

August 2012

Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment: Detailed Linkages

Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage Design



Arizona Game and Fish Department




Regional Transportation Authority of
Pima County

RTA
Regional Transportation Authority

Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro

Linkage Design



Recommended Citation

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012. Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment: Detailed Linkages. Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage Design. Report to the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County.

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the help of many individuals. We would like to thank the following:

CorridorDesign Team at Northern Arizona University:

Paul Beier, Dan Majka, Jeff Jenness, and Emily Garding (CorridorDesign Team) for authoring the Arizona Missing Linkages. Content from the Arizona Missing Linkages (Beier et al 2006a, Beier et al 2006b), is used directly throughout this report with permission. Models in this report were created using methods developed by Majka et al. (2007).

Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup:

Arizona Department of Transportation, Arizona Game and Fish Department, AZTEC Engineering, Bureau of Land Management, Defenders of Wildlife, Northern Arizona University, Sky Island Alliance, U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service

Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Workgroup:

Arizona Game and Fish Department, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Defenders of Wildlife, Pima County, Sky Island Alliance, Town of Marana, Tucson Audubon Society, University of Arizona, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County:

The Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County for funding the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment project, which this report is part of.

Arizona Game and Fish Department:

Dean Pokrajac, primary author, GIS analyst, and field investigator for this project. Julie Mikolajczyk and Ray Schweinsburg for providing project development and administration. Dennis Abbate, Scott Blackman, Jeff Gagnon, David Grandmaison, Shawn Lowery, and Scott Sprague for wildlife connectivity and road mitigation expertise. Kirby Bristow for species information from Arizona Game and Fish Department Research Branch. Arizona Game and Fish Department wildlife managers Brad Fulk, Mark Frieberg, and Karen Klima, for providing on the ground support. Jim Heffelfinger, Kristin Terpening, and John Windes for additional species information and project support from Arizona Game and Fish Department Region V. Jessica Gist, Bill Knowles, Shea Meyer, Mark Ogonowski, Dana Warnecke, and Kelly Wolff-Krauter for providing technical support and report review. Cristina Jones, Angela McIntire, Amber Munig, and Johnathan O'Dell for reviewing and updating species background information authored by the CorridorDesign Team at Northern Arizona University. George Andrejko, Randy Babb, Thomas Jones, and Audrey Owens for providing many of the photographs used throughout this report.

Table of Contents

LINKAGE DESIGN	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	VI
TERMINOLOGY	IX
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	XI
INTRODUCTION	1
NATURE NEEDS ROOM TO MOVE.....	1
BENEFITS OF WILDLIFE LINKAGE PLANNING.....	2
OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS THAT ACKNOWLEDGE THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSERVING WILDLIFE LINKAGES.....	3
LINKAGE PLANNING IN ARIZONA: A STATEWIDE-TO-LOCAL APPROACH.....	5
OVERVIEW OF THE PIMA COUNTY WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT.....	6
ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND EXISTING CONSERVATION INVESTMENTS OF THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE PLANNING AREA	7
ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE PLANNING AREA.....	7
CONSERVATION INVESTMENTS IN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE PLANNING AREA.....	8
THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN	11
ONE LINKAGE PROVIDES CONNECTIVITY ACROSS A DIVERSE LANDSCAPE.....	11
REMOVING AND MITIGATING BARRIERS TO MOVEMENT	13
IMPACTS OF ROADS ON WILDLIFE.....	15
IMPACTS OF STREAM AND RIPARIAN IMPEDIMENTS ON WILDLIFE.....	28
IMPACTS OF UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE ON WILDLIFE.....	31
APPENDIX A: LINKAGE DESIGN METHODS	33
FOCAL SPECIES SELECTION.....	33
HABITAT SUITABILITY MODELS.....	34
IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL BREEDING PATCHES AND POTENTIAL POPULATION CORES.....	35
MINIMUM LINKAGE WIDTH.....	38
FIELD INVESTIGATIONS.....	38
APPENDIX B: INDIVIDUAL SPECIES MODELING PARAMETERS	39
BADGER, <i>TAXIDEA TAXUS</i>	47
BLACK BEAR, <i>URSUS AMERICANUS</i>	50
BLACK-TAILED JACKRABBIT, <i>LEPUS CALIFORNIUS</i>	53
COUES’ WHITE-TAILED DEER, <i>ODOCOILEUS VIRGINIANUS COUESI</i>	56
DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP, <i>OVIS CANADENSIS NELSONI</i>	60
DESERT BOX TURTLE, <i>TERRAPENE ORNATE LUTEOLA</i>	64
GIANT SPOTTED WHIPTAIL, <i>ASPIDOSCELIS BURTI STICTOGRAMMUS</i>	67
GILA MONSTER, <i>HELODERMA SUSPECTUM</i>	70
JAGUAR, <i>PANTHERA ONCA</i>	73
JAVELINA, <i>TAYASSU TAJACU</i>	76
KIT FOX, <i>VULPES MACROTIS</i>	79
LOWLAND LEOPARD FROG, <i>RANA YAVAPAIENSIS</i>	81
MOUNTAIN LION, <i>PUMA CONCOLOR</i>	84

MULE DEER, <i>ODOCOILEUS HEMIONUS</i>	87
SONORAN DESERT TOAD, <i>INCILIUS ALVARIUS</i>	90
SONORAN DESERT TORTOISE, <i>GOPHERUS MORAFKAI</i>	93
SONORAN WHIPSNAKE, <i>MASTICOPHIS BILINEATUS</i>	97
WHITE-NOSED COATI, <i>NASUA NARICA</i>	100
APPENDIX D: SPECIES OCCURRENCE IN THE LINKAGE DESIGN.....	103
APPENDIX E: CREATION OF LINKAGE DESIGN.....	106
APPENDIX F: UPDATE AND DESCRIPTION OF LAND COVER	107
APPENDIX G: LITERATURE CITED.....	110
APPENDIX H: DATA REQUESTS.....	120

List of Tables and Figures

List of Tables

TABLE 1: FOCAL SPECIES SELECTED FOR THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN XIII

TABLE 2: APPROXIMATE LAND COVER FOUND WITHIN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN..... 12

TABLE 3: CHARACTERISTICS WHICH MAKE SPECIES VULNERABLE TO THE THREE MAJOR DIRECT EFFECTS OF ROADS (FROM FORMAN ET AL. 2003) 15

TABLE 4: ROADS GREATER THAN 1 KILOMETER IN LENGTH IN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN 21

TABLE 5: HABITAT SUITABILITY SCORES AND FACTOR WEIGHTS FOR EACH SPECIES (MAJKA ET AL. 2007). SCORES RANGE FROM 0 (WORST) TO 100 (BEST), WITH > 30 INDICATING AVOIDED HABITAT, 30 – 59 OCCASIONALLY USED FOR NON-BREEDING ACTIVITIES, 60 – 79 CONSISTENT USE AND BREEDING, AND 80 – 100 HIGHEST SURVIVAL AND REPRODUCTIVE SUCCESS39

TABLE 6: SPECIES OCCURRENCE IN THE LINKAGE DESIGN AS IDENTIFIED THROUGH ARIZONA HERITAGE DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ELEMENT OCCURRENCE DATA.....103

List of Figures

FIGURE 1: THE LINKAGE DESIGN BETWEEN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON AND GALIURO WILDLAND BLOCKS XIV

FIGURE 2: THE MAEVEEN MARIE BEHAN CONSERVATION LANDS SYSTEM SHOWS THE BIOLOGICALLY PREFERRED RESERVE DESIGN AND WORKS TO PROVIDE SUSTAINABLE GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT. CRITICAL LANDSCAPE CONNECTIONS, OR BROADLY-DEFINED AREAS WHERE WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY IS SIGNIFICANTLY COMPROMISED, BUT CAN STILL BE IMPROVED, ARE SHOWN BY THE PURPLE ARROWS (PIMA COUNTY 2009).4

FIGURE 3: THE 2004 CONSERVATION ACQUISITION BOND PROGRAM WAS APPROVED TO HELP IMPLEMENT THE SONORAN DESERT CONSERVATION PLAN (PIMA COUNTY 2011). MULTI-USE LANDS ARE IMPORTANT FOR HABITAT AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN THE REGION.4

FIGURE 4 AND FIGURE 5: STATEWIDE MAP OF WILDLIFE LINKAGES AND BARRIERS CREATED BY THE ARIZONA WILDLIFE LINKAGES WORKGROUP (2006). COUNTY-WIDE MAP OF WILDLIFE LINKAGE CREATED FOR THE PIMA COUNTY WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT: REPORT ON STAKEHOLDER INPUT (2012 (MAPS: COURTESY ARIZONA WILDLIFE LINKAGES WORKGROUP AND ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT).6

FIGURE 6: LAND COVER IN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN9

FIGURE 7: EXISTING CONSERVATION INVESTMENTS IN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN 10

FIGURE 8: TOPOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY ENCOMPASSED BY SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN: A) TOPOGRAPHIC POSITION, B) SLOPE, C) ASPECT..... 13

FIGURE 9: ROAD STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN 14

FIGURE 10: POTENTIAL ROAD MITIGATIONS (FROM TOP TO BOTTOM) INCLUDE: HIGHWAY OVERPASSES, BRIDGES, CULVERTS, AND DRAINAGE PIPES. FENCING (BOTTOM) SHOULD BE USED TO GUIDE ANIMALS INTO CROSSING STRUCTURES (PHOTOGRAPHS COURTESY GEORGE ANDREJKO AND DEAN POKRAJAC, AGFD)..... 17

FIGURE 11: REDFIELD CANYON BRIDGE ALONG REDINGTON ROAD (RS1) 24

FIGURE 12: DRAINAGE PIPES UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS2) 24

FIGURE 13: DRAINAGE PIPE UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS3)..... 25

FIGURE 14: DRAINAGE PIPES UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS4) 25

FIGURE 15: DRAINAGE PIPES UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS5) 26

FIGURE 16: DRAINAGE PIPES UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS6) 26

FIGURE 17: DRAINAGE PIPE UNDER CASCABEL ROAD (RS7)..... 27

FIGURE 18: TRES ALAMOS WASH BRIDGE ALONG CASCABEL ROAD (RS8)..... 27

FIGURE 19: RIPARIAN VEGETATION ALONG THE LOWER SAN PEDRO RIVER..... 30

FIGURE 20: ARTIST RENDITION OF THE ESTIMATED CROSSING LOCATION OF THE SUNZIA SOUTHWEST TRANSMISSION PROJECT ACROSS THE SAN PEDRO RIVER IN THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN (PHOTO: COURTESY NORM MEADER, CASCABEL WORKING GROUP)32

FIGURE 21: EXAMPLE MOVING WINDOW ANALYSIS WHICH CALCULATES THE AVERAGE HABITAT SUITABILITY SURROUNDING A PIXEL. A) ORIGINAL HABITAT SUITABILITY MODEL, B) 3X3-PIXEL MOVING WINDOW, C) 200M RADIUS MOVING WINDOW35

