

From May 2007 ROD
Lake Havasu ROD May 2007
PDF pg. 176

Havasu HMA

The area north of Lake Havasu City (west of SR 95 and east of the Colorado River) will be excluded from the Havasu HMA due to increasing population pressures, traffic concerns, and refuge conflicts.

Based on the manageability analysis found in Appendix M, wild burros will not be managed within the Little Harquahala HA boundaries; therefore, the HA will not be designated as an HMA and the BLM does not intend to maintain a burro herd in this areas.

PDF pg. 179

Management Actions

HB-6. Management of burros in the Alamo HMA will consider and assess the fish and wildlife conservation purposes and objectives for the Alamo Wildlife Area and the mandates of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act. The purposes and objectives for the Wildlife Area are outlined in AGFD's Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. AGFD has indicated that they will periodically (approximately every 5 years) review and possibly revise the plan. The BLM will manage the burros in consultation with AGFD and USFWS consistent with the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. Decisions concerning burros within the wildlife area will be consistent with federal laws and regulations, including the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971, as amended 1976 and 1978.

The BLM does not intend to maintain burros that are outside of HMA boundaries but are within the HAs, nor maintain burros that are within HA that have not been designated as an HMA. Burro use will occur within the Alamo Wildlife Area as outlined in the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. Burro use may occur within the Santa Maria and Big Sandy corridors at levels developed cooperatively with AGFD and USFWS.

The BLM and AGFD will work collaboratively to provide wild burros with access to water in Alamo Lake within specific areas of the Alamo Wildlife Area. Such access will be through agreement with AGFD and compatible with the goals and objectives of the wildlife area as outlined in the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan.

The level of burro use that is compatible and acceptable within the Alamo Wildlife Area will be cooperatively determined by AGFD and the BLM and identified in the Alamo Wildlife Area Plan. The BLM, AGFD, and USFWS will work together to establish key monitoring areas within sensitive riparian habitat. AGFD has indicated that they believe burro use will be compatible with the purposes of the wildlife area if annual bark stripping of live trees does not exceed 3% in any of the key areas. Additional upland monitoring sites and associated levels of acceptable use may be established within the Alamo Wildlife Area if resource damage by burros is observed in those areas.

The BLM will target burro removals in sensitive habitat areas and work with AGFD and USFWS to develop other management practices (if needed) such as the construction of fencing and alternative water sources to maintain levels of

acceptable burro use within the wildlife area and to protect sensitive habitats. The BLM will evaluate all monitoring data, population data, and removal data every 5 years to assess whether the current AML continues to be appropriate for all HMAs (Havasu and Alamo). During the evaluation process, monitoring protocols and additional data needs will be analyzed. The evaluation will consider acceptable levels of use within the Alamo Wildlife Area. The evaluation and any adjustments in AML will be conducted in coordination and

consultation with the AGFD and USFWS. The AGFD has stated that they will periodically re-evaluate monitoring and acceptable burro use levels within the Alamo Wildlife Area. Every effort will be made to insure that these evaluations occur as concurrently and collaborative as feasible.

HB-7. Any new fence construction within burro HMAs will not prevent burro access to water, unless the water has been developed for a specific purpose (such as wildlife catchments) that will make it necessary to exclude burros.

HB-8. The guidelines and criteria for adjusting AML will include the use of monitoring data and be coordinated with affected resources and agencies.

HB-9. Safety issues will continue to be handled as emergency/nuisance removals, receiving top priority to correct public safety concerns. Additionally, the BLM will work with ADOT to create accessible safe crossings for wildlife and wild burros.

HB-10. The initial Appropriate Management Levels for wild burros (the number of wild burros to be managed with the HMA) in the Approved RMP are listed below. Acreages within the HMAs appear in Table 9:

Alamo: 160

Havasu-AZ: 166

Havasu-CA/Chemehuevi: 108

HMA	Acreage
Alamo	189,237
Havasu AZ	268,271
Havasu-CA/Chemehuevi	24,318

Monitoring

Monitoring data will continue to be collected on the Havasu and Alamo HMAs to ensure proper use and to provide a tool to evaluate the Appropriate Management Level. The data collected include climate, actual use, utilization, and trend. Population data will continue to be collected in coordination with AGFD every 3 to 5 years through collaborative census techniques. Age and sex data are collected following removals of excess burros. Census flights and burro removals will be reported in the *Annual Planning Update Report and Summary*.

The simultaneous double-count census method has been tested in coordination with the AGFD as a technique for accurately estimating burro populations. As any technique becomes available, the BLM and AGFD will work collaboratively to test its

effectiveness.

Lake Havasu RMP -2006
Excerpts and Highlights

Volume 1
Page. 2-252

Table of AML's and Acreage Proposals

Table 2-41. Initial Appropriate Management Levels for Wild Burros. (This is the number of wild burros to be managed within the HMA.)

