation (2021 FEIS, p. 743). Certified weed-free seed and hay will be used for reclamation and compliance activities, including wattles and organic materials used for erosion control (Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:2)). Use of forage is not anticipated on NFS land with the preferred alternative. | Same | Same | Same |
| 560 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-03 (p. 144) | Fill and rock material should be inspected to limit and control the spread of invasive species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. The preferred alternative will comply with this guideline. | Same | Same | Same |
| 561 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-04 (p. 144) | After initial invasive species treatments, follow up monitoring and treatments should occur to prevent regrowth, establishment, or spread of other invasive species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. Follow-up monitoring will determine the effectiveness of the treatment and whether additional follow-up treatment would be required (Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:4–5)). | Same | Same | Same |
| 562 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-05 (p. 144) | If chemical application is necessary near human developments (e.g., developed recreation sites) or ecologically sensitive habitat (e.g., at-risk species and riparian areas), techniques should be applied to minimize negative effects (e.g., chemical-free buffers, and spot treatments). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. Forest Service approval will be obtained prior to initiating any noxious weed control program on federal land (Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:3)). The Forest Service will ensure that any chemical applications meet this guideline. | | | |
| 563 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-06 (p. 145) | When drafting water from streams or other water bodies, measures should be taken to prevent the spread of parasites, pathogens (e.g., fungi, bacteria, protozoa), and invasive species. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No aquatic invasive species were identified in the analysis. | N/A | Same | Same | Same |
| 564 | Invasive Species | G | INS-G-07 (p. 145) | Efforts to improve disturbed sites should include steps to reduce invasive plant species colonization, protect soils, and improve watershed condition. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. See the prevention section in the Resolution Copper Project noxious weed and invasive species management plan on NFS lands (Resolution Copper 2019:2–3). | Same | Same | Same |
| **Soils** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 565 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-01 (p. 147) | Soil productivity, function, and inherent physical, chemical, and biological processes remain intact or are enhanced. Soils can readily absorb, store, and transmit water vertically and horizontally, resist erosion, and accept, hold, and release nutrients, based on site potential. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Analysis of impacts on soil productivity concludes that project ground-disturbing activities would potentially compact soils, accelerate erosion and soil loss, contaminate soils, and reduce soil productivity (2021 FEIS, p. 238). Specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are in place to reduce these impacts (2021 FEIS, pp. 227–228). Reclamation activities would restore some soil productivity for the purposes of revegetation (2021 FEIS, pp. 237–239). The preferred alternative ground disturbance on NFS lands with the preferred alternative is limited to 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.9 percent of the forest. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. | | | |
| 566 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-02 (p. 147) | Vegetative cover and litter are distributed across the soil surface in adequate amounts to limit erosion and contribute to soil development, productivity, and carbon cycling. Soil cover and herbaceous vegetation protect soil, facilitate infiltration, and contribute to plant and animal diversity and ecosystem function. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. Ground disturbance on NFS lands with the preferred alternative is limited to 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.9 percent of the forest. Soil loss from construction and operations in the pipeline and power line corridor is expected to be minimal after compliance with applicant-committed environmental protection measures (stormwater pollution prevention plans and erosion and sediment controls), and post-closure after reclamation when the surface has stabilized from revegetation (2021 FEIS, p. 255). | Consistent. This alternative is similar to Alternative 6 in that powerlines, pipelines and road use permit are the only actions that would occur on NFS lands. While this alternative would result in up to 2,702 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, of disturbance of NFS land, which is 0.9 percent of the forest. The conclusions are the same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. This alternative differs from Alternatives 5 and 6 in that tailings storage facility is located on NFS land. Up to 7,910 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, of NFS land would be disturbed by this alternative, which is 0.37 percent of the forest. While this is greater than Alternatives 5 and 6, Alternative 4 would still have only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives when considered on a forest-wide basis. | Consistent. This alternative differs from Alternatives 5 and 6 in that tailings storage facility is located on NFS land. Up to 7,239 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Parcel, of NFS land would be disturbed by this alternative, which is 0.25 percent of the forest. While this is greater than Alternatives 5 and 6, Alternatives 2 and 3 would still only have a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives when considered on a forest-wide basis. |
