RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

FOR

GILA CLIFF DWELLINGS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Prepared By: Theresa J. Nichols 12/7/87
Park Ranger
Wilderness Ranger District
Date

Recommended By: Janet F. Hurley 12/14/87
District Ranger
Wilderness Ranger District
Date

Recommended by: FOR R Z Henderson 12/22/87
Forest Supervisor
Gila National Forest
Date

Approved By: Jo Ellen Cook 12/30/87
Regional Director
Southwest Region
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Overview and Needs-Cultural Resources

Overview and Needs-Natural Resources

Project Statements-Cultural
Five-Year Programming Sheet-Cultural

Project Statements-Natural
Five-Year Programming Sheet-Natural

Information Base Checksheet

INTRODUCTION

Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument is administered by the USDA, Forest Service under a cooperative agreement with the USDI, National Park Service. The Forest Service is required to operate the monument according to N.P.S. Standards and regulations. Much of the data used to make resource management decisions is based on material accumulated for the adjacent Gila Wilderness. Vegetative maps, aerial photographs, wildlife maps, hydrological surveys, etc. have been developed specifically for the Gila National Forest. Resource information for Gila Cliff Dwellings has been extracted from this information.

The monument does not have a current General Management Plan--The Master Plan dates to 1964. Many of the priorities assigned to project statements reflect the need to have them completed for GMP activities expected to occur in the coming years.

In general there is a lack of basic inventory data. Other projects, especially in natural resources, reflect the need to inventory resources within the monument.

Finally there are projects which identify safety problems and immediate threats to the resources in the monument and their mitigation. We believe these projects to be highest priority for funding.

OVERVIEW AND NEEDS CULTURAL RESOURCES

GILA CLIFF DWELLINGS NATIONAL MONUMENT

1. TJ Ruin Fencing GICL-C16

First priority is a project to survey and fence the detached unit, TJ Ruin. This area has suffered numerous animal trespasses from the neighboring lands. Also, not knowing location of legislated boundaries has hindered management of the area for its cultural resources. The area borders the U.S.F.S. heliport which becomes quite active during fire season. In addition, hunting occurs in the general area.

Needs and Proposed Program

A complete survey of legislated boundaries and fence are needed. The Monument will seek funding to support this project.

	FY-88
Survey & Fence	$7,000

2. Study of Structural Stability of Cave Underlying Room 25 GICL-C15

A second priority is a study to determine the structural stability of the small cave beneath Room 25, a portion of the dwellings. Increasing numbers of visitors pass over the area, with unknown effects on the stability of the cave and the dwelling. A recent safety inspection suggested closing the Room 25 portion of the trail.

Needs and Proposed Program

A study to investigate the load capacity of the area before major structural damage occurs or before visitor safety is threatened is needed. The Monument will seek funding to support such a project.

	FY-89
Study	$5,000

3. Carrying Capacity Study GICL-C-17

Third priority is a study to determine the carrying capacity of the cliff dwellings. Increasing numbers of visitors affect the dwellings through traffic vibrations, touching, leaning, and climbing. At times up to 800 people a day view the dwellings. The carrying capacity of the area is unknown. This information is needed for GMP development.

Needs and Proposed Program

A carrying capacity study is needed to determine the numbers of visitors per hour and day the dwellings can withstand without suffering from unacceptable deterioration.

The Monument will seek funding for such a study.

	FY-89
Study	$25,000

4. Historic Preservation Guide GICL-C-18

Fourth priority is development of a Historic Preservation Guide. The 33 known archeological sites are without benefit of regular ruins maintenance and inspections.

Needs and Proposed Program

A Historic Preservation Guide is needed. Personnel at the monument need to be trained in its application.

The Monument will seek funding for this project.

	FY-90
Historic Preservation Guide	$15,000

5. Archeological Survey GICL-C-1

Fifth priority is an archeological survey of the monument. A survey completed in 1968 was not done to current standards. Recording of the sites was inadequate, and some sites may have been missed. GMP development will rely upon data from this survey.

Needs and Proposed Program

A full archeological survey and base map of the monument is needed.

The Monument will seek funding for this project.

	FY-90
Survey and Base Map	$27,000

OVERVIEW AND NEEDS-NATURAL RESOURCES

GILA CLIFF DWELLINGS NATIONAL MONUMENT

1. Boundary Survey and Fencing GICL-N-3

First priority is a project to survey boundaries of the major portion of the monument and fence critical areas. Monument corners have never been established, thus leaving the location of the boundaries in question. Since the area is surrounded by U.S. Forest Service lands, hunting, grazing, camping, and hiking occur all around the boundaries. These activities encroach upon the monument, resulting in degradation to the natural and cultural resources.

Needs and Proposed Program

A survey of the corners and determination of and fencing of critical areas are needed. The Monument will seek funding to survey and fence critical areas.

	FY-89	FY-90
Survey	$6,000	
Fence		$30,000

2. Erosion Control on Loop Trail GICL-N2

Second priority is a project to help curtail erosion damage to vegetation near the loop trail through the monument. Off trail activity and trail construction on steep slopes have contributed to vegetation erosion. In addition, the stream has undercut bridge supports in the trail, and the trail bridges are threatened. Gabions which were installed on slopes are visually obtrusive.

Needs and Proposed Program

Eroded slopes and trail borders need to be stabilized with a combination of seeding, transplanting vegetation, and use of Curlex blankets. Supports for bridges should be protected by constructing small rock barriers downstream so that sediments will fill in behind.

The Monument will seek funding to buy materials and to support manpower for the project.

