

**United States Department of the Interior**  
**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103**  
**Phoenix, Arizona 85021-4951**  
**Telephone: (602) 242-0210 FAX: (602) 242-2513**

In Reply Refer To:  
AESO/SE  
02-21-05-F-0120  
02-21-94-F-0192-R4

March 3, 2005

Memorandum

To: Field Manager, Phoenix Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, AZ

From: Field Supervisor

Subject: Reinitiation of Formal Consultation and Conference: Amended Proposed Action for the Five Livestock Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona (02-21-94-F-0192-R4)

This responds to your October 13, 2004, memorandum to the Arizona Ecological Services Field Office requesting reinitiation of the Biological Opinion (BO) for the Five Livestock Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona dated June 21, 2004. You have amended the proposed action to incorporate the Why allotment into the Coyote Flat allotment and increase the authorized use on the new, combined allotment from 264 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) to 372 AUMs. The proposed action may affect the endangered Sonoran pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana sonoriensis*, SOPH) and the endangered cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl (*Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum*, CFPO). This document also constitutes a conference on proposed critical habitat for the CFPO.

This biological and conference opinion is based on information provided in your October 13, 2004, memorandum; telephone conversations of December 14 and 28, 2004, with Tim Hughes; field investigations; and other sources of information. Literature cited in this biological and conference opinion is not a complete bibliography of all literature available on the species of concern, livestock grazing and its effects, or on other subjects considered in this opinion. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at this office.

### **CONSULTATION HISTORY**

The September 30, 2002, BO contains the consultation history for all events prior to and including that BO. The BLM has reinitiated consultation on these five allotments twice since the September 30, 2002, BO. The following details the history of the consultation from that date forward:

- May 12, 2004: We received BLM's request for reinitiation of consultation on the BOs for the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (RMP) dated March 27, 1998, and the Five Livestock Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona, dated September 30, 2002.
- June 21, 2004: We provided a Biological Opinion on the Plan Amendment for the Lower Gila South RMP and an Amended Proposed Action for the Five Livestock Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona.
- October 13, 2004: We received BLM's request for reinitiation and amendment to the June 21, 2004, BO to include a change in the proposed action regarding the Five Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona.
- January 11, 2005: We provided a draft biological opinion to the BLM.
- February 22, 2005: BLM provided comments to us on the draft biological opinion.

### **BIOLOGICAL OPINION**

We refer the reader to the previous consultation documents for a description of proposed and ongoing grazing activities on the Cameron, Childs, and Sentinel allotments (see CONSULTATION HISTORY). Herein, we will only describe changes to the proposed action, which only affect the Why and Coyote Flat allotments.

#### **Changes to the Descriptions of the Proposed Action**

In the proposed action evaluated in the 2002 BO, BLM proposed to adjust permitted use on the Why and Coyote Flat allotments from 456 to 132 AUMs each (11 cows year long on each allotment) annually. Year-round use of these allotments would continue; however, summer grazing would be authorized on the Coyote Flat Allotment in even-numbered years, and on the Why Allotment in odd-numbered years.

In this amended proposed action, the Why Allotment will be incorporated into the Coyote Flat Allotment and cease to exist as a separate allotment. Authorized use on the new Coyote Flat Allotment will increase from the 264 Animal Unit Months (AUMs), 22 cows yearlong, previously authorized on both allotments, to 372 AUMs, 31 cows yearlong. The current permittee intends to remove all livestock for up to three months each year (usually late spring/summer) and rotate use between the north and south pastures every other year; however, the permittee desires to retain the flexibility to adapt to forage conditions, especially as rainfall permits. Regardless of rotation or periods of use, livestock use will not exceed 372 AUMs authorized annually.

All four of the conservation measures for CFPO, as identified in the September 30, 2002, BO and reiterated in the June 21, 2004, BO will continue to be implemented on public lands in the new Coyote Flat Allotment. With one exception, the conservation measures for the Sonoran pronghorn (SOPH), included in the June 21, 2004, BO remain unchanged and will continue to be implemented, except the allotment names will be amended to reflect the new, combined Coyote Flat Allotment. SOPH conservation measure number 6 will be amended to read as follows:

“BLM will remove all interior fences and cooperate with Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (OPCNM) and Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge (CPNWR) in the removal or modification of common boundary fences within the Cameron Allotment area.”

This amended conservation measure will allow the BLM to assist Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in placing two strands of smooth wire along the Monument’s northern boundary to discourage off-road vehicles from entering the Monument from the former Cameron Allotment. If requested by Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, the same could occur along the boundary with the refuge.