| 567 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-03 (p. | Logs and other woody material are | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred | Consistent. | Consistent. | Consistent. See |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 147) | retained and distributed across the soil surface to facilitate soil productivity (e.g., nutrient cycling) and maintain key habitat features, based on site potential. | | | alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #566. | See response to LMP component #566. | See response to LMP component #566. | response to LMP component #566. |
| 568 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-04 (p. 147) | Soil productivity is not inhibited by invasive plant species. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP components #565 and #554. | Same | Same | Same |
| 569 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-05 (p. 147) | Soils are free from contaminants that could alter ecosystem integrity or affect public health. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative maintains or makes progress toward attaining one or more plan desired conditions or objectives applicable to the project. A number of environmental protection measures are incorporated into the design of the project that would act to reduce potential impacts from hazardous materials and to reduce impacts on public safety from hazardous materials (see 2021 FEIS, pp. 717–719). Implementation of these measures minimizes the risk for unexpected releases of hazardous materials and provides for rapid emergency cleanup (2021 FEIS, p. 722). Also see response to LMP components #527 and #558. No other potential contaminants are anticipated. | Same | Same | Same |
| 570 | Soils | DC | SL-DC-06 (p. 147) | Soils do not exhibit signs of accelerated water or wind erosion (e.g., pedestaling, rills, and gullies). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. Analysis of impacts on soil productivity concludes that project ground-disturbing activities would potentially compact soils, accelerate erosion and soil loss, contaminate soils, and reduce soil productivity (2021 FEIS, p. 238). Specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are in place to reduce these impacts (2021 FEIS, pp. 227–228). | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Reclamation activities would reduce soil erosion potential over the long-term (2021 FEIS, pp. 237–239). The preferred alternative ground disturbance on NFS lands with the preferred alternative is limited to 2,511 acres, not excluding the Oak Flat Federal Parcel, which is 0.9 percent of the forest. The preferred alternative does not foreclose the opportunity to maintain or achieve any of the applicable desired conditions over the long term, even if the project (or an activity authorized by the project) would have an adverse short-term effect on one or more desired conditions. | | | |
| 571 | Soils | G | SL-G-01 (p. 147) | Ground disturbing management activities should be designed to minimize short- and long- term impacts to soil resources (e.g., soil compaction and soil loss). Where disturbance cannot be avoided, project specific soil and water conservation practices should be developed. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. Applicant-committed environmental protection measures (2021 FEIS, p. 228) and mitigation measures (2021 FEIS, pp. 256–257) are included in all action alternatives to reduce impacts to soils. | Same | Same | Same |
| 572 | Soils | G | SL-G-02 (p. 147) | Where biological soil crusts exist, ground disturbing activities should identify areas for protection and minimize disturbance. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Not consistent. For all action alternatives, biological crust soils (referred to as biotic soils and desert pavement in the FEIS) are present in some of these areas and cannot be completely avoided (2021 FEIS, pp. 247–248). | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 573 | Soils | G | SL-G-03 (p. 148) | Soils with impaired and unsatisfactory condition ratings (as defined by Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventory) should be managed to maintain or improve their conditions (for activities within the Lakes and Rivers Management Area, reference guideline MA-LRMA-G-03). | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No soils in the analysis area were identified as being impaired or having unsatisfactory condition ratings (see 2021 FEIS, pp. 207–209 and p. 224). | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 574 | Soils | G | SL-G-04 (p. 148) | In areas where soils have a severe erosion hazard rating, are poorly drained or saturated, or have an unsatisfactory soil condition, new activities that encourage | Forest-wide | Not applicable. No areas of severe erosion hazard, poorly drained or saturated soils or | Same | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | concentrated use (e.g., recreation, log landings, stock tanks, and cattle collection areas) should be avoided (for activities within the Lakes and Rivers Management Area, reference guideline MA-LRMA-G-03). | | soils with unsatisfactory conditions were identified in the project area. | | | | |