	FY-89	FY-90
Supplies & Manpower	$1,500	$1,500

3. Fire Management Plan GICL-N-5

Third priority is a project to develop a fire management plan which supports the specific needs of the monument and policies and standards of the NPS. Protection of archeological sites during suppression activities and long range resource management activities reflecting the role of fire are major concerns.

Needs and Proposed Program

A fire management plan is needed. This would be developed by personnel on the Wilderness District who have experience with fire management and who have knowledge of NPS policies and standards.

	FY-89
Manpower Expenses	$3,000

4. Soils Survey and Vegetation Survey & Base Maps GICL-N-7

Fourth and fifth priorities include a soils survey and base map, and a vegetation survey and base map. We have little information specific to the monument on both soils and vegetation. Although the monument was not established primarily for its natural resources, nonetheless we are obligated to manage them. We cannot manage them unless we have baseline data. Other surveys for animals and geologic features would rely on soils and vegetation information.

Needs and Proposed Program

A soils survey and base map, and vegetation survey and base map are needed for both units of the monument. Special attention is needed for rare, threatened, endangered, and exotic species. An updated plant list and slide file are also needed.

The Monument will seek funding to complete both projects.

	FY-89	FY-90
Soils Survey and Base Map	$3,000	
Vegetation Survey and Base Map	$3,500	$3,500

Note:

An integrated pest management project statement is not included in the plan because there are so few vegetation and pest problems in the monument. We do not anticipate needing this project.

GICL - C1

1.1 GICL Archeological Survey

1.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Archeologist Don Morris conducted a survey of the Monument and the surrounding area in 1968. Although he recorded 33 sites within Monument boundaries, he states that some may have been missed. Morris plotted the sites on paired aerial photographs, or upon sheets of USGS quadrangles. Some photos were taken. He did not complete standardized site forms. He also did not mark sites with metal stakes. Even though Morris undertook a full survey of the monument, the methods he used were inadequate in many ways. The current archeological base map using USGS topographic quadrangles is minimally adequate. Sites cannot be located accurately using it.

NPS archeologists Bradford and McKenna mapped and recorded the detached unit, TJ Ruin, in 1986. Although a draft report and map of the site were produced from this project, the detached TJ unit still requires a systematic archeological survey to ensure full coverage and comparability with a survey of the main unit.

Current Management Action

Management is doing nothing to rectify the inadequacies of this survey. It is basing its decisions on minimally adequate information.

1.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Management will continue to make decisions on incomplete and inadequate survey data. Executive Order 11593 will not be fully met.

2. Re-Survey the Monument and Produce an Archeological Base Map Standardized site forms and photo documentation would be completed. An archeological base map, using either a photogrammetric or orthocontour map, would be produced using data from both surveys. Management will have adequate data upon which to base decisions. Executive Order 11593 will be met.

1.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management must have through knowledge of the resources present in order to make its decisions. GMP planning will rely heavily on data obtained from this survey.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 E (1).

GICL -C4

4.1 GICL - C4 Historic Structure Report

4.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

During five different times, various people have stabilized and altered walls in 42 rooms of the Gila Cliff Dwellings. The history of stabilization on outlying structures within the monument is obscure. The methods and materials used by the original builders and the people who have stabilized the ruins recently have not been well documented. An historic structure report (HSR) would clarify the details of past stabilization work, evaluate other archeological and architectural findings on the various structures, and recommend treatment for each structure.

The recent publication of The Archeology of Gila Cliff Dwellings. (Anderson et al. 1986), helped to provide some of the information which would be included in this report, but it does not fulfill all the requirements of an HSR as described in NPS-28.

Current Management Action

Management depends on The Archeology of Gila Cliff Dwellings and other stabilization reports for information of specific structures. A comprehensive evaluation of the archeology of the structures and recommendations for treatment are not available.

4.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Future stabilization work on the structures in the major Cliff Dwellings and the outlying units will be based on inadequate back ground knowledge. The interpretive program will lack information.

2. Write An Historic Structure Report The report would fulfill the requirements of such reports outlined in NPS 28. Structures addressed would include not only the 42 room Cliff Dwellings, but also outlying structures within the Monument. Future stabilization work would have a sound basis. The interpretive program would also benefit by the expanded information.

4.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. The various data regarding the structures within the Monument need to be gathered and evaluated. Treatments of structures need to be determined. Future stabilization work will have a sound basis of research.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

6.1 GICL--Archeological Overview/Assessment

6.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Archeologist Keith Anderson and others wrote The Archeology of Gila Cliff Dwellings in 1986. It summarizes previous stabilization work, the 1968 archeological survey of the area, previous excavations, and analyzes the collection. Though this document compiles much information regarding the archeology of the Dwellings, it lacks certain information which would help in making well-informed management decisions and in improving our interpretive program. An Archeological Overview and Assessment would complete the information that this publication does not cover. GMP development, which is expected to occur in the next couple years, would depend greatly on information contained in such a document.

Current Management Action

Management uses the information contained in the above reference. No efforts are being made to complete the information not addressed in it.

6.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management decisions and the interpretive program will continue to be based on inadequate and incomplete information. The GMP will not benefit from such a reference.

2. Prepare an Archeological Assessment. Compile information which would meet standards for a full archeological assessment as defined in NPS-28. Management decisions would be based on current knowledge of the resource. The interpretive program would benefit greatly by having more complete information. GMP development would also benefit.

The Archeology of Gila Cliff Dwellings should be evaluated for its adequacy in fulfilling parts of this document. Chapters can be reviewed and/or expanded as necessary. Particular attention would be given to placing the Monument's resources within a regional context, in addition to recommending future archeological research needed.