### Sonoran Pronghorn

#### **STATUS OF THE SPECIES**

The status of the SOPH remains similar to that described in the April 29, 2004, reinitiation #2-Biological and Conference Opinion for the International Boundary Vehicle Barrier on the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (RBO – available on our website at <http://arizonaes.fws.gov>), except that recovery actions described in the Status of the Species have progressed. The semi-captive breeding facility has been built, and three Sonoran pronghorn, including two females from Sonora, Mexico, and one male and four females from the U.S. population, have been placed in the facility. Additionally, six emergency waters have been built and filled with water, and four emergency forage-enhancement plots are completed and being watered.

Preliminary count and population estimates from the biennial survey December 6-10, 2004, indicate that 39 SOPH were observed in the United States. In Mexico, east of Highway 8, preliminary numbers indicate 447 animals observed. In both cases more than twice as many pronghorn were observed in 2004 as compared to 2002, probably due to recovery actions in Arizona, favorable forage and water conditions, and associated increases in the populations since 2002. Surveys for the Pinacate region of Mexico have not been conducted yet; however, they are scheduled for February 2005.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE**

The environmental baseline is similar to that described in the RBO, with the above noted changes in the U.S. population, and is included herein by reference. No SOPH have been observed in or near the Why or Coyote Flat allotments since the September 30, 2002, BO was issued. Since the 2002 BO, the international vehicle barrier fence has been constructed on Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and the Cameron grazing allotment has been closed. Both Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge have begun removing fences associated with the Cameron Allotment.

#### **EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION**

Effects to SOPH from the proposed action will be similar to those described in the September 30, 2002, BO; however, an increase in authorized grazing by nine cows may increase all grazing

related impacts over what was anticipated in that BO. The following is taken from the 2002, BO and summarizes the effects of livestock grazing on the pronghorn:

“Of greatest concern is the habitat degradation and loss/restriction of forage, restriction of movement corridors and potential for range expansion, and increased potential for disease transmission from livestock to pronghorn. Grazing changes the composition, structure, and abundance of vegetation, and causes destruction of cryptobiotic crusts, soil erosion and compaction, reduced water infiltration rates, and increased runoff reducing the habitat’s ability to provide forage, fawn cover, and thermal cover. The presence of cattle in the currently limited range of the pronghorn results in a source of competition for vegetation and water resources. Habitat degradation and/or fencing at the boundary of the Ajo allotments appear to be restricting an important pronghorn movement corridor, as well as regular use of historic habitat that is now only sporadically accessed. Presence of livestock within the range of the Sonoran pronghorn increases the potential for not only continued exposure to diseases, but also those environmental situations to occur that are potentially fatal to adult pronghorn, can cause stress, debilitation and attendant reproductive failure, and increased fawn mortality.”

Analysis of satellite imagery from two sources indicated deterioration of range condition and plant communities on the BLM lands, particularly the Cameron allotment, relative to adjacent ungrazed lands on Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge. We suggested that the deteriorated conditions on the Cameron allotment relative to the Why and Coyote Flats allotments might be a result of ephemeral grazing, which has been conducted regularly on the Cameron but not on the other two allotments. Baseline conditions on the Why and Coyote Flats allotments were the result of grazing below authorized preference and a lack of ephemeral grazing. In the ten years prior to 2002, mean actual use (excluding periods of non-use) was 138 AUMs on the Why Allotment, and 405 AUMs on the Coyote Flat Allotment. Furthermore, mean actual use on the Coyote Flat Allotment in the five years prior to 2002 was only 228 AUMs. Total actual use on the Why and Coyote Flat allotments was 366 AUMs per year during that five-year period. In 2001, the actual use was 192 AUMs on the Why Allotment and 240 AUMs on the Coyote Flat Allotment. This use continued until the 2002 grazing year when cattle were removed from the allotments due to drought. Cattle were placed back on the allotments during the 2003 grazing year with total actual use at 516 AUMs for both allotments. For the 2004 grazing year, the permittee has run the full preference authorized, 264 AUMs total, 132 AUMs on each allotment. The proposed increase in authorization to 372 AUMs nearly matches the mean actual use chosen by the permittee for the five-year period before 2002 (366 AUMs from above). Range condition and impacts in the future would therefore likely be similar to what were described as the baseline conditions in the 2002 BO for these allotments.