| **Caves and Karsts** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 575 | Caves and Karsts | DC | CVK-DC-01 (p. 149) | The cultural, archaeological, geological, hydrological, paleontological, biological, recreational, and aesthetic resources associated with caves and karst features are conserved, maintained, and not degraded by visitors. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. There are no caves currently mapped in the Paleozoic limestone units within the analysis area for any action alternative (2021 FEIS, p. 184). While several karst features have been noted in Queen Creek Canyon upstream of Superior, only one existing cave has been identified in the area: Hawks Claw Cave is located near Alternative 2 tailings storage facility site (2021 FEIS, p. 185). However, Alternative 2 would not impact any known cave or karst resource (2021 FEIS, p. 195). | N/A | NA | N/A | N/A |
| 576 | Caves and Karsts | DC | CVK-DC-02 (p. 149) | Cave formations and karst landscapes continue to develop or erode under natural conditions. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 577 | Caves and Karsts | DC | CVK-DC-03 (p. 149) | Cave and karst feature conditions provide habitat for cave specialists (particularly hibernacula and maternity roosts for bats) and facultative use by other wildlife. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 578 | Caves and Karsts | G | CVK-G-01 (p. 149) | Environments in caves should not be altered except where necessary to protect associated natural resources or to protect health and safety. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 579 | Caves and Karsts | G | CVK-G-02 (p. 149) | Where necessary to protect human health and safety, gates should be installed to preserve habitats for and mitigate negative | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | impacts to wildlife, including roosting bats. Proposed gates should be designed to allow future access for authorized personnel and include a lock and/or removable bar along with a design to open from the inside without a key. | | | | | | |
| 580 | Caves and Karsts | G | CVK-G-03 (p. 149) | Projects for or near known cave and karst features should consider protections to minimize disruptions to hydrogeology, cave microbiology, and other aspects of cave ecology while also seeking to protect and conserve archaeological, biological, and geological resources. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 581 | Caves and Karsts | G | CVK-G-04 (p. 149) | The forest should strive to prevent the spread and minimize the impacts of white-nose syndrome for bat roosts in cave and karst features. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. See response to LMP component #575. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Air Quality** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 582 | Air Quality | DC | AQ-DC-01 (p. 152) | Air quality contributes positively to visibility, human health, quality of life, economic opportunities, quality recreation, and wilderness values. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. The analysis of air quality impacts for the action alternatives shows that all impacts would be within ambient air quality standards and well below the prevention of significant deterioration increments. The proposed emission sources would comply with applicable regulations and impacts on air quality-related values would be within the established thresholds for levels of acceptability (2021 FEIS, p. 361). Factoring in cumulative effects and mitigation, emissions from project-related activities would meet applicable Federal and State standards for air quality (2021 FEIS, p. 363). | Same | Same | Same |
| 583 | Air Quality | DC | AQ-DC-02 (p. 152) | Air quality on the Tonto National Forest meets or surpasses the State of Arizona and Federal ambient air quality standards. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #582. | | | |
| 584 | Air Quality | DC | AQ-DC-03 (p. 152) | Water chemistry and biotic components are not negatively impacted by atmospheric deposition of pollutants. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #582. | Same | Same | Same |
| 585 | Air Quality | DC | AQ-DC-04 (p. 152) | Air quality-related values, including high-quality visibility conditions, are maintained or improved by forest projects over the long term in Class I areas on the forest. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #582. | Same | Same | Same |
| 586 | Air Quality | DC | AQ-DC-05 (p. 152) | Visibility in Class I areas meets the most recent regional haze regulations as mandated by Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency. | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative has no effect or only a negligible adverse effect on the maintenance or attainment of applicable desired conditions or objectives. See response to LMP component #582. | Same | Same | Same |