FIGURE 22: A) LANDSCAPE PERMEABILITY LAYER FOR ENTIRE LANDSCAPE, B) BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR COMPOSED OF MOST PERMEABLE 10% OF LANDSCAPE.....37

FIGURE 23: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR BADGER.....48

FIGURE 24: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR BADGER49

FIGURE 25: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR BLACK BEAR51

FIGURE 26: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR BLACK BEAR52

FIGURE 27: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO BLACK BEAR BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR52

FIGURE 28: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR BLACK-TAILED JACKRABBIT.....54

FIGURE 29: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR BLACK-TAILED JACKRABBIT.....55

FIGURE 30: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO BLACK-TAILED JACKRABBIT BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR55

FIGURE 31: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR COUES’ WHITE-TAILED DEER58

FIGURE 15: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR COUES’ WHITE-TAILED DEER58

FIGURE 16: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO COUES’ WHITE-TAILED DEER TRIMMED BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR.....59

FIGURE 34: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP62

FIGURE 35: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP62

FIGURE 36: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR ..63

FIGURE 37: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR DESERT BOX TURTLE66

FIGURE 38: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR DESERT BOX TURTLE66

FIGURE 39: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO DESERT BOX TURTLE BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR66

FIGURE 40: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR GIANT SPOTTED WHIPTAIL.....68

FIGURE 41: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR GIANT SPOTTED WHIPTAIL.....69

FIGURE 42: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO GIANT SPOTTED WHIPTAIL BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR 69

FIGURE 43: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR GILA MONSTER71

FIGURE 44: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR GILA MONSTER.....72

FIGURE 45: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO TRIMMED GILA MONSTER BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR .72

FIGURE 46: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR JAGUAR74

FIGURE 47: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR JAGUAR.....75

FIGURE 48: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO TRIMMED JAGUAR BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR75

FIGURE 49: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR JAVELINA.....78

FIGURE 50: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR JAVELINA.....78

FIGURE 51: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO JAVELINA BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR.....78

FIGURE 52: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR KIT FOX.....80

FIGURE 53: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR KIT FOX.....80

FIGURE 54: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR LOWLAND LEOPARD FROG.....82

FIGURE 55: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR LOWLAND LEOPARD FROG.....83

FIGURE 56: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR MOUNTAIN LION.....85

FIGURE 57: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR MOUNTAIN LION86

FIGURE 58: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO TRIMMED MOUNTAIN LION BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR86

FIGURE 59: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR MULE DEER88

FIGURE 60: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR MULE DEER89

FIGURE 61: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO MULE DEER BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR89

FIGURE 62: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR SONORAN DESERT TOAD.....91

FIGURE 63: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR SONORAN DESERT TOAD.....92

FIGURE 64: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO SONORAN DESERT TOAD BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR...92

FIGURE 65: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR SONORAN DESERT TORTOISE95

FIGURE 66: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR SONORAN DESERT TORTOISE95

FIGURE 67: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO SONORAN DESERT TORTOISE BIOLOGICALLY BEST CORRIDOR96

FIGURE 68: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR SONORAN WHIPSNAKE.....98

FIGURE 69: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR SONORAN WHIPSNAKE.....99

*FIGURE 70: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO TRIMMED SONORAN WHIPSNAKE BIOLOGICALLY BEST
CORRIDOR.....99*

FIGURE 71: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO HABITAT SUITABILITY FOR WHITE-NOSED COATI.....101

FIGURE 72: MAP OF CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO POTENTIAL HABITAT PATCHES FOR WHITE-NOSED COATI102

*FIGURE 73: WIDTH ALONG THE CATALINA/RINCON - GALIURO TRIMMED WHITE-NOSED COATI BIOLOGICALLY BEST
CORRIDOR.....102*

FIGURE 74: PROGRESSION OF THE SANTA CATALINA/RINCON – GALIURO LINKAGE DESIGN106

Terminology

Biologically Best Corridor: A continuous swath of land expected to be the best route for one focal species to travel from a potential population core in one wildland block to a potential population core in the other wildland block. In some cases, the biologically best corridor consists of 2 or 3 strands.

Focal Species: A group of species chosen to represent the movement needs of all wildlife species in the linkage planning area. Focal species should include (a) species narrowly dependent on a single habitat type, (b) area-sensitive species, and (c) species most sensitive to barriers. Focal species should also include both passage species (able to travel between wildland blocks in a few days or weeks) and corridor dwellers (requiring multiple generations to move between wildland blocks). For some focal species, GIS analysis might not include a corridor model

Habitat Connectivity: The extent to which an area of the landscape facilitates ecological processes such as wildlife movement, seed dispersal, and gene flow. Habitat connectivity is reduced by habitat fragmentation.

Habitat Fragmentation: The process through which previously intact areas of wildlife habitat are divided into smaller disconnected areas by roads, urbanization, or other barriers.

Linkage Design: The land that should – if conserved – maintain or restore the ability of wildlife to move between the wildland blocks. The Linkage Design was produced by joining the biologically best corridors for individual focal species, and then modifying this area to delete redundant strands, avoid urban areas, include parcels of conservation interest, and minimize edge.

Linkage Planning Area: Includes the wildland blocks and the Potential Linkage Area. If the Linkage Design in this report is implemented, the biological diversity of the entire Linkage Planning Area will be enhanced.

Permeability: The opposite of travel cost, such that a perfectly permeable landscape would have a travel cost near zero. Permeability refers to the degree to which regional landscapes, encompassing a variety of natural, semi-natural and developed land cover types, are conducive to wildlife movement and may sustain ecological processes.

Pixel: The smallest unit of area in a GIS map – 30x30 m in our analyses. Each pixel is associated with a vegetation class, topographic position, elevation, and distance from paved road.

Potential Linkage Area: The area of land between the wildland blocks, where current and future urbanization, roads, and other human activities threaten to prevent wildlife movement between the wildland blocks. The Linkage Design would conserve a fraction of this area.

Riparian: An area that includes vegetation, habitats, or ecosystems that are associated with bodies of water (streams or lakes) or are dependent on the existence of ephemeral (rare), intermittent (infrequent), or perennial (year-round) surface or subsurface water drainage. This can include xeroriparian habitats (washes) that potentially only have surface water for a brief period (i.e. few hours a year) but may contain concentrated vegetation.

Travel Cost: Effect of habitat on a species’ ability to move through an area, reflecting quality of food resources, suitable cover, and other resources. Our model assumes that habitat suitability is the best indicator of the cost of movement through the pixel.

Wildland Blocks: The “rooms” that the Linkage Design is intended to connect. The value of these lands will be eroded if we lose connectivity between them. Wildland blocks can include a variety of land owners. However, wildland blocks must be biologically important to focal species and remain in relatively natural condition for at least 50 years. Although wildland blocks may contain non-natural elements like barracks or reservoirs, they have a long-term prospect of serving as wildlife habitat. Tribal sovereignty includes the right to develop tribal lands within a wildland block.

Executive Summary

Habitat loss and fragmentation are the leading threats to biodiversity, both globally and in Arizona. These threats can be mitigated by conserving well-connected networks of wild areas where natural ecological and evolutionary processes operate over large spatial and temporal scales. Large wildland blocks connected by corridors can maintain top-down regulation by large predators, natural patterns of gene flow, pollination, dispersal, energy flow, nutrient cycling, inter-specific competition, and mutualism. Corridors allow ecosystems to recover from natural disturbances such as fire or flood, and to respond to human-caused disturbance such as climate change and invasions by exotic species. A healthy ecosystem has a direct impact on the economy of an area as well. In an effort to maintain habitat connectivity in southern Arizona, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, in collaboration with the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, has developed this GIS-based linkage design.

Arizona is fortunate to have large conserved wildlands that have not yet been fragmented by development pressures, but there are many man-made barriers on the landscape that prevent a truly interconnected ecological system. With funding through the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, two workshops were held in 2011, bringing together a broad range of stakeholders with backgrounds in planning, wildlife conservation, development, academia, and government to identify and map important wildlife movement areas across Pima County. Stakeholders and partners also highlighted five linkage planning areas where wildlife connectivity is of particular importance to conserve, and that would benefit from a more detailed conservation plan which addresses wildlife permeability issues. These were areas previously not modeled, and largely followed the Critical Landscape Connections broadly-defined in Pima County's Conservation Lands System, as part of the county's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan.

In this report, we used a scientific modeling approach (described at <http://corridordesign.org>) to create a corridor (linkage design) that will conserve and enhance wildlife movement between two protected wildland blocks east of Tucson, Arizona: the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains (Catalina/Rincon), and the Galiuro Mountains (Galiuro). These areas represent a large public investment in biological diversity, and the linkage design presented in this report works to maintain and increase the value of that investment. This linkage design facilitates movement and reproduction of wildlife between the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains, and Galiuro Mountains (see *Figure 1* below).

This linkage design is based on a focal species approach. We identified 18 focal species to model, which are known to inhabit or which historically inhabited the previously mentioned wildland blocks, based on the recommendations of workshop participants, and other agency and academic scientists. Species of Greatest Conservation Need potential species distributions, as identified and modeled in Arizona's State Wildlife Action Plan, were also used to confirm possible focal species presence, through *Habimap Arizona™*. Focal species, in which habitat and/or corridors were modeled as part of this report, include eleven mammals, five reptiles, and two amphibians (see *Table 1* below). Species selected are sensitive to habitat loss and fragmentation, and represent the range of habitat and movement requirements of wildlife found in the region. For example, species such as mule deer are averse to crossing roads. Mountain lion require very large areas to ensure population viability and successful dispersal, and Gila monster and desert tortoise require specialized habitats for survival. The 18 species used to create this linkage design thus provide for the connectivity needs of many others not modeled that are found in the region, as represented by tables of known element occurrence within the linkage design recorded in Arizona's Heritage Data Management System (see *Appendix D* at the end of this report) at the end of this report.

Many of the species identified as having element occurrence within the linkage design are also recognized by Pima County's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan as priority vulnerable, or are federally listed as threatened or endangered.

To identify potential routes between existing protected areas we used GIS methods to identify a biologically best corridor for each focal species to move between the Catalina/Rincon and Galiuro wildland blocks. We also analyzed the size and configuration of suitable habitat patches to verify that the final linkage design provides live-in or move-through habitat for each focal species. We visited focus areas in the field to identify and evaluate barriers to wildlife movement, and we provide detailed mitigations for those barriers in the section titled Linkage Design and Recommendations.

The Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage currently contains few obstacles to wildlife movement. The San Pedro River Valley, in which this linkage passes through, is a relatively pristine place. National Forest, and large ranches currently provide much open space for wildlife to move through. However, some threats to connectivity in this area do exist. Redington and Cascabel Roads, although currently gravel, and passable by wildlife, are increasing in traffic volume. Utility transmission lines are a particular threat to this area, due to the large amounts of riparian habitat within the linkage, and the numerous birds that live and breed here. While this area has seen little development thus far, it is important that a plan to conserve connectivity be established before threats to wildlife movement are well established. Conservation of this linkage requires a proactive planning approach, rather than a reactionary one. This area remains permeable to a wide variety of wildlife species, and that permeability should be maintained into the future. It is important to consider this linkage design for any future projects that may threaten wildlife movement in the future.

This report contains recommendations to maintain permeability for wildlife throughout the linkage design, ultimately allowing the movement of wildlife populations, and associated flow of genes, between the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains, and the Galiuro Mountains to continue. This linkage design presents a vision that would maintain large-scale ecosystem processes that are essential to the continued integrity of existing conservation investments. Without accommodating wildlife needs through thoughtful land-use and project planning, the high level of connectivity in this area will suffer.

Next Steps

This linkage design is a science-based starting point for conservation actions. The plan can be used as a resource for regional land managers to understand their critical role in sustaining biodiversity and ecosystem processes. Relevant aspects of this plan can be folded into management plans of agencies managing public lands. Regulatory agencies can use this information to help inform decisions regarding impacts on streams and other habitats. This report can also help motivate and inform watershed planning, habitat restoration, conservation easements, zoning, and land acquisition. Implementing this plan will take decades, and collaboration among county planners, land management agencies, resource management agencies, land conservancies, and private landowners.

Public education and outreach is vital to the success of this effort, both to change land use activities that threaten wildlife movement, and to generate appreciation for the importance of the linkage design. Public education can encourage residents at the urban-wildland interface to become active stewards of the land and to generate a sense of place and ownership for local habitats and processes. Such voluntary cooperation is essential to preserving linkage function. The biological information, maps, figures, tables, and photographs in this plan are ready materials for interpretive programs.

This report can be particularly useful to transportation planners, such as the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County (RTA), in the event future transportation projects are planned in this area by providing planners with the following:

- Recommendations for the retrofitting of existing road structures, such as culverts and drainage pipes, to improve use by wildlife. Modification of existing road structures or their replacement with more wildlife-compatible structures, along with the installation of associated fencing, may offer a cost-effective alternative to the construction of new wildlife crossings.
- Recommendations for the construction of new wildlife crossing structures and associated fencing to funnel wildlife towards structures. As always, before the commitment of substantial funding, these recommendations should be verified by on the ground wildlife research, such as telemetry and road-kill studies.
- Recommendations for new wildlife transportation research. Using this plan may help prioritize research funding proposals to the RTA, by providing particular locations along transportation routes where more wildlife research is needed. This plan may also increase efficiency of research projects, by focusing study areas to within the modeled linkage design.

Ultimately, we hope this linkage conservation plan will be used to protect an interconnected system of natural space, where suitable habitats for wildlife can remain intact, and be combined with effective mitigation measures, which will allow our native biodiversity to thrive, at minimal cost to other human endeavors.

Table 1: Focal species selected for the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

MAMMALS	Amphibians	REPTILES
*Badger	*Lowland Leopard Frog ^{HDMS/SDCP}	*Desert Box Turtle ^{HDMS/SDCP}
*Black Bear	*Sonoran Desert Toad	*Giant Spotted Whiptail ^{HDMS/SDCP}
*Black-tailed Jackrabbit		*Gila Monster ^{HDMS}
*Coues' White-tailed Deer		*Sonoran Desert Tortoise ^{HDMS}
*Desert Bighorn Sheep		*Sonoran Whipsnake
*Jaguar ^{HDMS}		
*Javelina		
*Kit Fox		
*Mountain Lion		
*Mule Deer		
*White-nosed Coati		

*: Species in which habitat and/or corridors were modeled in this report. The other species were not modeled because there were insufficient data to quantify habitat use in terms of available GIS data (e.g., species that select small rocks), because the species does not historically occur in both wildland blocks, or because the species probably can travel (e.g., by flying) across unsuitable habitat.

HDMS: Species in which element occurrence data is collected as part of Arizona’s Heritage Data Management System managed by the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Element occurrence data, or data of breeding importance to a species, is collected and managed as part of Heritage Data Management System for animal and plant species of concern in Arizona, for management actions on the ground (see *Appendix D* at the end of this report).

SDCP: Species which were specifically identified as Priority Vulnerable, or federally listed as threatened or endangered, or other special status as recognized by the Pima County Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (also see *Appendix D* at the end of this report).




Figure 1: The linkage design between the Santa Catalina/Rincon and Galiuro wildland blocks

Introduction

Nature Needs Room to Move

Arizona's growing human population and expanding infrastructure has consequences for Pima County's wildlife species and the habitats on which they depend. While human development and disturbance can adversely affect wildlife by causing direct loss or degradation of habitat, the disruption of wildlife movement patterns is a less obvious, but equally important, consequence. All wildlife move across the landscape to varying extents in order to acquire the resources necessary for survival: food, water, protective cover, and mates. Mountain lions, black bears, and mule deer roam over vast expanses that can encompass thousands of acres, while smaller animals such as Chiricahua leopard frogs engage in essential movements in a much smaller area. There is also variation in the temporal patterns of animal movement: some animal movements occur on a daily basis, while seasonal migrations may occur annually, and the dispersal of young from their natal sites to secure new breeding territories happens only once in an individual's lifetime. These diverse movement patterns ensure individual survival and in doing so help protect local populations from extinction (Laurance 1991; Beier and Loe 1992), ensure genetic diversity and reduce the risk of inbreeding via gene flow (Beier and Loe 1992; Bennett 1999), and facilitate critical ecological processes such as pollination and seed dispersal.

Habitat fragmentation, or the process through which previously intact areas of habitat are divided into smaller disconnected areas by roads, urbanization, and other barriers, decreases the degree of habitat connectivity of the landscape for wildlife that once moved freely through a mosaic of natural vegetation types. Habitat fragmentation is a major reason for regional declines in native species and can have consequences for Arizona's wildlife, ranging from direct mortality on roadways to the genetic isolation of fragmented populations. This disruption of animal movement patterns also negatively affects human welfare by increasing the risk of wildlife-vehicle collisions and the frequency of unwanted "close encounters" with wildlife.

However, the effects of habitat fragmentation can often be mitigated by identifying and protecting areas that wildlife use for movement, known as wildlife linkages or wildlife corridors (Beier and Noss 1998; Bennett 1999; Haddad et al. 2003; Eggers et al. 2009; Gilbert-Norton et al. 2010). Ridgelines, canyons, riparian areas, cliffs, swaths of forest or grassland, and other landscape or vegetation features can serve as wildlife linkages. Wildlife linkages are most effective when they connect (or are located within) relatively large and unfragmented areas referred to as wildland blocks. Habitat blocks are areas large enough to sustain healthy wildlife populations and support essential biological processes into the future (Noss 1983; Noss and Harris 1986; Noss 1987; Noss et al. 1996).

Wildlife linkage planning should include conservation of wildlife linkages and the habitat blocks they connect, and, in most cases, require the implementation of multiple strategies such as land acquisition, community planning for developments, open space conservation, and habitat restoration. Installation of roadway mitigation features including wildlife crossing structures and fencing to funnel wildlife to crossing structures are important considerations that are best incorporated into the early planning stages of transportation and development projects.

Benefits of Wildlife Linkage Planning

Identifying and conserving habitat connectivity by maintaining wildlife linkages can provide many important benefits for both humans and wildlife.

Benefits to Wildlife

By preserving the ability of wildlife species to move between or within habitat blocks, linkages allow animals to access essential resources such as food and water during their daily activities. They also allow longer seasonal migratory movements between summer and winter habitats and facilitate the dispersal movements of animals in search of mates or breeding sites. Linkages that connect otherwise isolated populations help prevent small populations from extinction (Laurance 1991; Beier and Loe 1992), help maintain genetic diversity, and reduce the risk of inbreeding (Beier and Loe 1992; Bennett 1999). Habitat connectivity also helps ensure that critical ecological processes such as pollination and seed dispersal, which often depend on animal intermediaries, are maintained. In some cases the linkages themselves may sustain actively reproducing wildlife populations (Perault and Lomolino 2000; Beier et al. 2007). Linkages are also expected to play an important role in helping animal populations adapt to and endure the effects of climate change by allowing animals to shift their range with latitude or elevation as vegetation communities change their distribution and suitable environmental conditions shift on the landscape (Hannah et al. 2002; Glick et al. 2009).

Knowledge of wildlife linkage locations helps inform project planners about what appropriate mitigation needs to occur for roads that affect many wildlife species. Roadway mitigation features such as crossing structures and parcel acquisitions, can be expensive and should be designed and implemented to accommodate “umbrella species” which will, by proxy, serve many species’ movements (Beier et al. 2008; Lowery and Blackman 2007). However, certain species may require specific landscape features (i.e. ridgelines, stream corridors, etc.), vegetation composition and structure, crossing structure designs (i.e. specific height), and certain thresholds of human disturbance/activity in order to be functional. Planning for effective wildlife crossings must also consider what is going to happen on those lands in the immediate proximity of the crossing, which may also influence priorities for rural and urban open space planning and acquisition. Allowing development to occur near crossing structures and placing structures in locations that do not provide suitable habitat for the target species generally affects their use by wildlife (Beier and Loe 1992).

Benefits to People

Maintaining an interconnected network of wildland blocks will provide benefits to the local human communities as well, perhaps most obviously by improving public safety. It has been estimated that approximately 20% of the land area in the United States is ecologically affected by the country’s road network (Forman et al. 2003). The implications of this widespread impact include threats to connectivity and hazards to motorists (Forman and Alexander 1998). One study estimated that each year more than 200 motorists are killed and approximately 29,000 are injured as a result of deer-vehicle collisions in the United States (Conover 1995). Such collisions can cost \$2 billion annually (Danielson and Hubbard 1998). Identifying important wildlife movement areas that traverse transportation corridors prior to the construction of new roads or road improvements allows for the informed siting of wildlife-friendly over- and underpasses that can greatly reduce the likelihood of collisions (Clevenger et al. 2001; Forman et al. 2003; Dodd et al 2007). Along Arizona State Route 260, for example, a combination of wildlife underpasses and ungulate-proof fencing reduced elk-vehicle collisions by 80% (Dodd et al. 2007).

As the optimal objective of providing wildlife linkages is to maintain the connectivity between wildland blocks, there are circumstances where it is important to accommodate a linkage that, either partially or in its entirety, crosses through urban and suburban environments where open spaces invite (intended or not) passive recreation activities. In such situations, the linkage may also serve as a buffer between developed

areas and wildland blocks and can help protect the wildland network from potentially damaging external influences. Incorporating and designing rural and urban greenways and/or open spaces that support wildlife movement into municipal planning efforts also helps retain the natural vistas and aesthetic attributes that Arizona residents and visitors value. Since evidence suggests that some species are sensitive to the presence of humans (Clevenger and Waltho 2000; Taylor and Knight 2003), multi-use buffer zones should be made wide enough to maintain separation between human recreation activities and the needs of the wildlife species using the corridor.