6.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is the recommended action. The need for adequate and complete information of the resource for management decisions and interpretive programs is well-recognized.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

7.1 CICL Remote Sensing

7.2 Statement of Issue Or Concern

Aerial photos of the Monument were taken in the summer of 1987. However, no ground controls were used in the process, preventing the production of photogrammetric maps directly from them. Photogrammetric maps are possible only if ground controls were put in later and "bridging" used. Photogrammetric maps will be useful in planning maintenance work and monitoring erosion.

Current Management Action

Management relies on aerial photographs on which to base its decisions. It is without the benefit of accurate photogrammetric maps.

7.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Management will continue to rely on aerial photos. Information necessary for interpretation and the accuracy which could be provided by photogrammetric maps will not be available.

2. Produce Photogrammetric Maps Based on Available Aerial Photos Using Post Facto Ground Control and Bridging. Management will make decisions based on more accurate maps and additional information. The interpretive program will be more complete.

7.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Photogrammetric maps will give more accurate and thorough information on the area.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

9.1 GICL Ecological and Paleoenvironmental Studies Related to Cultural Resources

9.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

There is a long record of prehistoric human occupation in the Monument, from several thousand years B.C. to historical times. Yet we know little about the environments in which they lived. Knowledge of conditions and changes in past environments is important to evaluating, understanding, and interpreting the various cultural occupations.

Current Management Action

Management has not pursued studying the paleoenvironment. Information necessary to complete the interpretive program and evaluate cultural resources is missing.

9.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Information necessary for interpretation and management decisions will not exist.

2. Conduct Research Studies designed to determine the past environments relating to cultural occupations would be conducted. Pack rat midden analysis, pollen samples for paleobotanical evidence, geomorphology studies, and dendrochronological dating for paleoenvironmental reconstruction would be included. Information can be used for the interpretive program and management decisions.

9.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Information that would be gained from the various studies would greatly improve the interpretive program and also help management make more informed decisions.

This projects includes actions requiring further review to assure that satisfaction with NEPA and related compliance requirements are completed prior to requesting funding or implementation.

~~GICL - C11~~

11.1 GICL - C11 Document External Collections

11.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

All but about 400 items in the Monument's known collection are stored and curated at The Western Archeological and Conservation Center in Tucson. The remaining items are on display in the Gila Visitor Center or in storage at Monument headquarters.

There are reports of artifacts having been removed from the Monument by individuals who then kept them, gave them to other institutions, or sold them to other individuals. Some of those people who allegedly dealt with monument artifacts still live in the Silver City area. These items are a part of the Monument's resource and could yield valuable information.

Current Management Action

Management takes note of stories told by visitors of artifact removal, but does not follow up to try to locate these items or the people who were allegedly involved. Further information which might be available is never retrieved. Management has taken no action to attempt to locate artifacts alleged to exist in other museums.

11.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action information which could be gained from artifacts once removed from the area will never be obtained.

2. Obtain Information on Removed Artifacts Management would attempt to locate artifacts that have been removed. This may involve interviewing local people and various institutions. If artifacts themselves cannot be retrieved, then information regarding their removal and descriptions of the items would be solicited. Items available would be obtained through gifts or loans.

11.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Although this action would involve some intense investigation, the results in terms of information obtained would be worth the effort. The information and items would be used in the interpretive program and exhibit planning.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

GTCL - C13

13.1 GTCL - C13 - Limited Testing and Surface Collection

13.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The known sites within the monument cover a wide range in time periods and cultural affiliations. Management's very general understanding of these sites is based on the survey completed by Don Morris in 1968. Neither Morris nor other archeologists have done sub-surface testing of these sites, but some surface collections have been made. Provenience on these items is poor. Pothunting has since occurred at many of the sites, destroying stratigraphy and information that could be gained.

Current Management Action

Management has not planned for future testing. No surface artifacts are being collected from the sites. Information which could be gained from this type of study is non-existent.

13.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impact

1. No Action Information necessary to a fuller understanding of the sites will not be explored. Pothunting will continue, which will further destroy information. The interpretive program will be incomplete.

2. Conduct Testing and Collection Work would be conducted after full archeological survey was completed. Surface collection of sample units from selected archeological sites within the monument would promote a better understanding on the time range of the sites, regional interaction of site inhabitants, trade or exchange in lithic or ceramic materials within the region, and cultural affiliation of the local inhabitants. Limited testing would allow archeologists to confirm the above by providing a sample of cultural materials from undisturbed contexts. Surface artifacts already in the collection would be analyzed to support the above goals. The interpretive program would benefit from increased knowledge. The negative effects of possible future pothunting would be lessened.

13.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management would benefit by the greater understanding of the various sites gained by surface collection and limited testing. This work would be planned only after a full archeological survey was completed.

This project includes actions requiring further review to assure that satisfaction with NEPA and related compliance requirements are completed prior to requesting funding or implementation.

GICL--C-15

15.1 GICL--TJ Ruin Fencing

15.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The TJ Ruin site is one of the few remaining large Mogollon sites which has not been significantly damaged by vandalism or excavation. Presently there is a fence on one side of the site which prevents US Forest Service stock animals from grazing on it. The other sides are not fenced, which allows the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish stock (this agency's land borders the TJ Ruins) to graze the area. The area has a history of grazing prior to its addition to the Monument in 1962, in addition to experiencing grazing trespasses in recent years. Bradford and McKenna's 1986 draft report on the TJ Ruin notes that the "site's use as a pasture seems to be greatly responsible for a general reduction in surface sherd size." Continued grazing trespasses will cause further damage to surface cultural materials, encourage erosion on exposed masonry, and trample vegetation. In addition, Monument boundaries are not clearly defined because of lack of fencing.

Current Management Action

Management takes note of animal trespasses when they are discovered. Occasionally the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Officer is contacted to encourage his help in controlling the stock.