| 587 | Air Quality | S | AQ-S-01 (p. 152) | Prescribed fire (e.g., pile, broadcast, and jackpot burning) will occur in accordance with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality requirements. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize prescribed fire. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 588 | Air Quality | S | AQ-S-02 (p. 152) | When prescribed burns are implemented, strategies for Emissions Reduction Techniques (ERTs) per Arizona Administrative Code R18-2 Article 15 shall be followed when practicable to reduce negative impacts to air quality. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize prescribed fire. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 589 | Air Quality | G | AQ-G-01 (p. 152) | Dust abatement should occur during projects where there are adverse impacts to air quality (e.g., construction and road and motorized trail improvements). | Forest-wide | Applicable. | Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed in exact accord with the guideline. Dust abatement is included in required mitigation (see 2021 FEIS, pp. 349–350; and mitigation measure FS-SV-03, p. 362 and appendix J). | Same | Same | Same |
| 590 | Air Quality | G | AQ-G-02 (p. 152) | During the management of wildland fire, techniques to minimize adverse smoke | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | impacts (e.g., timing of ignitions, mass ignitions, and limiting fire spread) should be used. | | not authorize and will not affect techniques used during management of wildland fire. | | | | |
| 591 | Air Quality | G | AQ-G-03 (p. 152) | Coordination with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality should occur before and during prescribed burns to comply with State and Federal requirements for emissions and impacts to Class I areas. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize prescribed fire. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 592 | Air Quality | G | AQ-G-04 (p. 152) | During the management of wildland fires, smoke-sensitive receptors should be located and potential adverse impacts to them should be minimized or mitigated. | Forest-wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not authorize and will not affect management of wildland fire, including location of receptors. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **AREA-SPECIFIC DIRECTION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MANAGEMENT AREA DIRECTION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 593 | Designated Wilderness Management Area | DC, S, G | DWMA-DC-01 through 11 (pp. 158–159) DWMA-S-01 through 06 (pp. 159–160) DWMA-G-01 through 10 (pp. 160–161) | Various | Designated Wilderness Management Area (MA) | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on designated wilderness (2021 FEIS, p. 626). | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 594 | Recommended Wilderness Management Area | DC, S, G | RWMA-DC-01 through 07 (p. 164) RWMA-S-01 through 05 (p. 165) RWMA-G-01 through 10 (pp. 165–166) | Various | Recommended Wilderness MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on recommended wilderness. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 595 | Designated Wild and Scenic Rivers | DC, S, G | DWSRMA-DC-01 | Various | Designated Wild and Scenic River | Not applicable. The action alternatives | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Management Area | | through 06 (p. 167) DWSRMA-S-01 through 02 (p. 168) DWSRMA-G-01 through 02 (p. 168) | | MA | have no direct effects on designated Wild and Scenic Rivers. | | | | |
| 596 | Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Area | DC, S, G | EWSRMA-DC-01 through 05 (pp. 170–171) EWSRMA-S-01 through 03 (p. 171) EWSRMA-G-01 through 03 (p. 171) | Various | Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 597 | Designated and Recommended Research Natural Areas and Botanical Areas Management Area | DC, S, O, G | RNBAMA-DC-01 through 07 (pp. 176–177) RNBAMA-O-01 (p. 177) RNBAMA-S-01 through 03 (p. 148) RNBAMA-G-01 through 04 (pp. 177–178) | Various | Designated and Recommended Research Natural Areas and Botanical Areas MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on designated and eligible Research Natural Areas and Botanical Areas. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 598 | Inventoried Roadless Areas Management Area | DC, S, G | IRAMA-DC-01 through 04 (pp. 179–180) IRAMA-S-01 through 03 (p. 180) IRAMA-G-01 through 02 (p. 181) | Various | Inventoried Roadless Areas MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on Inventoried Roadless Areas. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 599 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-01 (p. 181) | Recreation opportunities on national trails support the needs of the diverse populations we serve by providing a variety | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not affect the | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | of opportunities for recreation with different levels of solitude, challenge, and development. | | recreational opportunities available on the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | | | | |
| 600 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-02 (p. 182) | Use conflicts among national trail users are infrequent. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not affect or contribute to user conflicts on the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 601 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-03 (p. 182) | Visitor access, use, and management activities are consistent with the recreational, scenic, ecological, cultural, traditional, wildlife resources, and the nature and purpose for which the trail is designated. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Not consistent. Regardless of alternative, new pipelines constructed within the Magma Arizona Railroad Company (MARRCO) corridor would cross the Arizona National Scenic Trail. Any new development intersecting the Arizona National Scenic Trail corridor would interfere with the nature and purpose of the Arizona National Scenic Trail (2021 FEIS, p. 626). Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 602 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-04 (p. 182) | National trails are signed, passable, and conform to National Forest Trail System Standards. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect trail signage, passage, or conformance with trail standards. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 603 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-05 (p. 182) | Unauthorized construction on or modification of national trails is minimized. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not result in unauthorized construction or modification of the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 604 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-06 (p. 182) | The Arizona National Scenic Trail and corridor are well-defined and provide high-quality, primitive hiking, mountain biking, equestrian opportunities, and other compatible nonmotorized trail activities. The significant scenic, natural, historic, and cultural resources within the trail's corridor | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Not consistent. None of the action alternatives would meet the criteria of maintaining views of a natural-appearing landscape on some trail segments. See earlier responses to Scenery. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | are conserved. The trail provides visitors with expansive views of the natural-appearing landscapes. | | | would be required. | | | |
| 605 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-07 (p. 182) | Scenery viewed from the Arizona National Scenic Trail is consistent with high or very high scenic integrity objectives. The foreground of the trail is natural-appearing. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Not consistent. None of the action alternatives would retain high or very high SIOs on all segments of the Arizona National Scenic Trail, and foreground would not be natural appearing in all trail segments. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 606 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-08 (p. 182) | The potential to view wildlife and natural ecological processes exist along the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not result in elimination of the potential to see wildlife or natural ecological processes from the Ariona National Scenic Trail. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 607 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-09 (p. 182) | Connectivity of the Arizona National Scenic Trail is maintained. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect the connectivity of the Arizona National Scenic Trail. Alternative 4 would require a reroute of 5.5 miles of the trail, but connectivity would be maintained. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 608 | National Trails Management Area | DC | NTMA-DC-10 (p. 182) | The Arizona National Scenic Trail has appropriate trailheads and access points that provide various opportunities to select the type of terrain, scenery, and trail length (ranging from long distance to day use) that best provide for compatible outdoor recreation experiences. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect trailheads and access points for the trail. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 609 | National Trails Management Area | S | NTMA-S-01 (p. 182) | Designated national trails conform to their Trail Management Objectives (TMO) and shall be maintained to National Forest Service standards. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not affect conformance to TMOs or how the trail is maintained. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 610 | National Trails Management Area | S | NTMA-S-02 (p. 182) | Motorized use shall not be allowed on newly constructed segments of the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | National Trails MA | Depends on the alternative. | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. | Applicable and consistent. While this alternative would result in rerouting of 5.5 miles of the trail, it would not allow motorized use on the trail. | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. |