Maintaining linkages that facilitate the ecological health of wildland blocks can also be a significant investment in contributing to the diversity and vitality of an area's economy. The economic value associated with fish and wildlife-related recreation is significant for Pima County and contributes greatly to Arizona's economy. A national survey of fishing, hunting, and wildlife-associated recreation has been conducted about every five years since 1955 to evaluate national trends. The survey provides information on the number of participants in fishing, hunting, and wildlife watching (observing, photographing, and feeding wildlife), and the amount of time and money spent on these activities. In the most recent survey, it was reported that in 2006, state resident and nonresidents spent \$2.1 billion on fishing, hunting, and watchable wildlife related recreation in Arizona (U.S. Department of the Interior 2006). In 2001, a county-level analysis of the national survey data revealed that in Pima County watchable wildlife activities generated a total economic effect of \$327 million, supporting 3,196 jobs, providing residents with \$91 million in salary and wages, and generating \$2.3 million in state tax revenue (Southwick Associates 2003). Fishing and hunting recreation generated a total economic effect of \$105 million for the County, supporting 1,187 jobs, providing residents with \$18 million in salary and wages and generating \$5.4 million in state tax revenue (Silberman 2003). These economic benefits illustrate that conserving our wildlife populations, through efforts such as maintaining or restoring habitat connectivity is also good for business in the County.

Overview of Regional Planning Efforts That Acknowledge the Importance of Conserving Wildlife Linkages

There is a long-standing appreciation among local governments, land management agencies, transportation departments, conservation organizations, energy and utility companies, and citizens across Pima County of the importance of conserving wildlife linkages and mitigating the impacts of barriers on wildlife movement.

Open space planning efforts substantively began in Pima County in 1928 with the establishment of Tucson Mountain Park (Pima County 2009). In 1976, the Trails Access Plan was formed to maintain access to existing public lands through parcel acquisition. In 1986, the Critical and Sensitive Wildlife Habitats Study marked the first effort in Pima County to help guide conservation planning by incorporating considerations for wildlife habitat and biology. In 2001, this effort was greatly refined when Pima County's Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System (CLS) was created based on comprehensive scientific and planning input (Pima County 2011; see *Figure 2* below). The CLS represents the conservation reserve design of the widely-acclaimed Pima County Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (SDCP) and was adopted into Pima County's Comprehensive Plan to provide sustainable development guidelines (Pima County 2009). It is noteworthy to point out that in implementing the CLS, the County's evaluation of comprehensive plan amendments and land uses requiring rezoning must consider potential effects to Critical Landscape Connections/CLS designated areas where preserving and enhancing wildlife movement is a primary concern, shown by the purple arrows in the map below (see *Figure 2* below).




Figure 2: The Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System shows the biologically preferred reserve design and works to provide sustainable guidelines for future development. Critical Landscape Connections, or broadly-defined areas where wildlife connectivity is significantly compromised, but can still be improved, are shown by the purple arrows (Pima County 2009).

To aid the implementation of the SDCP, a committee appointed by the Pima County Board of Supervisors developed a Conservation Bond Program which recommended the acquisition of certain properties to conserve community open space and important habitat within the CLS. This \$174 million bond package was approved by Pima County voters in 2004 by an overwhelming majority (Pima County 2011). Subsequent to the voters’ approval, Pima County began acquisition of these properties; to date, upwards of 175,000 acres have been conserved (48,000+ acres acquired and 127,000+ acres held as grazing leases). These bond acquisitions actively protect a diverse array of biologically-rich areas and maintain the landscape network of habitat connectivity throughout Pima County.




Figure 3: The 2004 Conservation Acquisition Bond Program was approved to help implement the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (Pima County 2011). Multi-use lands are important for habitat and wildlife conservation in the region.

In 2006, Pima County voters approved a sales tax increase that allowed the formation of the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County (RTA) to address transportation planning across Pima County (Regional Transportation Authority 2011). As part of that approval, county voters specifically ear-marked \$45 million to be used to incorporate wildlife linkage conservation into transportation projects. Over the 20-year timeframe of the RTA, these funds will mitigate barriers to wildlife movement and reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions.

RTA projects have been successful in coordinating with broader efforts to facilitate wildlife movement. For example, in 2009, two significant events occurred—the Town of Oro Valley incorporated the Tucson – Tortolita – Santa Catalina Mountains Linkage Design (Beier et al. 2006a) through the Arroyo Grande planning area as an amendment to its General Plan (Town of Oro Valley 2008); and the RTA approved the funding to construct one overpass and two underpasses as part of the Arizona Department of Transportation’s improvement to State Route 77 near the Arroyo Grande planning area (Regional Transportation Authority 2011). In addition, a project proposed by the Tohono O’odham Nation and supported by data from the Arizona Wildlife Linkages Assessment gained final approval for RTA funding in December 2011. Through this funding, one overpass and two underpasses will be built over State Route 86 near Kitt Peak.

The need to maintain habitat connectivity for wildlife will only grow as Arizona becomes more fragmented in coming decades as development continues to meet the needs of an expanding human population. Given the relatively undeveloped status of many areas of Pima County at present, we must continue to integrate knowledge of wildlife linkages and mitigation strategies into land-use and transportation planning in the region.

Linkage Planning in Arizona: A Statewide-to-Local Approach

Habitat connectivity can be represented at various spatial scales. In Arizona, we have found it valuable to identify statewide, county-wide, and fine-scale habitat blocks and wildlife linkages to serve different conservation and planning objectives. The linkage planning tools created at each scale have led to a progressive refinement of our knowledge of wildlife movement areas and threats to habitat connectivity across the state, and the fine-scale linkage design presented in this report owes much to the broader-scale efforts that preceded it.

Arizona’s statewide wildlife linkage planning efforts began in 2004 when federal, state, municipal, academic, and non-governmental biologists, and land managers participated in a workshop to map important habitat blocks, linkages, and potential threats to connectivity across the state. This workshop was convened by the Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup, a collaboration that included the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), Arizona Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration, Northern Arizona University (NAU), Sky Islands Alliance, US Bureau of Land Management, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, and the Wildlands Network, and resulted in Arizona’s Wildlife Linkages Assessment (AWLA; Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup 2006; see *Figure 4* below). The AWLA provides a vision for maintaining habitat connectivity in a rapidly growing state and has served as the foundation for subsequent regional and local efforts, including the creation of fine-scale GIS linkage designs by scientists at NAU (available at www.corridor-design.org) which provided the template for this report.

The statewide assessment was followed by an effort to map wildlife linkages and potential barriers within individual Arizona counties. Beginning in 2008 the AGFD partnered with county planners to organize workshops which gathered stakeholders with backgrounds in planning, wildlife conservation, transportation, academia and government.

Overview of the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment

Continuing with the statewide strategy to identify and prioritize linkages at the county level for GIS modeling of wildlife connectivity, AGFD received funding from the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County. This funding allowed AGFD to assemble current knowledge of wildlife linkages and barriers to wildlife movement across Pima County and to help build collaborative partnerships with local jurisdictions for eventual implementation efforts. To accomplish these tasks, AGFD joined with partner organizations (please see Acknowledgments for a list of members of the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Workgroup) to initiate the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment. This project built on prior initiatives including the SDCP and AWLA. The Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment (available at http://www.azgfd.gov/w_c/conn_Pima.shtml) represented a continuation of these previous efforts by identifying wildlife linkages at a finer scale that may have been overlooked in the earlier products, as well as those that will be useful for regional and local transportation or land-use planning efforts (see *Figure 5* below). With input gathered by the stakeholders at the workshops and with additional input by the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Workgroup, five areas encompassing numerous wildlife linkages were suggested as priorities for the development of detailed linkage designs with specific recommendations for implementation. These priority areas largely followed the broadly-defined Critical Landscape Connections from the SDCP. However, additional areas not previously considered as Critical Landscape Connections were also added as a priority to model, due to their biological resources, and threats to wildlife. The Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro linkage planning area was one of those prioritized areas. Other areas include Coyote – Ironwood – Tucson, Kitt Peak, Mexico – Tumacacori – Baboquivari, and Sierrita – Santa Rita.




Figure 4 and Figure 5: Statewide map of wildlife linkages and barriers created by the Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup (2006). County-wide map of wildlife linkage created for the Pima County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment: Report on Stakeholder Input (2012 (Maps: Courtesy Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup and Arizona Game and Fish Department).

Ecological Significance and Existing Conservation Investments of the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage Planning Area

In this section, we describe the ecology and conservation investments of the linkage planning area, including the wildland blocks, and the potential linkage area between them:

Ecological Significance of the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage Planning Area

The Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage area in Pima County lies at the crossroads of two major ecoregions; the Apache Highlands, which create the mountainous sky islands, and the Sonoran Desert, which extends west and south into Mexico. The Sonoran Desert is the most tropical of North America’s warm deserts (Marshall et al. 2000). Bajadas sloping down from the mountains support forests of ancient saguaro cacti, palo verde, and ironwood; creosote bush and bursage desert scrub dominate the lower desert. The Sonoran Desert Ecoregion is home to more than 200 threatened species, and its uniqueness lends to a high proportion of endemic plants, fish, and reptiles (Marshall et al. 2000; The Nature Conservancy 2006). More than 500 species of birds migrate through, breed, or permanently reside in the ecoregion, which are nearly two-thirds of all species that occur from northern Mexico to Canada (Marshall et al. 2000). The Sonoran Desert Ecoregion’s rich biological diversity prompted Olson and Dinerstein (1998) to designate it as one of 233 of the earth’s most biologically valuable ecoregions, whose conservation is critical for maintaining the earth’s biodiversity.

This diversity supports many mammals, reptiles, birds, and amphibian species. Wide-ranging mammals include among others, and badger, mountain lion, and mule deer. Many of these animals move long distances to gain access to suitable foraging or breeding sites, and would benefit significantly from corridors that link large areas of habitat (Turner et al. 1995). Less-mobile species and habitat specialists such as Gila monsters also need corridors to maintain genetic diversity, allow populations to shift their range in response to climate change, and promote recolonization after fire or epidemics.

Two wildland blocks exist here: the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains (Catalina/Rincon), and the Galiuro Mountains (Galiuro). These wildland blocks are separated by various topographic features, including the flat lands of San Pedro Valley between the Catalina/Rincon and Galiuro wildland blocks. Man-made features separating the blocks include: gravel roads, and the farming communities Cascabel and Redington.

Maintaining connectivity between these wildland blocks would help to provide the contiguous habitat necessary to sustain viable populations of sensitive and far ranging species in these ecoregions, and provide the chance for important focal species, such as desert bighorn sheep, to expand their range to historically used habitats. Providing connectivity is paramount in sustaining this unique area’s diverse natural heritage. Future human activities could sever natural connections and alter the functional integrity of this natural system. Conserving linkages will ensure that wildlife will thrive in the wildland blocks and the potential linkage area.