15.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. With no additional fencing, animal trespass will continue to be a problem, causing damage to surface cultural resources. Lack of clearly defined boundaries will hamper management of the area.

2. Survey and Fence the TJ Ruin Unit. Survey the area for legislated boundaries and fence the entire area. This will insure prevention of animal trespass and further damage to surface features and artifacts. An identifiable boundary will aid in future management decisions and resource planning.

15.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. A survey of the boundary and complete fencing is necessary to protect the unit.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 A(2), C(20).

16.1 GICL-Study of Structural Stability of Cave Underlying Room 25

16.2 Statement of Issue or Concern:

Increasing numbers of visitors are visiting the cliff dwellings every year. Both large groups and individual visitors use the trail which passes over an area near room 25 which is undercut by a smaller cave. A study of the structural stability of this area has never been done. A recent safety inspection suggested closing a portion of the trail which passes over the area.

Current Management Action

Management has considered and rejected the idea of closing a significant portion of the trail which passes over the area. A limit of 25 individuals per visiting organized group at one time in the caves is enforced.

16.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts:

1. No Action. The area will continue to be impacted by visitors with the effects on the stability and safety of the trail unknown. The integrity of the cave above the undercut may be adversely affected by continued visitor traffic in the area.

2. Close the Trail in the Area. Although reducing the weight on the area, this would deny the visitors a chance to view unique and significant portions of the ruins. This part of the trail comprises nearly a third of the self-guided tour through the ruins. The decision would be based on insufficient data to support such an extreme action.

3. Conduct a Study to Investigate the Structural Characteristics of the Area. A controlled scientific study designed by a qualified structural engineer and/or geologist should determine the load capacity of the area before major structural damage occurs or visitor safety is threatened.

16.4 Recommended Course of Action:

Alternative 3, providing for a controlled study of the area, is recommended. Once the study and recommendations are completed, management can make a decision based on research as to whether to close the trail, provide reinforcement to the area, limit numbers of visitors, or continue current management policy.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

GICL--C-17

17.1 GICL--Carrying Capacity Study

17.2 Statement of Issue or Concern:

Every year increasing numbers of people visit the Dwellings. Both large and small groups visit at one time, sometimes resulting in crowding of limited spaces. Up to 800 visitors have come on a Holiday weekend day. Visitor traffic affects the walls through vibration, climbing, touching, and leaning. All these actions hasten the weakening and collapse of these fragile structures.

Current Management Action

A limit of 25 individuals per visiting organized group at one time in the caves is enforced. Ranger patrols in the caves help deter leaning and climbing on the walls.

17.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts:

1. No Action. Management will continue to enforce the arbitrary number of 25 visitors per organized group in the caves at one time. This restriction, however, does not extend to the majority of visitors, as most are not in organized groups. The actual effects to the ruin walls by large numbers of visitors will remain unknown. Without knowing the effects of visitor traffic on the walls, we will not be able to mitigate those possible effects.

2. Restrict Numbers of Visitors to Caves. Management would set an arbitrary limit on the numbers of visitors which could be in the caves at any one time. This would probably reduce the severity of vibrations to the walls from traffic, and reduce overcrowding which would probably lessen the chances of leaning and climbing on walls. Rangers could watch the area better with fewer numbers of visitors at a time. However, this decision would involve an arbitrary limit instead of being supported by scientific data. The public may object to such a policy and not be willing to support it. Solid data on how visitor traffic affects the area would be lacking.

3. Conduct a Carrying Capacity Study. A controlled scientific study would determine the carrying capacity of the cave area in terms of numbers of visitors per day and hour it could withstand without the walls suffering unacceptable deterioration. Management then will set a limit, if necessary, on numbers of visitors allowed daily based on the study. The public would more likely support this decision and comply.

17.4 Recommended Course of Action:

Alternative 3 is recommended. Management will have sound scientific data upon which to base its decisions for restricting visitor traffic.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 D(1).

GICL--C--18

18.1 GICL--Historic Preservation Guide

18.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

There are 33 known archeological sites in the Monument which include cliff shelters, rock art, pithouses, checkdams, and surface masonry. Archeologist Larry Nordby in his stabilization inspection of 1979 provided several suggestions for ruins maintenance and inspections for the Cliff Dwellings only. Other than this, no written guide exists which programs maintenance, nor is the Monument staff trained in this area. The last NPS stabilization work was done in March of 1987 as a result of the Exhibit Specialist visiting on his own time and taking a personal interest in the Dwellings' maintenance.

Current Management Action

Monument staff do visual inspections of the Cliff Dwellings, and on a more infrequent basis, the TJ Ruins. They are not trained in how to look for preservation and maintenance needs.

18.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Monument staff will provide untrained, visual inspection to the Cliff Dwellings site only. Maintenance, stabilization, and housekeeping needs may be overlooked. Other sites will be neglected.

2. Prepare Historic Structure Preservation Guide. Guides would describe inspections, routine and cyclic maintenance, treatments, materials, and schedules for all the known sites within the Monument. In addition, Monument staff would be trained to observe for problem areas. Adequate preservation of the sites would be assured, and timely stabilization work would more likely be accomplished.

18.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended because of the need to increase our vigilance in preserving the sites.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(2).

19.1 GICL--Administrative History

19.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument has had a varied history since its establishment in 1907. Several legislative actions have added or retracted acreage. The U.S. Forest Service became involved in administering the area in 1965. Since 1975 this agency has had full responsibility in administering the area, an agreement which is unique in the National Park System.

During its existence, a detailed history of the establishment, development, and administration of the area has not been researched and compiled. Some of the people who were central to the Monument's history are still living in the Silver City area, but are getting on in years. The information they possess may soon be permanently lost.