Placing two strands of smooth wire along the boundary between the Cameron Allotment and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument will discourage off road vehicles (ORVs) from illegally entering Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument from the former Cameron Allotment and damaging sensitive habitat in these areas. ORVs have recently been documented driving in Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in areas known to be occupied by SOPH. The bottom strand of the two wire strands will be placed no lower than 30 inches above ground to facilitate SOPH movement between BLM lands and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument. In order to help SOPH see the wires from a distance and while moving, new wire will be used and bright flagging will be tied to the wires at regular intervals. Although SOPH prefer areas without

fencing or restricted movement of any kind, they will cross under fencing placed at least 18 inches above ground level. Furthermore, these two strands of wire are anticipated to prevent further damage of SOPH habitat and potential harassment of SOPH occupying the area. Similar fencing may also be requested by Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge if illegal ORVs are documented entering the refuge from the former Cameron Allotment.

The BLM's proposed conservation measures, outlined and discussed in both the 2002 and 2004 BOs and modified in this BO will significantly reduce these adverse effects and, in meaningful ways, provide some benefits to SOPH (see the Conclusions for the pronghorn in the 2002 and 2004 BOs). In addition to the conservation measures previously agreed upon, the permittee will remove all cattle from the allotment for three months out of the year (usually late spring/summer) and will rotate use between the north and south pastures of the allotment every other year. Removal of cattle and rotation of pasture use will allow for some soil and habitat recovery during those periods of non-use.

### **CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, tribal, local or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological opinion. Analysis of cumulative effects remains similar to that described in the previous BOs, except that smuggling and illegal immigration, and associated impacts to pronghorn and their habitats, as described in the 2002 BO, have continued to increase.

### **CONCLUSION**

After reviewing the anticipated effects of the proposed action, including current conservation measures for the Five Livestock Grazing Allotments in the Vicinity of Ajo, Arizona, the environmental baseline for the action area, the current status of the SOPH, and the cumulative effects, we affirm our previous conclusion that the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SOPH. We base this determination on our rationale from the original BOs and the following:

- 1) The addition of nine cattle will not significantly increase the effects to SOPH. Furthermore, the proposed action AUMs nearly matches the mean actual use chosen by the permittee for the five-year period before 2002.
- 2) No SOPH have been observed in or near the Coyote Flat (formerly Why and Coyote Flat allotments) since the 2002 BO was issued.
- 3) The permittee will remove cattle completely three months out of the year, usually in the spring/summer, and rotate use between the north and south pastures every other year, allowing range conditions to improve during those time periods.
- 4) Current conservation measures are sufficient to minimize the effects to SOPH in the vicinity of the grazing allotment.

- 5) Modifying conservation measure number six to allow placing two strands of wire along the boundary between the former Cameron Allotment and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge is anticipated to reduce the likelihood of ORVs damaging SOPH habitat and directly affecting SOPH.

## **INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT**

Section 9 of the ESA and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. "Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. "Harm" is defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering (50 CFR 17.3). "Harass" is defined as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering (50 CFR 17.3). "Incidental take" is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the ESA provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

## **AMOUNT OR EXTENT OF TAKE ANTICIPATED**

Because SOPH numbers are low, the chances of an authorized increase of nine cows affecting SOPH are also low. Therefore, we do not anticipate incidental take of SOPH as a result of the proposed action. See our September 2002 and June 2004 BOs for additional rationale for why incidental take is not reasonably certain to occur.

## **CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

No additional conservation recommendations are recommended beyond those described in the June 21, 2004 BO.

### **Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy-Owl**

The status of the CFPO remains the same as or similar to that described in the RBO and is included here by reference.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE**

The environmental baseline for the CFPO remains similar to that described in the RBO, and is included here by reference. CFPOs have not been detected on the Ajo allotments since the 2001 detection on the Childs allotment. However, they continue to breed and use areas on Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument immediately south of the reconfigured Coyote Flat allotment. CFPOs from these territories likely occasionally forage or disperse through the reconfigured Coyote Flat allotment. We published a proposed rule to redesignate critical habitat in the Federal Register on November 27, 2002 (67 FR 71032). The proposal included approximately 1,208,000

acres in portions of Pima and Pinal counties, Arizona. Currently both the critical habitat and the listing of the CFPO are under litigation, however at this writing, the CFPO remains listed as endangered with proposed critical habitat. Populations of CFPO have declined in the last five years from 41 in 1999 to 20 in 2004. We believe that more owls exist in Arizona, but systematic surveys have not been conducted in all areas of potential habitat. In the Ajo block, critical habitat (CH) includes all of the reconfigured Coyote Flat allotment and the southern half of the Cameron and Childs allotments.