Below is a description of the ecological significance of each wildland block (see *Figure 6* below for a map of land cover categories):

Catalina/Rincon Wildland Block

The Catalina/Rincon wildland block encompasses over 336,000 acres of the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains, east of Tucson, Arizona. These mountains are dominated by pine-oak forest and woodland, which comprise the largest percentages of its land cover classification, along with chaparral and pinyon-

juniper woodland. The wildland block is also comprised of encinal oak woodland, mesquite upland scrub, ponderosa pine woodland, and semi-desert grassland and steppe, among various other land cover types. Elevation here ranges from 2,638 feet to 9,147 feet.

Galiuro Wildland Block

The Galiuro wildland block includes over 144,000 acres of land encompassing the Galiuro Mountains. The majority of the land cover within the wildland block is comprised of pine-oak forest and woodland, chaparral, and pinyon-juniper woodland. Mesquite upland scrub, ponderosa pine woodland, and semi-desert grassland and steppe, also make up the wildland block, among various other land cover types. Barren lands comprise most of the remaining portions. Elevation in this block ranges from 3,419 feet to 7,635 feet.

Conservation Investments in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage Planning Area

The Catalina/Rincon and Galiuro wildland blocks represent large conservation investments that protect habitat for different wildlife species in the linkage planning area. Connectivity between these wildland blocks helps to provide the contiguous habitat necessary to sustain viable populations of sensitive and far ranging species in the Apache Highlands and Sonoran Desert, and provide the chance for important focal species, such as desert bighorn sheep, to expand their range to historically used habitats. Maintaining connectivity is paramount in sustaining this unique area's diverse natural heritage. Future human activities could sever natural connections and alter the functional integrity of this natural system. Conserving and restoring linkages will ensure that wildlife will thrive in the wildland blocks and the potential linkage area:

Below is a description of the conservation investments of each wildland block (see *Figure 7* below for a map of conservation investments):

Catalina/Rincon Wildland Block

The Catalina/Rincon wildland block includes the Pusch Ridge Wilderness which is over 56,000 acres managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Also included is the over 36,000 acre Rincon Mountain Wilderness, administered by the U.S. Forest Service, and the over 71,000 acre Saguaro East Wilderness administered by the U.S. National Park Service. Besides these wilderness areas, the Catalina/Rincon wildland block includes over 265,000 acres of the Coronado National Forest.

Galiuro Wildland Block

Both the over 77,000 acre Galiuro Wilderness, administered by the U.S. Forest Service, and the Redfield Canyon Wilderness, administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, are within a portion of the Galiuro wildland block. Also included as part of this wildland block, is the over 134,000 acres portion of the Coronado National Forest




Figure 6: Land cover in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design




Figure 7: Existing conservation investments in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

The Santa Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Linkage Design

In this section, we describe the linkage design and summarize the barriers to animal movement it encompasses. Methods for developing the linkage design are described in *Appendix A*.

One Linkage Provides Connectivity Across a Diverse Landscape

The Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro Linkage

The Santa Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro linkage runs between the Catalina/Rincon wildland block and the Galiuro wildland block, across the San Pedro Valley. It

spans about 36 km (22 mi) in a straight-line between each wildland block used in this analysis. The linkage design encompasses 336,007 acres (135,978 ha) of land, of which over 46% is State Trust land, 23% is administered by the U.S. Forest Service, 19% is private land, 8% is administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and the rest by the U.S. National Park Service (see *Figure 1* for a map of the linkage design and land ownership at the beginning of this report). It is primarily composed of mesquite upland scrub (18.2%), semi-desert grassland and steppe (13.8%), miscellaneous desert scrub (11.5%), encinal oak woodland (11.5%), creosotebush, mixed desert and thorn scrub (11.5%) and paloverde-mixed cacti desert scrub (11.1%; see *Table 2* below). A range of topographic diversity exists within the

linkage design, providing for the ecological needs of the focal species, as well as creating a buffer against a potential shift in ecological communities due to climate change (see *Figure 8* below). The average slope within the linkage is 9.4% (Range: 0 – 240.9%, SD: 17.9). Most of the land (49.4%) is steep sloped, and flat-gentle sloped (33.2%), with the rest a mix of canyon bottom and ridgetop. Most land aspects are well represented, with the exception of flat aspects.

This linkage between the Santa Catalina and Rincon Mountains, and Galiuro Mountains is a relatively undeveloped and intact landscape. However, barriers to wildlife connectivity still exist:

Redington/Cascabel Road

An animal moving terrestrially between the Catalina/Rincon and Galiuro wildland blocks eventually must cross Redington/Cascabel Roads. Although Redington/Cascabel Roads are currently gravel, Pima County stakeholders indicated traffic volume is increasing (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2012b). Also, this transportation route has been considered for major transportation projects in the past, such as the I-10 bypass (Arizona Department of Transportation 2008).

LINKAGE DESIGN GOALS

- Provide move-through habitat for diverse group of species
- Provide live-in habitat for species with dispersal distances too short to traverse linkage in one lifetime
- Provide adequate area for a metapopulation of corridor-dwelling species to move through the landscape over multiple generations
- Provide a buffer protecting aquatic habitats from pollutants
- Buffer against edge effects such as pets, lighting, noise, nest predation and parasitism, and invasive species
- Allow animals and plants to move in response to climate change

Stream Impediments

The San Pedro River’s riparian habitat is crucial for many species of wildlife, and represents a rare commodity in the arid southwest. The Nature Conservancy (2012) states, “The San Pedro River’s cottonwood-shaded corridor provides critical stopover habitat for millions of migrating birds each year. It is one of only two major rivers that flow north out of Mexico into the United States and is one of the last large undammed rivers in the Southwest.” Threats to this riparian habitat include groundwater withdrawal and damage from off-highway vehicles (Tucson Audubon Society 2012).

Utility Infrastructure

The San Pedro Valley has been considered as a preferred Route for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project (U.S. Bureau of Land Management 2012). Utility infrastructure can be a particular threat in the San Pedro Valley due to the numerous bird species that depend on the San Pedro riparian corridor. The Tucson Audubon Society in partnership with the Arizona Game and Fish Department have designated the Lower San Pedro River as an Important Bird Area, highlighting the importance of this area for a variety of bird species (Tucson Audubon Society 2012).

Table 2: Approximate land cover found within the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

Land Cover Group	Land Cover Class	% of Linkage Design
Evergreen Forest	Encinal (Oak Woodland)	0.5%
Evergreen Forest	Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	0.2%
Grasslands-Herbaceous	Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	0.8%
Scrub-Shrub	Chaparral	0.1%
Scrub-Shrub	Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	0.4%
Scrub-Shrub	Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	9.6%
Scrub-Shrub	Desert Scrub (misc)	1.7%
Scrub-Shrub	Mesquite Upland Scrub	4.2%
Scrub-Shrub	Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	64.5%
Woody Wetland	Riparian Mesquite Bosque	1.4%
Woody Wetland	Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	4.7%
Barren Lands	Barren Lands, Non-specific	2.1%
Barren Lands	Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	0.2%
Barren Lands	Wash	2.7%
Developed and Agriculture	Agriculture	5.2%
Developed and Agriculture	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	0.7%
Developed and Agriculture	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1.3%




Figure 8: Topographic diversity encompassed by Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design: a) Topographic position, b) Slope, c) Aspect

Removing and Mitigating Barriers to Movement

Although roads and utility infrastructure may occupy only a small fraction of the linkage design, their impacts threaten to block animal movement between wildland blocks. In this section, we review the potential impacts of these features on ecological processes, identify specific barriers in the linkage design, and suggest appropriate mitigations.

While roads impede animal movement, and the crossing structures we recommend are important, crossing structures are only part of the overall linkage design. To maintain connectivity between the Catalina/Rincon wildland block, and Galiuro wildland block, it is essential to consider the entire linkage design, including conserving the land within the linkage. **Indeed, investment in a crossing structure would be futile if habitat between the crossing structure and either wildland block is lost.**

All of the waypoints referenced for each section on barriers refer to the following maps (see *Figure 9* below):




Figure 9: Road structures within the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

Impacts of Roads on Wildlife

While the physical footprint of the nearly 4 million miles of roads in the United States is relatively small, the ecological footprint of the road network extends much farther. Direct effects of roads include road mortality, habitat fragmentation and loss, and reduced connectivity. The severity of these effects depends on the ecological characteristics of a given species (see *Table 3* below). Direct road kill affects most species, with severe documented impacts on wide-ranging predators such as the cougar in southern California, the Florida panther, the ocelot, the wolf, and the Iberian lynx (Forman et al. 2003). In a 4-year study of 15,000 km of road observations in Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Rosen and Lowe (1994) found an average of at least 22.5 snakes per km per year killed due to vehicle collisions. Although we may not often think of roads as causing habitat loss, a single freeway (typical width = 50 m, including median and shoulder) crossing diagonally across a 1-mile section of land results in the loss of 4.4% of habitat area for any species that cannot live in the right-of-way. Roads cause habitat fragmentation because they break large habitat areas into small, isolated habit patches which support few individuals; these small populations lose genetic diversity and are at risk of local extinction.

In addition to these obvious effects, roads create noise and vibration that interfere with ability of reptiles, birds, and mammals to communicate, detect prey, or avoid predators. Roads also increase the spread of exotic plants, promote erosion, create barriers to fish, and pollute water sources with roadway chemicals (Forman et al. 2003). Highway lighting also has important impacts on animals (Rich and Longcore 2006).

Table 3: Characteristics which make species vulnerable to the three major direct effects of roads (from Forman et al. 2003)

Characteristics making a species vulnerable to road effects	Effects of Roads		
	Road mortality	Habitat loss	Reduced connectivity
Attraction to road habitat	★		
High intrinsic mobility	★		
Habitat generalist	★		
Multiple-resource needs	★		★
Large area requirements/low density	★	★	★
Low reproductive rate	★	★	★
Behavioral avoidance of roads			★

Mitigation for Roads

Wildlife crossing structures that have been used in North America and Europe to facilitate movement through landscapes fragmented by roads include wildlife overpasses, bridges, culverts, and pipes (see *Figure 10* below). While many of these structures were not originally constructed with ecological connectivity in mind, many species benefit from them (Clevenger et al. 2001; Forman et al. 2003). No single crossing structure will allow all species to cross a road. For example rodents prefer to use pipes and small culverts, while bighorn prefer vegetated overpasses or open terrain below high bridges. A concrete box culvert may be readily accepted by a mountain lion or bear, but not by a deer or bighorn sheep. Small mammals, such as deer mice and voles, prefer small culverts to wildlife overpasses (McDonald and St Clair 2004).