An administrative history is necessary for preparation of the GMP, which should be underway within the next couple of years.

Current Management Action

Management is taking no action to compile an administrative history of the monument.

19.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. An important aspect of the Monument will remain obscure. Inadequate information will be available for GMP development.

2. Compile an Administrative History. The history would include research on the politics and personalities behind the legislative history of the Monument, the personalities and policies involved in its administration, and an analysis of the development of its joint administration and the cooperative agreement between the U.S. Forest Service and NPS. The history will aid in GMP development, the interpretive program, and in other management decisions.

19.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Given the unique cooperative agency administration and GMP development in the near future, an administrative history is highly desirable for the area.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

20.1 GICL-C-20 Ethnographic Assessment

20.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The Apache are historically known to have usedthe area around the Monument. There is a possible Apache burial site within its boundaries. Other sites linked specifically with the Apache may also exist. It is not known whether there is a current relationship between this ethnic group and the monument. Other ethnic groups, such as the Zuni, may also claim a connection to the area. An ethnographic assessment would evaluate and formally clarify the current connection between these groups and the Monument.

Current Management Action

There is currently no formal statement of ethnographic concerns within the Monument. As this issue is not well-defined, problems may occur if these groups are not taken into account in future planning efforts, or if they claim access to the resources.

20.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. The issue will remain obscure. Future planning will not take these groups into account. Confusion may result should they claim future access to resources.

2. Write an Ethnographic Assessment. This document would identify possible sites within and near the Monument to establish broad patterns of Apache use of the area. It would define the current relationship between the Apache and other ethnic groups and the Monument.

20.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. In anticipation of GMP activities in the near future and lack of clearly defined policy in this area, it is importatnt to develop this document.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

21.1 GICL--Historic Resource Study

21.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Gila Cliff Dwellings is situated in the vast Gila Wilderness--an area with a rich and varied human history. Early miners, trappers, military men, explorers, settlers, and Apaches have a connection with the area. Some research has been done on its history, but information is scattered and incomplete. Historic events and cultural properties within and outside the Monument lack documentation. People who have knowledge of the early history still live in the area, but most are getting on in years and their information will soon be lost.

Current Management Action

Management relies on scattered information regarding historical events and structures in the area. Nothing is being done to expand this information.

21.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management will continue to rely on scattered and incomplete information for planning and resource decisions. The interpretive program will be incomplete.

2. Conduct a Historic Resource Study and compile an Historical Resource Base Map. The study would identify historic events and prominent personalities associated with the Monument and the region. Historic sites and structures would be identified and placed on an historical resource base map. Sites of ethnographic significance would also be identified. Information would be used in GMP development, management decisions, and in the interpretive program.

21.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. The rich historical setting of Gila Cliff Dwellings should be researched and a base map of the area prepared.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

RESOURCES PROGRAMMING SHEET

GICL / PARK / AREA — SW / REGION — NM / ST — ____ NATURAL — X CULTURAL — NOVEMBER 1987 / DATE — PAGE 1 OF 1

PRI ORITY	RMP REF NO.	PKG NO.	T	PROJECT TITLE	A	FY 87 NPS MY	FY 87 COST / 1000	FY 88 NPS MY	FY 88 COST / 1000	FY 89 NPS MY	FY 89 COST / 1000	FY 90 NPS MY	FY 90 COST / 1000	FY 91 NPS MY	FY 91 COST / 1000	REMARKS
1	C-15			T.J. Ruin Fencing				7								Funded FY '88
2	C-16			Study of Cultural Stability of Cave Underlying Room 25						5						
3	C-17			Carrying Capacity Study						25						
4	C-18			Historic Preservation Guide						15						
5	C-1			Archeological Survey								27				
6	C-19			Administrative History						15		15				
7	C-20			Ethnographic Assessment								7				
8	C-6			Archeological Overview/ Assessment								7				
9	C-4			Historic Structure Report								30				
10	C-7			Remote Sensing								8				
11	C-21			Historic Resource Study										30		
12	C-13			Limited Testing and Surface Collection						30		30		30		
13	C-11			Document External Collections										15		
14	C-9			Ecological and Paleo-environmental Studies										10		

2.1 Erosion Control on Loop Trail

2.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Past work on trail re-routing and construction have left areas near the trail which are subject to erosion. Gabions using 4 inch wire mesh, which is currently rusting, were placed in certain areas to prevent erosion of slopes and to support the trail. The gabions are visually obtrusive and are likely to present problems in the future when the retaining wire rusts through and the rocks are not held back. Other sloping areas are devoid of vegetation, and water run-off from snow melt or thunderstorms takes more soil away. Visitors also have created paths free of vegetation by leaving the main trail.

Some of the concrete supports for the footbridges which were built in 1985 and 1986 are being undercut by water action. Given time and more water action, the bridge supports may become completely undercut.

Current Management Action

Gabions were installed to prevent flooding and erosion at the mouth of Cliff Dwellers Canyon. Brush and rock barriers are placed as needed in paths created by visitors going off trails to allow vegetation to re-establish. The Dwellings staff placed Curlex blankets in one portion of an eroding slope and planted it with winter rye. However, it was improperly installed in places, and incorrect vegetation was planted. Some erosion still occurs at this place.

Other points on the trail which present erosion problems are not being treated.

The staff built a short rock barrier downstream of one bridge whose support was being undercut by water. During the next flash flood, sediments filled in behind, thus reducing the threat to the bridge support.

2.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Slopes near the trail will continue to erode and thus threaten the condition and safety of the trail. Continuing to place brush over unauthorized trails will help prevent further trampling, but re-vegetation is a slow and often unsuccessful project. The visual intrusion and future safety concern of the wire and rock gabions will not be resolved. Bridge supports may eventually be undercut by water.