HMA	Alt 1 (No Action)	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5 (Proposed Plan)
Alamo	200	160	200	160	160
Havasus-AZ	170	166	170	166	166
Havasus-CA/ Chemehuevi	150 ^a	108 ^a	108 ^a	108 ^a	108

Notes:

The initial AML levels would be adjusted based on the AMLs in the existing plans and the effects of boundary changes on the critical area, which is the basis for the AML.

^a Havasus-CA AML is shared with the Chemehuevi HMA in California.

Table 2-42. Acres within Herd Management Areas

HMA	Alt 1 (No Action)	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5 (Proposed Plan)
Alamo	277,017 ^a	182,576	288,263	189,237	189,237
Havasus-AZ	282,576	268,271	282,576	268,271	268,271
Havasus-CA/ Chemehuevi	25,945 ^b	24,318 ^b	24,318 ^b	24,318 ^b	24,318

Notes:

^a In Alternative 1, acres include the Alamo Wildlife Area.

^b Acres shown for Havasus-CA/Chemehuevi HMA include only the acres for the Havasus side in California.

Table 2-38. Wild Burro Management–Desired Future Conditions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Proposed Plan)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1983 LGNMFP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMFP:</i></p> <p>A viable, color-diverse burro population of 200 animals would be maintained in the Alamo HMA; however, burro numbers in the remaining herd areas (in the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan Area) would be reduced to zero.</p>	<p>Viable, color-diverse burro populations would be maintained within the HMA, while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance with other resources and consistent with other management agencies' objectives (including wildlife, riparian and upland vegetation, recreation, and others).</p>			

Table 2-39. Wild Burro Management–Land Use Allocations

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Proposed Plan)
<p><i>The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:</i></p> <p>Burros would continue to be managed in accordance with the herd plans. Excess animals would be removed as necessary to protect forage resources.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act, non-BLM administered lands including the Alamo Wildlife Area, would be excluded from HMAs. These lands would be excluded from determinations of Appropriate Management Level (AML) for burros within the HMA. Wild burros that use non-BLM lands as part of their habitat remain protected under the Wild Horse and Burro Act; therefore, any removal actions remain the responsibility of BLM.</p> <p>The California side of the Havasu HMA (Havasú-CA HMA) would be managed in accordance with the Northern and Eastern Colorado Desert Coordinated Management Plan, which combines the Havasu-CA HMA with the Chemehuevi HMA. The combined area would be named Chemehuevi HMA and the initial AML would be 108 burros.</p> <p>Based on the manageability analysis found in Appendix L, wild burros would not be managed within the Little Harquahala HA boundaries; therefore, the HA would not be designated as an HMA and BLM does not intend to maintain a burro herd in this areas.</p>			

Table 2-39. Wild Burro Management–Land Use Allocations

The following decision is derived from the 1995 KRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the KRMP: The Alternative 1 decision is not carried forward because it is a restatement of regulations. See the Code of Federal Regulations at 43 CFR 4710.5(b).

Public lands within HMAs would be closed to domestic horses and burros, subject to immediate impoundment.

<p>The HMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-55, and includes public land and those lands within the Alamo Wildlife Area.</p>	<p>Based on threatened and endangered species, riparian, and wildlife issues, the eastern Alamo HMA boundary would follow the western Palmerita Allotment boundary, excluding Alamo Wildlife Area, state, and private land.</p>	<p>The Alamo HMA boundary would be the same as the current HMA boundary from Alternative 1 plus HA lands to US 93, excluding the Alamo Wildlife Area, state, and private land. Management prescriptions for acceptable use levels would mitigate impacts to other resources.</p>	<p>The eastern boundary of the Alamo HMA would run west from the southern boundary of the Alamo Wildlife Area, and then extend south from the state land block within the Palmerita Allotment, excluding the Alamo Wildlife Area, state, and private land. This demarcation would provide protection for threatened and endangered species, riparian, and wildlife issues.</p>
<p>See above.</p>	<p>The area north of Lake Havasu City (west of SR 95 and east of the Colorado River) would be excluded from the Havasu HMA. The growth of Lake Havasu City is impacting the Havasu HMA due to increased traffic concerns and refuge conflicts.</p>	<p>The Havasu HMA boundary would continue to be the same as the HA boundary.</p>	<p>The area north of Lake Havasu City (west of SR 95 and east of the Colorado River) would be excluded from the Havasu HMA due to increasing population pressures, traffic concerns, and refuge conflicts.</p>
<p>Not addressed in previous plans</p>	<p>The initial AML levels would be adjusted based on the AMLs in the existing plans, the effects of boundary changes on the critical area, and existing monitoring data, which is the basis for the AML (see Table 2-41).</p>		

Alternative 1 (No Action)

Alternative 2

Alternative 3

Alternative 4

Alternative 5
(Proposed Plan)

The following decision is derived from the 1987 YRMP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the YRMP:

LHFO would not allow water developments for burros that would expand their present herd areas.