Wildlife overpasses are most often designed to improve opportunities for large mammals to cross busy highways. Forman et al. (2003) documented approximately 50 overpasses that have been built in the world, with only 6 of these occurring in North America. Recently, three overpasses were constructed over U.S. Highway 93 in northwestern Arizona to improve permeability of the highway for desert bighorn sheep and prevent negative wildlife-vehicle interactions based on McKinney and Smith's (2007) desert bighorn movement study. Overpasses are typically 30 to 50 m wide, but can be as large as 200 m wide. In Banff National Park, Alberta, grizzly bears, wolves, and all ungulates (including bighorn sheep, deer, elk, and moose) prefer overpasses to underpasses, while species such as mountain lions prefer underpasses (Clevenger and Waltho 2005).

Wildlife underpasses include viaducts, bridges, culverts, and pipes, and are often designed to ensure adequate drainage beneath highways. For ungulates such as deer that prefer open crossing structures, tall, wide bridges are best. Mule deer in southern California only used underpasses below large spanning bridges (Ng et al. 2004), and the average size of underpasses used by white-tailed deer in Pennsylvania was 15 ft wide by 8 ft high (Brudin 2003). Because most small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and insects need vegetative cover for security, bridged under-crossings should extend to uplands beyond the scour zone of the stream, and should be high enough to allow enough light for vegetation to grow underneath. In the Netherlands, rows of stumps or branches under crossing structures have increased connectivity for smaller species crossing bridges on floodplains (Forman et al. 2003). Black bear and mountain lion prefer less-open structures (Clevenger and Waltho 2005). A bridge is a road supported on piers or abutments above a watercourse, while a culvert is one or more round or rectangular tubes under a road. The most important difference is that the streambed under a bridge is mostly native rock and soil (instead of concrete or corrugated metal in a culvert) and the area under the bridge is large enough that a semblance of a natural stream channel returns a few years after construction. Even when rip-rap or other scour protection is installed to protect bridge piers or abutments, stream morphology and hydrology usually return to near-natural conditions in bridged streams, and vegetation often grows under bridges. In contrast, vegetation does not grow inside a culvert, and hydrology and stream morphology are permanently altered not only within the culvert, but for some distance upstream and downstream from it.




Figure 10: Potential road mitigations (from top to bottom) include: highway overpasses, bridges, culverts, and drainage pipes. Fencing (bottom) should be used to guide animals into crossing structures (Photographs courtesy George Andrejko and Dean Pokrajac, AGFD)

Despite their disadvantages, well-designed and located culverts can mitigate the effects of busy roads for small and medium sized mammals (Clevenger et al. 2001; McDonald and St Clair 2004). Culverts and concrete box structures are used by many species, including mice, shrews, foxes, rabbits, armadillos, river otters, opossums, raccoons, ground squirrels, skunks, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions, black bear, great blue heron, long-tailed weasel, amphibians, lizards, snakes, and southern leopard frogs (Yanes et al. 1995; Brudin III 2003; Dodd et al. 2004; Ng et al. 2004). Black bear and mountain lion prefer less-open structures (Clevenger and Waltho 2005). In south Texas, bobcats most often used 1.85 m x 1.85 m box culverts to cross highways, preferred structures near suitable scrub habitat, and sometimes used culverts to rest and avoid high temperatures (Cain et al. 2003). Culvert usage can be enhanced by providing a natural substrate bottom, and in locations where the floor of a culvert is persistently covered with water, a concrete ledge established above water level can provide terrestrial species with a dry path through the structure (Cain et al. 2003). It is important for the lower end of the culvert to be flush with the surrounding terrain. Some culverts in fill dirt have openings far above the natural stream bottom. Many culverts are built with a concrete pour-off of 8-12 inches, and others develop a pour-off lip due to scouring action of water. A sheer pour-off of several inches makes it unlikely that many small mammals, snakes, and amphibians will find or use the culvert.

General Standards and Guidelines for Wildlife Crossing Structures

Based on the increasing number of scientific studies on wildlife use of highway crossing structures, we offer these standards and guidelines for all existing and future crossing structures intended to facilitate wildlife passage across highways, railroads, and canals.

- 1) **Multiple crossing structures should be constructed at a crossing point to provide connectivity for all species likely to use a given area** (Little 2003). Different species prefer different types of structures (Clevenger et al. 2001, McDonald and St Clair 2004, Clevenger and Waltho 2005, Mata et al. 2005). For deer or other ungulates, an open structure such as a bridge is crucial. For medium-sized mammals, black bear, and mountain lions, large box culverts with natural earthen substrate flooring are optimal (Evink 2002). For small mammals, pipe culverts from 0.3m – 1 m in diameter are preferable (Clevenger et al. 2001, McDonald and St Clair 2004).
- 2) **At least one crossing structure should be located within an individual’s home range.** Because most reptiles, small mammals, and amphibians have small home ranges, metal or cement box culverts should be installed at intervals of 150-300 m (Clevenger et al. 2001). For ungulates (deer, pronghorn, bighorn) and large carnivores, larger crossing structures such as bridges, viaducts, or overpasses should be located no more than 1.5 km (0.94 miles) apart (Mata et al. 2005, Clevenger and Wierzchowski 2006). Inadequate size and insufficient number of crossings are two primary causes of poor use by wildlife (Ruediger 2001).
- 3) **Suitable habitat for species should occur on both sides of the crossing structure** (Ruediger 2001, Barnum 2003, Cain et al. 2003, Ng et al. 2004). This applies to both local and landscape scales. On a local scale, vegetative cover should be present near entrances to give animals security, and reduce negative effects such as lighting and noise associated with the road (Clevenger et al. 2001, McDonald and St Clair 2004). A lack of suitable habitat adjacent to culverts originally built for hydrologic function may prevent their use as potential wildlife crossing structures (Cain et al. 2003). On the landscape scale, “Crossing structures will only be as effective as the land and resource management strategies around them” (Clevenger et al. 2005). Suitable habitat must be present throughout the linkage for animals to use a crossing structure.

- 4) **Whenever possible, suitable habitat should occur *within* the crossing structure.** This can best be achieved by having a bridge high enough to allow enough light for vegetation to grow under the bridge, and by making sure that the bridge spans upland habitat that is not regularly scoured by floods. Where this is not possible, rows of stumps or branches under large span bridges can provide cover for smaller animals such as reptiles, amphibians, rodents, and invertebrates; regular visits are needed to replace artificial cover removed by flood. Within culverts, earthen floors are preferred by mammals and reptiles.
- 5) **Structures should be monitored for, and cleared of, obstructions such as detritus or silt blockages that impede movement.** Small mammals, carnivores, and reptiles avoid crossing structures with significant detritus blockages (Yanes et al. 1995, Cain et al. 2003, Dodd et al. 2004). In the southwest, over half of box culverts less than 8 ft x 8 ft have large accumulations of branches, Russian thistle, sand, or garbage that impede animal movement (Beier, personal observation). Bridged under-crossings rarely have similar problems.
- 6) **Fencing should never block entrances to crossing structures, and instead should direct animals towards crossing structures** (Yanes et al. 1995). In Florida, construction of a barrier wall to guide animals into a culvert system resulted in 93.5% reduction in road kill, and also increased the total number of species using the culvert from 28 to 42 (Dodd et al. 2004). Along Arizona State Route 260, a combination of wildlife underpasses and ungulate-proof fencing reduce elk-vehicle collisions by 80% (Dodd et al. 2007). Fences, guard rails, and embankments at least 2 m high discourage animals from crossing roads (Barnum 2003, Cain et al. 2003, Malo et al. 2004). One-way ramps on roadside fencing can allow an animal to escape if it is trapped on a road (Forman et al. 2003).
- 7) **Raised sections of road discourage animals from crossing roads, and should be used when possible to encourage animals to use crossing structures.** Clevenger et al. (2003) found that vertebrates were 93% less susceptible to road kills on sections of road raised on embankments, compared to road segments at the natural grade of the surrounding terrain.
- 8) **Manage human activity near each crossing structure.** Clevenger and Waltho (2000) suggest that human use of crossing structures should be restricted and foot trails relocated away from structures intended for wildlife movement. However, a large crossing structure (viaduct or long, high bridge) should be able to accommodate both recreational and wildlife use. Furthermore, if recreational users are educated to maintain utility of the structure for wildlife, they can be allies in conserving wildlife corridors. At a minimum, nighttime human use of crossing structures should be restricted.
- 9) **Design culverts specifically to provide for animal movement.** Most culverts are designed to carry water under a road and minimize erosion hazard to the road. Culvert designs adequate for transporting water often have pour-offs at the downstream ends that prevent wildlife usage. At least 1 culvert every 150-300m of road should have openings flush with the surrounding terrain, and with native land cover up to both culvert openings, as noted above.

Specifications for Wildlife Crossing Structures

Based on local on the ground wildlife research, we offer the following specifications for culverts and overpasses. Our recommendations for crossings structures follow these specifications.

The following recommendations are based on culvert design specifications from Lowery et al. (2010):

Small culverts (small mammals; herpetofauna):

- Culverts should be at least 0.3 m (1.5 ft) high.
- Culverts should be spaced every 50 m and contain vegetation cover for predation avoidance.
- For small mammals, fencing made of impenetrable mesh and 3-4 ft high is the most appropriate to reduce road kills and funnel animals.
- For herpetofauna, the crossing structures should include a sandy substrate (reptiles) or moist substrate (amphibians) on the bottom, and have an open top fitted with an open grate positioned flush with the road surface. The grate should allow for adequate rain, light, and air circulation.
- For herpetofauna, fencing of approximately 1.5 – 2.5 ft with a preventative fence top, such as a lipped wall or overhang 6 inches wide is the most appropriate to reduce road kills and funnel animals.

Medium culverts (mid-size mammals):

- Culverts should be at least 2 m (6 ft) high with an openness index (culvert height x width)/length) of at least 0.4.
- Culverts should be spaced every 100 m.
- Fencing should be chain link and approximately 3 – 6 ft high to reduce road kills and funnel animals.

Large culverts (large-size mammals):

- Culverts should be at least 3 m (9 ft) high with an openness index (culvert height x width)/length) of at least 0.9.
- Culverts should be spaced every 500 – 1000 m.
- Fencing should be chain link or woven wire and at least 8 ft high to reduce road kills and funnel animals.

The following overpass specifications are based on Highway 93 overpass specifications recommended by McKinney and Smith (2007):

- Overpasses should connect elevated habitats on both sides of the highway
- Overpasses should measure approximately 160 feet wide and have roughly six feet of topsoil to promote growth of native vegetation.
- Fencing to funnel large-sized mammals into should follow recommendations for fencing by the Arizona Game and Fish Department (2012) for desert bighorn sheep and mule deer, and should be tied into existing culverts to allow use by wildlife.

Existing Roads in the Linkage Design Area

There are over 209 km (129.9 mi) of roads in the linkage design (See *Table 4* below). However, most of these roads are currently gravel and easily passable by wildlife. We focused our field observations on Redington/Cascabel Roads for this report. Most of Redinton/Cascabel Road is also gravel, but traffic volume, and transportation improvement potential is increasing.

