

**Ironwood Forest National Monument**  
**Draft Goals and Objectives on Recreation and Visual Resources**  
**June 23, 2004**  
**Comment Summary**

The following are summarized comments from the public meeting conducted Wednesday, June 23, 2004 at the Pima County Parks and Recreation Center in Tucson, Arizona regarding the draft goals and objectives for recreation and visual resources within the monument. The meeting included a presentation on recreation by Francisco Mendoza of BLM and a presentation on visual resources by Randy Simpson of URS.

The meeting attendance included 16 individuals from the general public and agencies (outside of BLM). Attendees worked in one discussion group and discussed the draft goals and objectives.

**General Items and Comments:**

- Larry Shults (BLM, Planning Team Leader) suggested that the goals and objectives that were not addressed last week (Air Quality and Geology) due to lack of time would be revised and emailed to attendees of that meeting for review and comment, in lieu of the addition of another meeting. [If time permits, these may be reviewed during one of the scheduled upcoming meetings.]
- It was questioned whether goals had to be achievable, or could instead represent something that is continually strived for. For example, it was suggested that a goal of harmony among users of Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM) be considered as either a recreation or an overarching goal. Specific ways to address conflicts could be objectives under such a goal. A different way to state the “harmony” goal was suggested as “promote communication, collaboration, and coordination among users.”
- Safety and other issues for inholders need to be addressed. A second potential overarching goal was suggested: Protect inholder/landowner quality of life. Questions were raised about the legal ramifications of using this wording, and the quality of life considerations of this goal may be in conflict with the proclamation. Alternatively, it was suggested that a goal or objective could include, “consider impacts on/collaborate with inholders.” It was noted that these concepts are specific to how humans are using the monument.

**Recreation Comments:**

**GOAL NUMBER 1:** *Manage recreation for enhanced recreation experiences and quality of life, while protecting resources and, minimizing conflicts with other users, and promoting safety.*

- Define “enhanced” and “quality of life” (for who – people or animals?). Suggest removing these ambiguous terms.

- Since the above-referenced terms seem to mean the quality of the recreation experience, suggested rewriting the goal: Manage for quality recreation experiences while protecting resources, etc.
- It was discussed that “minimizing conflicts” and “safety” items could be objectives. It was also suggested that a goal could state, “Eliminating conflict and promoting mutual respect among users.”
- Consider impacts on quality of life when making decisions. Need to coordinate with inholders, others. Any actions considered would have to take into account impacts to landowners – this is common to all goals.
- Clarify/define “resource” as natural or cultural; concerned that people would think that shooting is a resource to be protected.
- Suggested objective: incorporate road and trail design into mitigation for protection of resources. This may be more appropriate for next week’s conversation on transportation and access.

**Objective:** *Implement a comprehensive visitor services and use supervision program that addresses resource, facility, and visitor management actions required to produce desired experiences and quality of life outcomes for various users and user groups and consistent with the monument Proclamation.*

- Again, “quality of life” is an ambiguous term. Suggest removing it.
- Consider using terms “quality of service” versus “quality of life.”
- It was asked whether “user supervision program” is standard terminology for BLM (it is).

**GOAL NUMBER 2:** *Manage recreation resources to provide a variety of appropriate opportunities, quality experiences, and enjoyment for which there is public demand, consistent with the purposes of the monument.*

- Need to define times (seasons) and areas appropriate for each recreation use or class. (This may be addressed in the objective for this goal.)
- Analyze impacts of recreation on monument resources/objects to determine appropriate levels of use.
- The components of public demand may be outside the guidance set up by the Proclamation.

**Objective:** *Use recreation management zones on an ongoing basis as a tool to inventory, plan, and manage recreation opportunities. The recreation opportunity zones and management objectives established in the RMP to enhance recreation experiences and benefits and reduce conflicts among users consistent with the monument Proclamation will be managed by:*

- *Establishing standards for maintaining the desired future conditions in recreation management zones (activities and settings) within a year.*
  - *Developing a multi-faceted adaptive management process within a year.*
- Add the term “monitor.”

- Look at the range of sensitive resources and develop indicators to determine limits of acceptable change.
- Would like to see wilderness characteristics zones added. It was questioned whether this would constitute the implementation of the objective and would be addressed as an action item/alternative. Also suggested that this would be added as part of the recreation characteristic zones, as something “beyond” primitive. Consider using an objective that uses terms like roadless, wilderness.

### **Visual Resources Comments:**

**GOAL NUMBER 1:** *Preserve the monument’s natural scenic and visual values, and where appropriate rehabilitate disturbed areas with visual impacts.*

- Looked at wording about “disturbed areas” – ultimately it was suggested that wording be changed to, “...rehabilitate disturbed areas that have visual impacts.”
- Need to look at scale of disturbed areas – i.e. distance from viewers – to prioritize or address areas that need rehab. Also noted that the goal states “where appropriate,” and that people may define “appropriate” differently.
- Consider another objective to address areas that are not covered by Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes, such as adjacent areas.
- It was asked how the Park Service manages the immediate contact zone.

**Objective Number 1:** *Manage visual resources in the monument by assigning VRM classes to consider the importance of visual values, present resource conditions, and current and potential future uses and activities.*

- It was noted that VRM would be assigned as part of the planning process, but that BLM may revise this to a long-term objective for reevaluating VRM over time.
- It also was noted that there could be subjectivity in determining VRM classes.

**Objective Number 2:** *Maintain or enhance opportunities to view those landscapes of the monument that may be values for scenic, cultural, biological, recreation, or other reasons. Preserve the visual quality of those landscapes visible from important viewing areas, which may include:*

- *Specific road corridors*
  - *Recreational sites and areas (perhaps as characterized by BLM’s Recreation Opportunity Spectrum [ROS]), including trails*
  - *Cultural and historic areas*
  - *Residences in or near the monument*
  - *Other sites/values with identified place-based values*
- Add primitive areas/wilderness characteristic zones. It was noted that the top candidate for such an area may be Ragged Top, and you can see everything from the peak – may not be feasible to address visual comprehensively in that case.
  - Large areas of VRM need to be subdivided into classes, to look at the whole monument versus different scales.

- It was noted that Silver Bell mine will continue to expand, and that you can see the dump/spoils from Ragged Top. It's important that people don't get the idea that the mine would stop expanding and recognize that it will continue to be a visible feature in the area.
- Whatever the VRM class, it will abut adjacent land uses such as the mine – user expectations of what should or should not be there can be handled through education.

### **Discussion of Wilderness Characteristics**

How to address wilderness values was raised in the discussion for both recreation and visual:

- It was noted that there is a relationship between wilderness and both recreation and visual resources, but that wilderness values suggest additional qualities. Solitude and primitive recreation are both addressed through BLM's ROS; it was noted that the VRM classes do not evaluate "naturalness."
- Need to inventory wilderness characteristics and protect wilderness quality areas.
- Suggested that a goal or objective be developed (to manage for wilderness value in appropriate areas), and may be separated out from recreation or visual later. It was mentioned that any goal must be consistent with changing/emerging policy – perhaps that language could be included in the goal.
- It was noted that Arizona Game and Fish Department wildlife management activities occur on IFNM that people may not think of as "wilderness management," but these activities will/should continue.