This is not carried forward because BLM is prohibited by law to manage for wild burros outside of Herd Areas.

The following decision is derived from the 1983 LGNMFP and is applicable only to those lands covered by the LGNMFP:

Access to Alamo Lake would be maintained for the wild burro herd in the Alamo HMA. Free access for wild burros would be maintained to livestock-watering facilities in the Alamo HA.

Management of burros in the Alamo HMA would consider and assess the fish and wildlife conservation purposes and objectives for the Alamo Wildlife Area and the mandates of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act. The purposes and objectives for the Wildlife Area are outlined in AZGFD's Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. AZGFD has indicated that they would periodically (approximately every 5 years) review and possibly revise the plan. BLM would manage the burros in consultation with AZGFD and USFWS consistent with the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. Decisions concerning burros within the wildlife area would be consistent with federal laws and regulations, including the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971, as amended 1976 and 1978.

BLM does not intend to maintain burros that are outside of HMA boundaries but are within the HAs, nor maintain burros that are within HA that have not been designated as an HMA. Burro use would occur within the Alamo Wildlife Area as outlined in the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan. Burro use may occur within the Santa Maria and Big Sandy corridors at levels developed cooperatively with AZGFD and USFWS.

BLM and AZGFD would work collaboratively to provide wild burros with access to water in Alamo Lake within specific areas of the Alamo Wildlife Area. Such access would be through agreement with AZGFD and compatible with the goals and objectives of the wildlife area as outlined in the Alamo Wildlife Area Management Plan.

The level of burro use that is compatible and acceptable within the Alamo Wildlife Area would be cooperatively determined by AZGFD and BLM and identified in the Alamo Wildlife Area Plan. BLM, AZGFD, and USFWS would work together to establish key monitoring areas within sensitive riparian habitat. AZGFD has indicated that they believe burro use would be compatible with the purposes of the wildlife area if annual bark stripping of live trees does not exceed 3 percent in any of the key areas. Additional upland monitoring sites and associated levels of acceptable use may be established within the Alamo Wildlife Area if resource damage by burros is observed in those areas. BLM would target burro removals in sensitive habitat areas and work with AZGFD and USFWS to develop other management practices (if needed) such as the construction of fencing and alternative

Table 2-40. Wild Burro Management–Management Actions

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5 (Proposed Plan)
	<p>water sources to maintain levels of acceptable burro use within the wildlife area and to protect sensitive habitats.</p> <p>BLM would evaluate all monitoring data, population data, and removal data every five years to assess whether the current AML continues to be appropriate for all HMAs (Havasu and Alamo). During the evaluation process, monitoring protocols and additional data needs would be analyzed. The evaluation would consider acceptable levels of use within the Alamo Wildlife Area. The evaluation and any adjustments in AML would be conducted in coordination and consultation with the AZGFD and USFWS. The AZGFD has stated that they would periodically re-evaluate monitoring and acceptable burro use levels within the Alamo Wildlife Area. Every effort would be made to insure that these evaluations occur as concurrently and collaborative as feasible.</p>			
Construction of new structures within HMAs that would restrict burro movement would be limited or modified.	<p>Any new fence construction within burro HMAs would not prevent burro access to water, unless the water has been developed for a specific purpose (such as wildlife catchments) that would make it necessary to exclude burros.</p>			
Not addressed in previous plans	<p>The guidelines and criteria for adjusting AML would include the use of monitoring data and be coordinated with affected resources and agencies.</p> <p>The simultaneous double-count technique (a census technique used by BLM Arizona and Arizona Game and Fish to estimate the wild burro population) developed in cooperation with AZGFD would continue to be an acceptable method for estimating burro populations.</p>			
None identified	<p>Burro information would continue to be included on informational kiosks (such as those currently at Swansea).</p>	<p>Burro information would be included on bulletin boards and kiosks within HMAs.</p>		
Not addressed in previous plans	<p>Burros would be removed from all areas where burro crossings cause a hazard to the animals and to the motoring public.</p>	<p>The ADOT would be requested to create accessible underpasses on SR 95 during reconstruction activities for access by wild burros and wildlife to cross under the road.</p>	<p>Safety issues would continue to be handled as emergency/nuisance removals, receiving top priority to correct public safety concerns. These removals would be top priority. BLM would work with the Arizona Department of Transportation to create accessible safe crossings on state and federal highways during reconstruction activities for access by wild burros and wildlife to cross the road safely.</p>	

Volume 2 Pg. 5-58

Sub Concern A:

To reduce auto accidents caused by free-range cattle.

Comment: Something needs to be done [grazing along Salome road between Salome and I-10]. Last year at least 20 dead cows littered the roadside. Serious accidents and injuries occurred from hitting the free ranging cattle. (Letter 13)

Response: *The State of Arizona is an open range state. As new roads are improved through grazing allotments, the public needs to be aware that livestock may be present and should use caution.*