2. Develop and Implement Methods to Revegetate Problem Areas and Prevent Future Erosion. Management would determine the best vegetation and methods to control erosion on off-trail paths and slopes. Those methods would then be implemented. Curlex blankets with appropriate vegetation could be used in some of these problem areas. A determination would be made of whether to replace, remove, repair, or cover the rusting gabions and then revegetate over them. The method of building a small rock dam downstream from threatened foot bridges would be used to prevent undercutting of water.

These actions would prevent further erosion, thereby reducing

potential loss of the trail and resources, and preventing safety hazards.

2.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Alternative 1 does not address nor solve all the erosion problems. Taking preventative action to reduce erosion is the only acceptable solution.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 C (12), C (17, E(4), E(8), C(18), C(19).

GICL - N3

3.1 GICL - N3 Monument Boundry Survey and Fencing

3.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Exact Monument boundaries and corners have never been established. The Monument remains unfenced. There is a fence which designates the north boundary of the Monument along the West Fork Trail. However, the fence is inaccurately placed. Backcountry users camp near cultural resources within the monument, perhaps thinking they are outside monument boundaries. Campers leave fire rings, and they and their stock trample cultural resources and vegetation. Grazing of stock from outfitters occur all around the monument. Hunting occurs all around and probably inside the Monument.

Current Management Action

Management has posted signs at the West Fork Trailhead and fenceline near the north boundary prohibiting camping within the monument boundaries. It also attempts to confine grazing to areas outside the monument only. A separate project statement identifies survey and fencing needs for the detached TJ unit.

3.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Grazing and hunting within the monument will continue and may increase, causing damage to cultural materials and vegetation. Camping also will probably continue, also affecting cultural resources and vegetation. Conflicts may arise with grazing policies of the U.S. Forest Service which are in effect outside monument boundaries.

2. Survey Monument Boundaries and Fence Critical Portions Corners and boundaries would be established. Critical areas needed to be fenced for resource protection would be determined and fenced. Old fencing would be removed.

3.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Establishing boundaries will enable better management of cultural and natural resources. Fencing will help prevent damage from livestock, backcountry users, and hunters.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 A (2), C(20).

5.1 GICL Fire Management Plan

5.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Although there is a Fire Prevention Plan and Fire Management Plan for the Wilderness Ranger District (which includes the Monument), it does not address the specific needs of the Monument itself. Cultural resources and NPS policies and standards are not adequately treated. There are no long-range resource management strategies which reflect the role of fire.

Current Management Action

Management uses the fire plans developed for The Wilderness District of The Gila National Forest. These plans do not reflect the philosophy, standards, and policies of fire management plans developed for NPS areas. Specifically, attention to cultural resources during suppression efforts is not addressed. Long range resource management within the monument does not consider fire management.

5.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Damage to archeological sites might occur should fire suppression be necessary within the Monument. Long-range vegetative management will not take fire management into account.

2. Write Fire Management Plan This would identify the use of fire management in long-range resource management objectives. The role of the fire organization on the Wilderness District would be clearly defined. Attention to cultural resources during suppression activities would be addressed.

5.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Defined policies as described in this alternative will help set long range goals, minimize confusion, and avoid possible damage to archeological resources should fire occur within the Monument.

This project includes actions requiring further review to assure that satisfaction with NEPA and related compliance requirements are completed prior to requesting funding or implementation.

6.1 GICL Soils Survey and Base Map

6.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The Monument has no baseline data on soils specific to the monument. General soils maps are available for the entire Gila National Forest, but are not detailed enough to provide meaningful information for the monument. A soils survey would provide information necessary to understanding the prehistoric agriculture of the area and also help define prehistoric agricultural and underground features. Soils information would help identify possible areas for sensitive plant communities, thereby contributing towards their management.

Current Management Action Management is without benefit of soils data and is doing nothing to collect it. Information which could contribute towards increasing the archeological information and managing vegetation will remain absent.

6.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action The status quo will be maintained. Information which could help understand the archeology of the area and manage sensitive vegetation will remain unavailable.

2. Conduct Soils Survey and Compile Base Map The survey would concentrate on areas with known archeological sites and areas identified by archeologists as likely places for prehistoric agriculture . Special emphasis would also be given to identifying soils which could support sensitive plant communities that might need special management attention. A base map would provide the information in a more useable form for managers and researchers.

6.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. A soils survey and base map would add to our knowledge of prehistoric agriculture and the location of archeological sites. It would also help in managing sensitive plant communities.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

7.1 Vegetation Survey and Base Map

7.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

The monument has little baseline data on vegetation within the monument. A plant list and herbarium exist. However, the plant list is for the entire Gila River-Lake Roberts area, and the herbarium needs updating. A study of the vegetation of the monument was initiated in 1978 by Sherman Lambert, a teaching assistant under William H. Reid, PhD., Department of Biological Sciences, University of Texas at El Paso. This study is incomplete and no base map was prepared. It is unknown whether there are rare, threatened, or endangered species within the monument. Vegetation data would also supplement our understanding of the environment of the prehistoric inhabitants.

Current Management Action

Management bases its decisions on inadequate data regarding vegetation. Past actions such as trail re-routing and footbridge construction did not have vegetation data to consider. Possible rare, threatened, and endangered species are not getting proper attention as mandated by law. Information which could be useful in understanding the prehistoric environment is missing.

7.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management will continue to rely on unavailable data. Rare, endangered, and threatened species will remain unidentified. Information relating to the archeology of the area will be lacking.