Table 4: Roads greater than 1 kilometer in length in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

Road Name	Kilometers	Miles
Bellota Ranch Rd	2.5	1.6
Bellota Ranch Road N	2.1	1.3
Benson-Mammoth Hwy	3.4	2.1
Bunker Hill Rd	6.2	3.9
Canyon Rd	3.6	2.2
Cascabel Rd	27.1	16.8
Cattle Dr	1.1	0.7
Copper Creek Rd	6.6	4.1
Flower Dr	1.4	0.9
Gavin Ranch Rd	2.9	1.8
Happy Valley Rd	3.9	2.4
Keith Ranch Rd	1.7	1.1
Mescal Rd	18.1	11.3
Mulshoe Rd	3.6	2.2
Neds Jeep Trl	1.2	0.7
Ocotillo Rd	19.5	12.1
Old Mesquite Ln	1.7	1.1
Oracle Control Rd	7.9	4.9
Redfield Canyon Rd	1.9	1.2
Redington Rd	32.8	20.4
River Rd	19.9	12.4
Rockspring Ln	1.0	0.6
Sage Hill Rd	1.1	0.6
San Pedro River Rd	10.5	6.5
Six Bar Ranch Rd	4.0	2.5
Teran Rd	1.0	0.6
Tom Rhodes Ranch Rd	10.2	6.3

Recommendations for Crossing Structures in Santa Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Linkage Design

As mentioned in the Santa Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Linkage Design section above, Redington/Cascabel roads, while still passable to wildlife, may be potential barriers to movement as traffic volumes increase.

The following recommendations for retrofitting of existing structures are based on Lowery et al. (2010) culvert design specifications. These recommendations will help maintain wildlife connectivity across Redington/Cascabel roads into the future, and refer to waypoints on the map at the beginning of this section (see *Figure 9* above):

Redington/Cascabel Road

- Road structure RS1, Redfield Canyon Bridge, is a large bridged underpass along Redington Road spanning Redfield Canyon (see *Figure 11* below), and was the only road structure detected near the linkage design in Pima County. This bridge in its current construction should allow the passage of wildlife in the region, and should be considered a priority to maintain during any future transportation projects in the area. Currently, traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure with fencing. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this road structure should be a priority for retrofitting considerations, and should be retrofitted with barriers/fencing according to specifications referenced above for hepetofauna, and medium-sized mammals based on its proximity to biologically best corridors for javelina, giant spotted whiptail, and Sonoran desert tortoise. In the future, this bridge should also be considered for retrofitting with fencing to accommodate large-sized mammal movements based on its current size and construction.
- Road structure RS2, consists of a two corrugated metal drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 12* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipes measure 0.5 m (1.5 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of these structures. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, these pipes should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers/fencing, according to specifications referenced above for hepetofauna, and large-sized mammals. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to biologically best corridors for black bear and desert box turtle.
- Road structure RS3, consists of a single corrugated metal drainage pipe under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 13* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipe measures 0.6 m (2 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this pipe should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers, according to specifications referenced above for hepetofauna. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle.
- Road structure RS4, consists of a two corrugated metal drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 14* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipes measure 0.6 m (2 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this pipe should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers, according to specifications referenced above for hepetofauna. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle.
- Road structure RS5, consists of a two corrugated metal drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 15* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipes measure 0.5 m (1.5 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this pipe should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers, according to specifications referenced above

for hepetafauna. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle.

- Road structure RS6, consists of a two corrugated metal drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 16* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipes measure 0.6 m (2 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this pipe should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers, according to specifications referenced above for hepetafauna. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle.
- Road structure RS7, consists of a one corrugated metal drainage pipe under Cascabel Road (see *Figure 17* below), and is located in Cochise County. The drainage pipe measures 1.4 m (4.5 ft) in diameter. Again, current traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this pipe should be retrofitted with a culvert and barriers, according to specifications referenced above for hepetafauna. This recommendation is based on the structures' proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle.
- Road structure RS8, Tres Alamos Wash Bridge, is a large bridged underpass along Cascabel Road spanning Tres Alamos Wash (see *Figure 18* below), and is located in Cochise County. This bridge in its current construction should allow the passage of wildlife in the region, and should be considered a priority to maintain during any future transportation projects in the area. Currently, traffic volumes may not be large enough to be cause for any retrofitting of this structure with fencing. However, if traffic volumes increase with any future transportation projects, this road structure should be a priority for retrofitting considerations, and should be retrofitted with barriers according to specifications referenced above for hepetafauna, based on its proximity to the biologically best corridor for desert box turtle. In the future, this bridge should also be considered for retrofitting with fencing to accommodate large-sized mammal movements based on its current size and construction.



Figure 11: Redfield Canyon Bridge along Redington Road (RS1)



Figure 12: Drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (RS2)



Figure 13: Drainage pipe under Cascabel Road (RS3)



Figure 14: Drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (RS4)



Figure 15: Drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (RS5)



Figure 16: Drainage pipes under Cascabel Road (RS6)



Figure 17: Drainage pipe under Cascabel Road (RS7)



Figure 18: Tres Alamos Wash Bridge along Cascabel Road (RS8)

Impacts of Stream and Riparian Impediments on Wildlife

Importance of Riparian Systems in the Southwest

Riparian systems are one of the rarest habitat types in North America. In the arid Southwest, about 80% of all animals use riparian resources and habitats at some life stage, and more than 50% of breeding birds nest chiefly in riparian habitats (Krueper 1996). They are of particular value in lowlands (below 5,000 feet) as a source of direct sustenance for diverse animal species (Krueper 1993). For example, the San Pedro River (see *Figure 19* below), and entire San Pedro River Valley, has been called, “One of the last great places...” by The Nature Conservancy (2012), and which also stated about the area’s biodiversity, “The San Pedro River basin is home to 84 species of mammals, 14 species of fish, and 41 species of reptiles and amphibians.” The Tucson Audubon Society, in partnership with the Arizona Game and Fish Department, has highlighted the San Pedro Valley’s importance to birds, by designating it in their Important Bird Area’s (IBA) program as the Lower San Pedro River IBA. The San Pedro River riparian habitat is crucial for numerous species of birds, including many that are federally listed as candidate, threatened, or endangered, such as the western yellow-billed cuckoo and southwestern willow flycatcher (Tucson Audubon Society 2012).

Stream Impediments in the Linkage Design

Most streams in Arizona have areas without surface water or riparian vegetation, and thus are naturally fragmented from the perspective of many wildlife species. But nearly all riparian systems in the Southwest also have been altered by human activity (Stromberg 2000) in ways that increase fragmentation. Fortunately, the San Pedro River is one of the last undammed rivers in the Southwest. Unfortunately, development and active agriculture near the river, is lowering the water table, and parts of the San Pedro River are no longer perennially flowing (The Nature Conservancy 2012). Off-highway vehicle use threatens the riparian vegetation established along the San Pedro River channel (Tucson Audubon Society 2012).

For animals associated with streams or riparian areas, impediments are presented by road crossings, vegetation clearing, livestock grazing, invasion of non-native species, accumulation of trash and pollutants in streambeds, farming in channels, and gravel mining. Groundwater pumping, upland development, water recharge basins, dams, and concrete structures to stabilize banks and channels change natural flow regimes which negatively impacts riparian systems. Increased runoff from urban development not only scours native vegetation but can also create permanent flow or pools in areas that were formerly ephemeral streams. Invasive species, such as bullfrogs and giant reed, displace native species in some permanent waters.

Development increasingly threatens the San Pedro River within the linkage design. Protection of the river and associated riparian areas and will ensure the utility of this corridor remains intact into the future.

Guidelines and Recommendations for Mitigating Stream Impediments

We endorse the following management recommendations for riparian connectivity and habitat conservation in riparian areas.

- 1) **Retain natural fluvial processes** – Maintaining or restoring natural timing, magnitude, frequency, and duration of surface flows is essential for sustaining functional riparian ecosystems (Shafroth et al. 2002; Wissmar 2004).
 - Urban development contributes to a “flashier” (more flood-prone) system. Check dams and settling basins should be required in urban areas within the watershed to increase infiltration and reduce the impact of intense flooding (Stromberg 2000)].
 - Maintain natural channel-floodplain connectivity—do not harden riverbanks and do not build in the floodplain (Wissmar 2004).
 - Release of treated municipal waste water in some riparian corridors has been effective at restoring reaches of cottonwood and willow ecosystems. Habitat quality is generally low directly below the release point but improves downstream (Stromberg et al. 1993). However in an intermittent reach with native amphibians or fishes, water releases should not create perennial (year-round) flows. Bullfrogs can and do displace native amphibians from perennial waters (Kupferberg 1997; Kiesecker and Blaustein 1998; Maret et al. 2006).
- 2) **Promote base flows and maintain groundwater levels within the natural tolerance ranges of native plant species** – Subsurface water is important for riparian community health, and can be sustained more efficiently by reducing ground water pumping near the river, providing municipal water sources to homes, and reducing agricultural water use through use of low-water-use crops, and routing return flows to the channel (Stromberg 1997; Colby and Wishart 2002). Cottonwood/willow habitat requires maintaining water levels within 9 feet (2.6 m) below ground level (Lite and Stromberg 2005).
- 3) **Maintain or improve native riparian vegetation** – Moist surface conditions in spring and flooding in summer after germination of tamarisk will favor native cottonwood/willow stands over the invasive tamarisk (Stromberg 1997). Pumps within ½ mile of the river or near springs should cease pumping in early April through May, or, if this is impossible, some pumped water should be spilled on to the floodplain in early April to create shallow pools through May (Wilbor 2005). Large mesquite bosques should receive highest priority for conservation protection because of their rarity in the region; mesquite, netleaf hackberry, elderberry, and velvet ash trees should not be cut (Stromberg 1992; Wilbor 2005).
- 4) **Maintain biotic interactions within evolved tolerance ranges.** Arid Southwest riparian systems evolved under grazing and browsing pressure from deer and pronghorn antelope—highly mobile grazers and browsers. High intensity livestock grazing is a major stressor for riparian systems in hot Southwest deserts; livestock should thus be excluded from stressed or degraded riparian areas (Belsky et al. 1999; National Academy of Sciences 2002). In healthy riparian zones, grazing pressure should not exceed the historic grazing intensity of native ungulates (Stromberg 2000).
- 5) **Eradicate non-native invasive plants and animals** – Hundreds of exotic species have become naturalized in riparian corridors, with a few becoming significant problems like tamarisk and Russian olive. Removing stressors and reestablishing natural flow regimes can help bring riparian communities back into balance, however some exotics are persistent and physical eradication is necessary to restore degraded systems (Stromberg 2000; Savage 2004; but see D’Antonio and

Meyerson 2002). Elimination of unnatural perennial surface pools can eradicate water-dependent invasives like bullfrogs, crayfish, and mosquitofish.