| 611 | National Trails Management Area | S | NTMA-S-03 (p. 182) | Sales or extraction of mineral materials (e.g., limestone and gravel) shall not be authorized within the Arizona National Scenic Trail corridor. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not authorize sale or extraction of limestone or gravel from within the trail corridor. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 612 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-01 (p. 182) | National trails should be consistent with management direction in the trail establishment reports as well as the maintenance standards for trail class and use. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Not consistent. Regardless of alternative, new pipelines constructed within the MAARCO corridor would cross the Arizona National Scenic Trail. Any new development intersecting the Arizona National Scenic Trail corridor would interfere with the nature and purpose of the Arizona National Scenic Trail (2021 FEIS, p. 626). Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 613 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-02 (p. 183) | To retain or enhance the purposes for which the national trail was designated, new or relocated trail segments should be located within the recreation opportunity spectrum and scenic integrity objectives consistent with or complementing the pre-existing condition. | National Trails MA | Depends on the alternative. | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. | Applicable and not consistent. This alternative would result in rerouting of 5.5 miles of the Arizona National Scenic Trail, as well as in reductions in | Not applicable. This alternative would not result in any newly constructed segments of the trail. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | SIO and ROS categories in the vicinity of the trail. | |
| 614 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-03 (p. 183) | Construction of new motorized routes should not intersect national trails located within primitive or semiprimitive nonmotorized recreation opportunity spectrum classes. Management activities should maintain public access to designated national trails. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Consistent. The action alternatives would construct an access road that would cross the Arizona National Scenic Trail in the MAARCO corridor. The new access road would not be a ”new motorized route” available for public use. The concentrate pipeline corridor management plan (M3 Engineering and Technology Corporation 2019) details how public motorized access will be restricted from the MARRCO corridor.<br><br>With respect to ROS classes, the MARRCO corridor crossing impacts 1 acre of semiprimitive nonmotorized ROS, out of 7,421 acres of this ROS class in the analysis area (see 2025 FEIS, section 3.9).<br><br>Applicant-committed measures are also in place to reduce impacts to trail users: “During construction of that section, that portion of the AZT will be temporarily closed to public access and a temporary crossing within the corridor in another location will be established to allow continued passage for recreational users. Additionally, to the extent practicable, the construction of that section will occur during low recreational use (summer months)” (Resolution Copper 2020b).<br><br>The project design varies from the exact words of the guideline but is as effective in meeting the purpose of the guideline to contribute to the maintenance or attainment of relevant desired conditions and | Same | Same | Same |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | objectives. | | | |
| 615 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-04 (p. 183) | If national trails are to be used as firelines, management actions should be reviewed and approved prior to use, and adverse effects should be mitigated. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not authorize the use or location of firelines. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 616 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-05 (p. 183) | Landings created for timber harvest or mechanical treatments should not be visible from national trails. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not include landings for timber harvest or mechanical treatments. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 617 | National Trails Management Area National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-06 (p. 183) | Fences crossing national trails should be designed with gates and pass-throughs that accommodate multiple modes of nonmotorized traffic. Fences should be compatible with the scenic objectives of the area. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. No fences would cross the Arizona National Scenic Trail with any of the action alternatives. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 618 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-07 (p. 183) | Special use authorizations that affect national trails should include measures to avoid impacts to visual resources. | National Trails MA | Depends on the alternative. | Not applicable. No special use authorizations that would affect national trails would be issued under this alternative. | Consistent. While this alternative could include issuance of special use authorizations that unavoidably include a closure of the Arizona National Scenic Trail, specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are in place to avoid impacts to visual resources (2021 FEIS, pp. 742—743), and there is | Not applicable. No special use authorizations that would affect national trails would be issued under this alternative. | Not applicable. No special use authorizations that would affect national trails would be issued under this alternative. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How?<br>Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | required mitigation to avoid impacts to visual resources (appendix J, mitigation measure FS-SR-01). The project design varies from the exact words of the guideline but is as effective in meeting the purpose of the guideline to contribute to the maintenance or attainment of relevant desired conditions and objectives. | | |