2. Conduct Vegetation Survey and Compile Base Map. Plant communities would be identified with special emphasis on exotic, rare, threatened, and endangered species. Special attention would be given to known archeological sites, such as TJ ruins, in order to delineate possible underground or agricultural features. A vegetative base map would be prepared showing plants to the community level. The herbarium would be updated, a complete plant slide file prepared, and a plant list completed. The last three items are invaluable for aiding staff with identification.

7.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management needs a vegetation data base not only to help manage these resources properly, but also to supplement the archeological record and interpretive story.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

8.1 GICL Geological Feature survey and Base Map

8.2 Statement of Issue of Concern

The Gila Conglomererate is the predominant formation within the Monument. The alcoves that formed naturally in this formation are what many of the prehistoric Mogollon and Archaic peoples used for their shelter. The Monument does not have baseline data regarding various geologic features. The process by which the alcoves formed is not clearly understood.

Current Management Action

Management is doing nothing to add to the information about the geologic features, thereby expanding the information which could be useful in understanding the prehistoric presence in this area.

8.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Management will continue to be deficient in baseline data regarding the locations of geologic features of the area, and information which could be useful to the understanding of the prehistoric peoples.

2. Conduct Geological Feature Survey and Compile Base Map Special attention would be given to locations of alcoves and information pertaining to their formation. Other features such as locations of rare minerals, rocks, and fossils would be noted. The base map would give a visual means of use of data for management and researchers. Information gained would help support archeological understanding of the area and locate other features of scientific interest.

8.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Information gained by this action will contribute towards understanding prehistoric use of the area and special management of areas displaying features of scientific interest.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

9.1 GICL--N-9 Bird Survey

9.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

A wide variety of birds use the Monument area as a permanent or temporary home. A bird list for the general area exists, but it is not specific to the Monument and is not current nor comprehensive. It is unknown whether endangered or threatened species live in the area.

Current Management Action

Management uses a bird list which is outdated and not comprehensive. Endangered and/or threatened species have not been identified.

9.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management will continue to use an outdated bird list. Interpretation will not have full information on the bird population. Possible threatened or endangered species will not be identified and given proper management as mandated by law.

2. Conduct Bird Survey. The survey would give special emphasis to locating rare, threatened, and endangered species. Other species would be identified as to frequency and time of year of occurence. A revised bird checklist would be produced form the survey to aid in the interpretive program.

9.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management will have knowledge of possible rare, threatened, or endangered species which would require further management. Current information will add to interpretive program.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

10.1 GICL--N-10 Mammal Survey

10.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

A variety of mammals use the Monument as a temporary or permanent home. A mammal list for the entire Gila National Forest exists, but it is not specific to the small area of the Monument. It is unknown whether endangered or threatened species live in the area.

Current Management Action

Management uses a mammal list which is too general for the area. Rare, threatened, and endangered species have not been identified.

10.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management will continue to use an inadequate mammal list. Possible threatened or endangered species will not be identified and given proper management as mandated by law. Information about mammals will be inadequate for interpreters.

2. Conduct Mammal Survey. The survey would give special emphasis to locating rare, threatened, and endangered species. A revised mammal list specific to the Monument would be produced from the survey to aid in the interpretive program.

10.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management will have knowledge of possible rare, threatened, or endangered species which would require further management. Information will add to the interpretive program.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

GICL--N-11

11.1 GICL Reptiles and Amphibians Survey and Base Map

11.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

Although there is a reptile and amphibian list for the entire Gila National Forest, it is not specific to the small area of the monument and is also not up to date. Several species of rattlesnakes are known to exist in the area which sometime suffer from actions of visitors. It is unknown whether we have rare, threatened, or endangered species which would need special management. Various species are known to have been used by the prehistoric inhabitants. Information relating to their range and distribution in the monument today would help understand their use in prehistoric times.

Current Management Action

Management relies on an outdated and very general reptile and amphibian list. When the staff finds visitors harassing rattlesnakes, the animals are gently herded off the trail. Management remains ignorant regarding the presence of rare, threatened or endangered species.

11.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action Management will continue to use an inadequate animal list and will have no information regarding the distribution of them. Possible rare, threatened, and endangered species would have no management attention as mandated by law.

2. Conduct Reptile and Amphibian Survey and Base Map The survey would give special emphasis to locating rare, threatened, and endangered species. Special attention would be given to the range and distribution of rattlesnakes, data which would help management determine whether a trail rerouting is justified. A base map would indicate range and distribution of various species and provide a useable form of data for management. A reptile and amphibian list would also be prepared to aid in the interpretive program.

11.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management will be able to provide special attention to rare, threatened, and endangered species. Rattlesnake management will be based on firm data. Information will be used also in helping to understand the prehistoric use of reptiles and amphibians.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

12.1 GICL--N-12 Inventory of Various Resources

12.2 Statement of Issue or Concern

A variety of creatures and plants exist in the Monument which have not been identified in other project statements. These organisms include fish, invertebrates, and non-flowering plants. Although they may represent a small part of the overall resources within the Monument, they nonetheless should be inventoried so that management can make informed decisions regarding their management. Sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species could exist which would require further management consideration.

Current Management Action

Management has little data specific to the above organisms in the Monument. Is is unknown whether sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species exist. A lack of information hampers the interpretive program.

12.3 Alternative Actions and Their Probable Impacts

1. No Action. Management will remain ignorant regarding sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species among fish, invertebrates, and non-flowering plants. Knowledge of the varieties of species and their ranges will remain non-existent. The interpretive program will be hampered for lack of information.

2. Conduct Inventories. Identify and inventory species among fish, invertebrates, and non-flowering plants. Special attention would be given to sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species. Plant and animal lists in these groups would be developed for interpretive use. Base maps would be prepared for sensitive species which might need special management.