## **EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION**

Implementing the proposed action will result in the same possible impacts to the CFPO and its proposed critical habitat as described in the BOs. Our 2002 BO summarizes effects to CFPOs as follows:

“Based on the grazing guidance criteria, the proposed action is likely to adversely affect the pygmy-owl. Potential effects of grazing on the pygmy-owl include: 1) increased dominance of nonnative annuals caused by grazing, which together may alter fire regimes and increase the chance that a wildfire would occur in occupied pygmy-owl habitat (Schmid and Rogers 1988); 2) reduced productivity and vigor of desert ecosystems; 3) trampling and browsing of vegetation cover, including saguaros and their nurse plants; 4) reduction of cryptobiotic crusts; 5) soil erosion and compaction; 6) reduced water infiltration rates and increased runoff, leaving less water for plant production; and 7) harm or harassment of pygmy-owls, particularly in areas where cattle are gathered or where they water. Changes in the vegetation community can also result in decreased pygmy-owl prey base, increased susceptibility of pygmy-owls to aerial predators, lack of suitable nesting structures, and habitat fragmentation. As discussed in the effects of the action for the pronghorn, vegetation communities have apparently been adversely affected by land management practices, including grazing, on the Ajo allotments (see Figure 5, Appendix 2 of the 2002 BO).”

This BO does not rely on the regulatory definition of “destruction or adverse modification” of critical habitat at 50 C.F.R. 402.02. Instead, we have relied upon the statutory provisions of the ESA to complete the following analysis with respect to critical habitat. The revised action would not affect the proposed critical habitat’s ability to aid in the recovery of CFPO in the Coyote Flat Allotment differently than what was described in the previous BOs. In the revised proposed action, the BLM proposes to combine the Coyote Flat and Why allotments into one allotment, referred to as the Coyote Flat Allotment. The revised action will increase the number of currently authorized cattle from 22 cows yearlong (264 AUMs) to 31 cows yearlong (372 AUMs). This increase is in accordance with actual use by the permittee on the Why and Coyote Flat allotments for the five-year period before 2002. The increase in the number of cattle is not significant when compared to the historical use of the allotments. In 2001, the actual use was 192 AUMs on the Why Allotment and 240 AUMs on the Coyote Flat Allotment. This use continued until the 2002 grazing year when cattle were removed from the allotments due to drought. Cattle were placed back on the allotments during the 2003 grazing year with total actual use at 516 AUMs for both allotments. For the 2004 grazing year, the permittee has run the full preference authorized, 264 AUMs total, 132 AUMs on each allotment.

Of the primary constituent elements (PCE) listed for CFPO critical habitat, structural makeup of the habitat necessary to meet the biological needs of the CFPO has the highest probability of

being affected due to degradation related to an increase in authorized use by cattle on the Coyote Flat Allotment; however, the proposed increase in authorization to 372 AUMs nearly matches the mean actual use chosen by the permittee for the five-year period before 2002 (366 AUMs from above) as well as the actual use from the last two years (excluding periods of non-use). Range condition and impacts in the future would therefore likely be similar to what were described as the baseline conditions in the 2002 BO for these allotments and are not likely to significantly decrease the ability of proposed critical habitat to aid in the recovery of the CFPO. Furthermore, the BLM's proposed conservation measures, outlined in both the 2002 and 2004 BOs will significantly reduce these adverse effects and, in meaningful ways, provide some benefits to CFPO. In addition to the conservation measures previously agreed upon, the permittee will remove all cattle from the allotment for three months out of the year (usually late spring/summer) and will rotate use between the north and south pastures of the allotment every other year. Removal of cattle and rotation of pasture use will allow for some soil and habitat recovery during those periods of non-use.

Similar to the SOPH, placing two strands of smooth wire along the boundary between the Cameron Allotment and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument will discourage off road vehicles (ORVs) from illegally entering Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument from the former Cameron Allotment and damaging sensitive habitat in these areas. ORVs have recently been documented driving in Organ Pipe cactus National Monument in areas known to be occupied by CFPO. CFPO are not anticipated to be affected by placement of these two strands of wire. Furthermore, these two strands of wire are anticipated to prevent further damage of CFPO habitat and potential harassment of CFPO occupying the area.