| 619 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-08 (p. 183) | If management activities result in short-term impacts to the scenic character of the Arizona National Scenic Trail, design elements should be included (e.g., screening, feathering, and other scenery management techniques) at the project level. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Not consistent. All action alternatives would result in impacts to the scenic character of the Arizona National Scenic Trail that cannot be fully mitigated through design elements. Project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be required. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not consistent. Same as Alternative 6. |
| 620 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-09 (p. 183) | The minimum trail facilities necessary to accommodate the amount and types of use anticipated on any given segment along the Arizona National Scenic Trail should be provided to protect resource values and for health and safety (not for the purpose of promoting user comfort) to preserve or promote a natural-appearing setting. | National Trails MA | Depends on the alternative. | Not applicable. This alternative does not propose any changes to trail facilities. | Not applicable. This alternative does not propose any changes to trail facilities. | Applicable and consistent. This alternative would relocate 5.5 miles of the Arizona National | Not applicable. This alternative does not propose any changes to trail facilities. |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | Scenic Trail. The newly constructed segment would be designed with the minimum trail facilities to meet this guideline. | |
| 621 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-10 (p. 183) | Linear utilities and rights-of-way should not be constructed over national trails. Where unavoidable, these should be limited to a single Arizona National Scenic Trail crossing per special use authorization to maintain the integrity of the trail corridor and values for which the Arizona National Scenic Trail was designated. | National Trails MA | Applicable. | Consistent. Only one crossing of the Arizona National Scenic Trail would occur with this alternative. | Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not applicable. No special use permits would be issued as part of this alternative. | Same as Alternative 4. |
| 622 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-11 (p. 183) | Wildland fire in the foreground of the Arizona National Scenic Trail should be managed using tactics appropriate to protect and incorporate the values of the Arizona National Scenic Trail.<br>Firelines created with heavy equipment (e.g., dozer lines) should not be used within the Arizona National Scenic Trail corridor unless necessary for emergency protection of life and property. | National Trails MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not determine management of wildland fires. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 623 | National Trails Management Area | G | NTMA-G-12 (pp. 183–184) | To protect scenic integrity, special use authorizations for new communication sites, utility corridors, and renewable energy sites should be avoided. Where unavoidable, design elements should be implemented to maintain scenic integrity in the trail corridor and the values for which the Arizona National Scenic Trail was designated. | National Trails MA | Depends on Alternative | Applicable. Consistent. The preferred alternative is designed exactly in accord with the guideline. While this alternative could potentially issue a special use authorization that unavoidably includes a changes to SIOs within the Arizona National Scenic Trail corridor, specific applicant-committed environmental protection measures are in place to avoid impacts to visual resources (2021 FEIS, pp. 742–743), and required mitigation to avoid impacts to visual resources (appendix J, mitigation measure FS-SR-01). | Applicable. Consistent. Same as Alternative 6. | Not applicable. No special use permits would be issued as part of this alternative. | Not applicable. Same as Alternative 4. |
| 624 | National Trails | G | NTMA-G-13 | E-bikes should not be allowed on the | National Trails | Not applicable. None of | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Management Area | | (p. 184) | Arizona National Scenic Trail, unless a regulatory exception authorized by the National Trails System Act is met or there is an exception in the enabling legislation for the trail. | MA | the action alternatives proposes allowing ebikes on the Arizona National Scenic Trail. | | | | |