12.4 Recommended Course of Action

Alternative 2 is recommended. Management will have the information it needs for special management of sensitive, rare, threatened, and endangered species. Interpretation will have needed information for its program.

The recommended action is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS or EA. (516 DM6, Appendix 7.4 B(4).

RESOURCES PROGRAMMING SHEET

GICL (PARK / AREA) | SW (REGION) | NM (ST) | X NATURAL | CULTURAL | NOVEMBER 1987 (DATE) | PAGE 1 OF 1

PRIORITY	RMP REF NO.	PKG NO.	T	PROJECT TITLE	A	FY 87 NPS MY / COST 1000	FY 88 NPS MY / COST 1000	FY 89 NPS MY / COST 1000	FY 90 NPS MY / COST 1000	FY 91 NPS MY / COST 1000	REMARKS
1	N-3			Monument Boundry Survey and Fencing				5	30		
2	N-2			Erosion Control On Loop Trail				.1 1.5	.1 1.5		
3	N-5			Fire Management Plan				.1 3			
4	N-6			Soils Survey and Base Map				3			
5	N-7			Vegetation Survey and Base Map				3.5	3.5		
6	N-8			Geological Feature Survey and Base Map					2.5	2.5	
7	N-9			Bird Survey					2.5	2.5	
8	N-10			Mammal Survey					2.5	2.5	
9	N-11			Reptiles and Amphibians Survey and Base Maps					2.5	2.5	
10	N-12			Inventory of Various Resources					2.5	2.5	

Information Base Checksheet

Master Plan, Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument 1964

Statement for Management, Draft, 1986

Statement for Interpretation, 1980

Interpretive Prospectus, 1981

Scope of Collections, 1985

Bibliography in The Archeology of Gila Cliff Dwellings, Anderson et al, 1986

NARRATIVE FILE

Climate. Weather information, including temperature and rainfall averages by month and year, is available at Monument headquarters.

Socio-economic Environment. No information available.

Geology. Narrative treatments of the geology of the Monument area may be found in Scenic Trips to the Geologic Past, No.10, Revised by Russell E. Clemons, Paige W. Christiansen, and H. L. James, New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources, a Division of New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, 1980, and Guidebook of Southwestern New Mexico II, by J. Paul Fitzsimmons and Christine Lochman-Balk, New Mexico Geological Society, 1965. Both guides are available at the Gila Center Library.

A third geological study, also available at Monument headquarters, includes narrative material on geological features, "Mineral Resources of the Gila Primitive Area and Gila Wilderness, New Mexico," Geological Survey Bulletin 1451, U.S.G.P.O., Washington, 1979.

Land Ownership and Use. In addition to the maps previously cited, information dealing with Monument boundary changes is on file at Monument headquarters.

Soils. General information at Monument headquarters. See previous reference.

Hydrology. See previous reference.

Vegetation. Narrative information is not generally available.

Wildlife. See previous reference.

Recreation, Development and Support Facilities. Narrative information can be found in the Master Plan, Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, Developed Area Narrative, 1965.

Cultural. A series of five schematic maps which detail archeological sites and groups is available at Monument headquarters. The survey consists of two parts. The first is Archeological Base Map, Cliff Dwellings Section, Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, drawing #349/60,000, scale 1" = 6'. The other part, which includes portions of the Gila National Forest immediately adjacent to the Monument, is entitled Archeological Base Map, Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, drawing #349/60,000, scale 1" = 690'. Both map sections were compiled by USDI, National Park Service, Park Support Service, SWRO, 1971. These base maps have never been updated. See RMP, Project C1.

Recreation, Development, and Support Facilities. No specific maps are available.

PARK SPECIFIC FILE

Topography. Two USGS quadrangle maps, Series V882, scale 1:24,000, dated 1965, are available at the Gila Visitor Center. The "Little Turkey Park" quad contains the detached T.J. Ruins section of the Monument. The "Gila Hot Springs" quad encompasses the main Gila Cliff Dwellings complex.

Geology. A series of geological maps is contained in a study entitled "Mineral Resources of the Gila Primitive Area and Gila Wilderness, New Mexico," Geological Survey Bulletin 1451, U.S.G.P.O., Washington, 1979. The map portion of the bulletin, which encompasses Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, includes three parts: 1) Geochemical Sample Locality Map of the Gila Study Area (Eastern Part), Plate 3, 2) Residual Gravity and Aeromagnetic Maps of the Gila Study Area, Plate 2, and 3) Generalized Geologic and U. S. Bureau of Mines Sample Localities Maps, Plate 1. These maps are available at Monument headquarters.

Land Use and Ownership. Land status and use restriction maps, which include status of lands within the Monument boundaries as well as adjacent Gila National Forest land, are on file at the Gila Visitor Center.

Soils. General soils maps are available and titled "Reconnaissance Soil Survey for Gila National Forest." Compiled by the USDA, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, 1968, the maps incorporate the entire Gila National Forest and are on file at the Gila Visitor Center.

Hydrology. Hydrological features may be located on maps compiled by the State of New Mexico, Office of State Engineer, 1965. The study is entitled "Hydrographic Survey, Gila River System, Upper Gila Area." Information on watershed may be found in "Inventory of Watershed," assembled by USDA, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, 1968. Both maps are on file at Monument headquarters.

Vegetation. A vegetation map has not been compiled for Gila Cliff.

Wildlife. No wildlife maps are currently available. The USDA Forest Service, Gila National Forest, is in the process of collecting information to be used on wildlife maps for the entire Gila National Forest. The proposed maps, which include Gila Cliff, will be completed in 1982, and will delineate the habitats of threatened and endangered species, major game species, riparian species, etc.