## **CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, tribal, local or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological opinion. Analyses of cumulative effects remain unchanged from the previous BOs, except that smuggling and illegal immigration, and associated impacts to pygmy-owls and their habitats, as described in the 2002 BO, have continued to increase.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed changes to the BLM management of the Coyote Flat and Why allotments and placing two strands of wire along the boundary between the former Cameron Allotment and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument does not change our previous conclusion that the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the CFPO. Neither is the proposed action likely to adversely modify or destroy proposed critical habitat. We base these conclusions on the rationale provided in the previous BOs and the following:

- 1) The BLM has proposed to continue to implement the four CFPO conservation measures in the 2002 BO.
- 2) Modifying conservation measure number six to allow placing two strands of wire along the boundary between the former Cameron Allotment and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument is anticipated to reduce the likelihood of ORVs damaging CFPO habitat and directly affecting CFPO.



- 3) The authorization of an additional nine cattle will not significantly increase the effects to CFPO or the ability of designated critical habitat to aid in the recovery of CFPO. Furthermore, the proposed action AUMs nearly matches the mean actual use chosen by the permittee for the five-year period before 2002.
- 4) The permittee will remove cattle complete three months out of the year, usually in the spring/summer and rotate use between the north and south pastures every other year, allowing range conditions to improve during those time periods.

### **INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT**

Section 9 of the ESA and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. "Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. "Harm" is defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering (50 CFR 17.3). "Harass" is defined as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering (50 CFR 17.3). "Incidental take" is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

### **AMOUNT OR EXTENT OF TAKE ANTICIPATED**

For the reasons outlined in our 2002 BO, we do not anticipate the proposed action will result in incidental take of any CFPO based on the current project description.

### **CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

No additional conservation recommendations beyond those described in the previous BOs are recommended.

## **DISPOSITION OF DEAD OR INJURED LISTED ANIMALS**

Upon locating a dead, injured, or sick listed species initial notification must be made to the FWS's Law Enforcement Office, 2450 West Broadway Road #113, Mesa, Arizona [telephone: (480) 967-7900] within three working days of its finding. Written notification must be made within five calendar days and include the date, time, and location of the animal, a photograph if possible, and any other pertinent information. The notification shall be sent to the Law Enforcement Office with a copy to this office. Care must be taken in handling injured animals to ensure effective treatment and care, and in handling dead specimens to preserve biological material in the best possible condition. If feasible, the remains of intact specimens of listed animal species shall be submitted to educational or research institutions holding appropriate State and Federal permits. If such institutions are not available, the information noted above shall be obtained and the carcass left in place.

Arrangements regarding proper disposition of potential museum specimens shall be made with the institution prior to implementation of the action. Injured animals should be transported to a qualified veterinarian by a qualified biologist. Should any treated listed animal survive, the Service should be contacted regarding the final disposition of the animal.

## **REINITIATION NOTICE**

This concludes reinitiation of formal consultation and conferencing on BLM's proposal to combine two former livestock grazing allotments into one, the Coyote Flat Allotment, and authorize an additional nine cattle on the new allotment near Ajo. As provided in 50 CFR §402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to a listed species or critical habitat not considered in this opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, any operations causing such take must cease pending reinitiation. If conservation measures or other aspects of the proposed action are not implemented as anticipated herein, including schedules for implementation, reinitiation may be warranted pursuant to 50 CFR 402.16(b).

You may request in writing that we confirm our conference opinion on CFPO critical habitat as a biological opinion issued through formal consultation if the proposed critical habitat is designated. If, after designation, we review the proposed action and find there are no significant changes in the action as planned or in the information used during the conference, we will confirm the conference opinion as the biological opinion for the project and no further section 7 consultation will be necessary, absent triggers for reinitiation, listed in the preceding paragraph.

Thank you and your staff for their efforts and assistance in completing this reinitiation of consultation and conferencing. Any questions or comments should be directed to Brian Wooldridge (520) 670-6150 (x235) or Jim Rorabaugh (x238) of my staff.

/s/ Steven L. Spangle

cc: Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM (ARD-ES)  
Assistant Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Tucson, AZ  
Manager, Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, Ajo, AZ  
State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, AZ  
Justin Tade, Office of the Regional Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Albuquerque, NM  
Field Office Manager, Yuma Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, Yuma, AZ  
Colonel James Uken, Barry M. Goldwater Executive Council, Luke Air Force Base, AZ  
Park Superintendent, Organ Pipe Cactus NM, Ajo, AZ  
Ronald Pearce, Director of Range Management, Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, AZ  
Director of Natural Resources, Tohono O'odham Nation, Sells, AZ  
  
Chief, Habitat Branch, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ  
Regional Supervisor, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Yuma, AZ

W:\Brian Wooldridge\Coyote Flat-allotment-BO-concurrence-02-24-05-final.doc:egg