| 625 | Significant Caves Management Area | DC, S | (SCMA-DC-01 through 02 (p. 185) (SCMA-S-01 (p. 185) | Various | Significant Caves MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on Significant Caves MA. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 626 | Lakes and Rivers Management Area | DC, S, G | LRMA-DC-01 through 05 (p. 187) LRMA-S-01 through 03 (p. 187) LRMA-G-01 through 06 (p. 187) | Various | Lakes and Rivers MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects on Lakes and Rivers MA. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 627 | Saguaro Wild Burro Management Area | DC, S | SWBMA-DC-01 through 02 (pp. 188–189) SWBMA-S-01 through 02 (p. 189) | Various | Saguaro Wild Burro MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects the Saguaro Wild Burro MA. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 628 | Salt River Horse Management Area | DC, S, G | SRHMA-DC-01 through 03 (p. 190) SRHMA-S-01 through 03 (p. 190) SRHMA-G-01 through 03 (pp. 190–191) | Various | Salt River Horse MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives have no direct effects to the Salt River Horse MA. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 629 | Apache Leap Special Management Area | DC | ALSMA-DC-01 (p. 162) | The Apache Leap Special Management Area persists as a special place with emphasis given to preserving the area's natural character, allowing traditional uses by Indian tribes, and protecting and conserving the cultural and archeological resources of the area. | Apache Leap Special MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not impact Apache Leap Special Management Area. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 630 | Apache Leap Special Management Area | G | ALSMA-G-01 (p. 162) | Management activities should protect the cultural, archaeological, or historical | Apache Leap Special MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| # | Plan Section | Component Type | Component Number and LMP Location | Land Management Plan Text | Scale | Is It Applicable? | Is It Consistent? How? Alt 6 – Preferred | Alternative 5 – Peg Leg | Alternative 4 – Silver King | Alternatives 2 and 3 – Near West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | resources of Apache Leap, which may include permanent or seasonal closures of all or a portion of Apache Leap. | | would not impact Apache Leap Special Management Area. | | | | |
| 631 | Apache Leap Special Management Area | G | ALSMA-G-02 (p. 162) | Access should be provided for recreation opportunities. | Apache Leap Special MA | Not applicable. The action alternatives would not impact access to Apache Leap Special Management Area. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **SUITABILITY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 632 | Timber Suitability | | | Timber Suitability and Projected Harvest Levels is addressed in the LMP section on Forestry and Forest Products (pages 51-54). A map of areas suitable for timber production is contained in Forest Plan FEIS, Appendix B, Figure 8, p. 69. | Forest-Wide | Not applicable. The action alternatives do not overlap with any areas that are suitable for timber production. The action alternatives do not authorize any timber harvest activities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 633 | Suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System | | | Suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System is addressed under Recommended Wilderness (LMP, p. 136). | Recommended Wilderness MA | Not applicable. See response to Recommended Wilderness Management Area above. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

***** Note the following: (1) The column titled '#' is referred to as 'LMP component #' throughout this table. (2) The terms **forest plan** and **LMP** are used interchangeably throughout this table to refer to the 2023 "Tonto National Forest Land Management Plan" (Forest Service 2023). (3) Blocks shaded gray indicate alternatives that are not consistent with specific forest plan components, where project modification or amendment of the forest plan would be needed.

# Key Documents and References Cited for Forest Plan Consistency


M3 Engineering and Technology Corporation. 2019. *Resolution Copper Project: Concentrate Pipeline Corridor Management Plan, Superior, Arizona*. Revision 4. Project No. M3-PN140023.603. Chandler, Arizona: M3 Engineering and Technology Corporation. May 2.

Rausch, R., and M. Rasmussen. 2020. *A Mitigation Effectiveness Evaluation of the Superior, Arizona Recreation Project Conceptual Plan (March 2019): Submitted by the Recreation User Group (RUG), a subcommittee of the Community Working Group (CWG) of Superior, Arizona*. Process memorandum to file. Phoenix, Arizona: SWCA Environmental Consultants and U.S. Forest Service. September.

Resolution Copper. 2019. *Resolution Copper Project Noxious Weed and Invasive Species Management Plan on National Forest System Lands*. Prepared for Tonto National Forest. Superior, Arizona: Resolution Copper. May.

———. 2020a. *Wildlife Management Plan*. Superior, Arizona: Resolution Copper. October.

———. 2020b. *General Plan of Operations: Road Use Plan*. Superior, Arizona: Resolution Copper. August.

Tetra Tech. 2020. *Draft Reclamation Plan: Preferred Alternative*. #114-570991. Prepared for Resolution Copper. Missoula, Montana: Tetra Tech Inc. June.

Tirmenstein, D. 1999. *Quercus turbinella*. In *Fire Effects Information System*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Available at: Quercus turbinella. Accessed September 27, 2018.

U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service). 1985. *Tonto National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.* U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region. October.

———. 2023. *Tonto National Forest Land Management Plan.* Coconino, Gila, Maricopa, Pinal, and Yavapai Counties, Arizona. MB-R3-12-13. U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region. December.