- 6) **Where possible, protect or restore a continuous strip of native vegetation at least 200 m wide along each side of the channel.** Buffer strips can protect and improve water quality, provide habitat and connectivity for a disproportionate number of species (compared to upland areas), and provide numerous social benefits including improving quality of life for residents and increasing nearby property values (Fisher and Fischenich 2000; Parkyn 2004; Lee et al. 2004). Continuous corridors provide important wildlife connectivity but recommended widths to sustain riparian plant and animal communities vary widely (from 30 to 500 m) (Wenger 1999; Fisher and Fischenich 2000; Wenger and Fowler 2000; Environmental Law Institute 2003). At a minimum, buffers should capture the stream channel and the terrestrial landscape affected by flooding and elevated water tables (Naiman et al. 1993). Buffers of sufficient width protect edge sensitive species from negative impacts like predation and parasitism. We therefore recommend buffer strips on each side of the channel at least 200 m wide measured perpendicular to the channel starting from the annual high water mark.
- 7) **Enforce existing regulations.** We recommend aggressive enforcement of existing regulations restricting dumping of soil, agricultural waste, and trash in streams, and of regulations restricting farming, gravel mining, and building in streams and floodplains. Restricted activities within the buffer should include OHV use which disturbs soils, damages vegetation, and disrupts wildlife (Webb and Wilshire 1983).



Figure 19: Riparian vegetation along the lower San Pedro River

Impacts of Utility Infrastructure on Wildlife

The growing population in Arizona will also bring increased energy demands. The development of wind and solar energy facilities, utility corridors, and other energy-related infrastructure may be considerable over the next several decades. In 2012, the Bureau of Land Management and Department of Energy will finalize a new policy framework for utility-scale (>20 megawatt) solar energy development on BLM lands, which will govern and guide the future of this rapidly growing form of energy development across millions of acres of land in the sun-rich state of Arizona. Concurrently, the Arizona BLM's Restoration Design Energy Project will delineate low-conflict zones across multiple land ownerships where utility and sub-utility solar and wind development will be incentivized. A recently published review paper by the United States Geological Survey (Lovich and Ennen 2011) concluded, "...it appears that insufficient evidence is available to determine whether solar energy development, as it is envisioned for the desert Southwest, is compatible with wildlife conservation". While this study reveals a void of scientific studies quantifying the effects of this relatively new form of energy development on wildlife, some of the known primary impacts of this form of development (i.e. habitat conversion, fragmentation, and disturbance) have been studied extensively elsewhere and have been shown to affect habitat quantity, quality, and connectivity. The expansion of renewable energy development in the West will also spur new development and retrofit of energy transmission infrastructure. For example, the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, sponsored by numerous energy organizations, proposes to develop approximately 460 miles of two 500-kilovolt transmission lines from Arizona to New Mexico. The proposed right-of-way corridors may be up to 1,000 feet wide (U.S. Bureau of Land Management 2009). A portion of this proposed project runs through Pima County (AGFD 2012b).

Specifically, one of the proposed routes, and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) preferred alternative for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, travels through the San Pedro Valley and this linkage design (see *Figure 20* below). This proposed route threatens habitat connectivity for numerous wildlife species here, particularly that of the many bird species which depend on the mature riparian habitat along the San Pedro River (see *Appendix D* at the end of this report for a list of birds which have element occurrence data within the linkage design as recorded by Arizona's Heritage Data Management System).

Existing utility infrastructure in the Linkage Design

Some small above ground utility lines were observed within the linkage design during field observations. However, these transmission lines are much smaller in size than the SunZia two 500-kilovolt transmission lines proposed for construction through this area. The current utility infrastructure that exists within the linkage design may have little effect on the wildlife species that occur here. However, future large-scale utility infrastructure projects, like the proposed SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, may have numerous negative impacts on wildlife in the San Pedro Valley. Large-scale utility infrastructure projects would threaten wildlife connectivity in this linkage, specifically for the numerous rare bird species that use the area for reproduction (see *Appendix D* at the end of this report).

We provide the following recommendations from the Arizona Game and Fish Department (2009a) as a baseline for mitigating existing utility infrastructure, and the construction of utility infrastructure within the linkage design. However, the construction of large-scale utility infrastructure, like that proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, may be devastating to the area's wildlife, regardless of the mitigation measures implemented.

Recommendations and Guidelines for Mitigating Utility Infrastructure

- 1) **To prevent avian collisions and electrocutions, bury all connecting power lines** associated with the solar development, unless burial of the lines would result in greater impacts to biological or archeological resources.
- 2) **Follow existing disturbed areas during installation to minimize habitat alterations.** In low areas where the power line crosses drainages, the soil should be compacted to reduce the potential for erosion.
- 3) **Trenching and backfilling crews should be close together** to minimize the amount of open trenches at any given time.
- 4) **Ideally, trenching should occur during the cooler months** (October – March) when wildlife are less active. However, there may be exceptions (e.g. critical wintering areas) that need to be assessed on a site-specific basis.
- 5) **Avoid leaving trenches open overnight** as they can be effective traps for wildlife. Where trenches cannot be back-filled immediately, escape ramps should be constructed at least every 45 meters. Escape ramps can be short lateral trenches or wooden planks sloping to the surface. The slope should be less than 45 degrees (1:1).
- 6) **Trenches that have been left open overnight should be inspected daily**, prior to work beginning, and any animals removed. Prior to backfilling, the trenches should be inspected and any animals removed. A monitoring schedule should be developed for each segment of the underground power line installation to ensure minimizing potential impacts to wildlife.
- 7) **All above-ground lines, transformers, or conductors should fully comply with the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) 2006 Standards** to prevent avian fatality, including use of various bird deterrents and avian protection devices. These are available online: [http://www.aplic.org/uploads/files/2643/SuggestedPractices2006\(LR-2\).pdf](http://www.aplic.org/uploads/files/2643/SuggestedPractices2006(LR-2).pdf).



Figure 20: Artist rendition of the estimated crossing location of the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project across the San Pedro River in the southern portion of the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design (Photo: Courtesy Norm Meader, Cascabel Working Group)

Appendix A: Linkage Design Methods

Our goal was to identify a continuous corridor of land which – if conserved and integrated with underpasses or overpasses across potential barriers – will best maintain or restore the ability of wildlife to move between large *wildland blocks*. We call this proposed corridor the *linkage design*.

To create the linkage design, we used GIS approaches to identify optimal travel routes for focal species representing the ecological community in the area¹. By carefully selecting a diverse group of focal species and capturing a range of topography to accommodate climate change, the linkage design should ensure the long-term viability of all species in the protected areas. Our approach included six steps:

- 1) Select focal species.
- 2) Create a habitat suitability model for each focal species.
- 3) Join pixels of suitable habitat to identify potential breeding patches and potential population cores (areas that could support a population for at least a decade).
- 4) Identify the biologically best corridor (BBC) through which each species could move between protected core areas. Join the BBCs for all focal species.
- 5) Ensure that the union of BBCs includes enough population patches and cores to ensure connectivity.
- 6) Carry out field visits to identify barriers to movement and the best locations for underpasses or overpasses within Linkage Design area.

Focal Species Selection

To represent the needs of the ecological community within the potential linkage area, we used a focal species approach (Lambeck 1997). Focal species were originally chosen by the CorridorDesign Team at Northern Arizona University and Regional biologists familiar with species across the State that had one or more of the following characteristics:

- Habitat specialists, especially habitats that may be relatively rare.
- Species sensitive to highways, canals, urbanization, or other potential barriers in the potential linkage area, especially species with limited movement ability.
- Area-sensitive species that require large or well-connected landscapes to maintain a viable population and genetic diversity.
- Ecologically-important species such as keystone predators, important seed dispersers, herbivores that affect vegetation, or species that are closely associated with nutrient cycling, energy flow, or other ecosystem processes.
- Species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, or species of special concern to Arizona Game and Fish Department, US Forest Service, or other management agencies.

Information on each focal species is presented in Appendix B. As indicated in *Table 1* at the beginning of this report, we constructed models for some, but not all, focal species. We did not model species for which there were insufficient data to quantify habitat use in terms of available GIS data (e.g., species that select small rocks), or if the species probably can travel (e.g., by flying) across unsuitable habitat. We

¹ Like every scientific model, our models involve uncertainty and simplifying assumptions, and therefore do not produce absolute “truth” but rather an estimate or prediction of the optimal wildlife corridor. Despite this limitation, there are several reasons to use models instead of maps hand-drawn by species experts or other intuitive approaches. (1) Developing the model forces important assumptions into the open. (2) Using the model makes us explicitly deal with interactions (e.g., between species movement mobility and corridor length) that might otherwise be ignored. (3) The model is transparent, with every algorithm and model parameter available for anyone to inspect and challenge. (4) The model is easy to revise when better information is available.

narrowed the list of identified focal species to 14 that could be adequately modeled using the available GIS layers. For a list of focal species not modeled, but having Heritage Data Management System (HDMS) element occurrence records within the linkage design, see *Appendix D*.

Habitat Suitability Models

We created habitat suitability models (see *Appendix B*) for each species by estimating how the species responded to four habitat factors that were mapped at a 30x30 m level of resolution (see *Figure 21 below*):

- *Vegetation and land cover.* We used the Southwest Regional GAP Analysis (ReGAP) data, merging some classes to create 46 vegetation and land cover classes as described in *Appendix E*. This dataset was originally classified in 2001 using imagery from previous years. Since, significant development occurred since ReGAP was published, the dataset was updated to represent development using imagery from 2010. This was done by digitizing developed areas on privately owned lands located in areas previously classified in ReGAP as non-developed classes. The digitized areas were then appended to the land cover raster dataset.
- *Elevation.* We used the USGS National Elevation Dataset digital elevation model.
- *Topographic position.* We characterized each pixel as ridge, canyon bottom, flat to gentle slope, or steep slope.
- *Straight-line distance from the nearest paved road or railroad.* Distance from roads reflects risk of being struck by vehicles as well as noise, light, pets, pollution, and other human-caused disturbances.

To create a habitat suitability map, we assigned each of the 46 vegetation classes (and each of 4 topographic positions, and each of several elevation classes and distance-to-road classes) a score from 0 (worst) to 100 (best), where 0-30 is strongly avoided (0 = absolute non-habitat), 30 - 60 may be occasionally used by cannot sustain a breeding population (30 = lowest value associated with occasional use for non-breeding activities), 60-80 is suboptimal but used (60 = lowest value associated with consistent use and breeding), and 80-100 is optimal (80 = lowest score typically associated with successful breeding and 100 = best habitat, highest survival and reproductive success). Whenever possible we recruited biologists with the greatest expertise in each species to assign these scores (see *Acknowledgments*). When no expert was available for a species, three biologists independently assigned scores and, after discussing differences among their individual scores, were allowed to adjust their scores before the three scores were averaged. Regardless of whether the scores were generated by a species expert or our biologists, the scorer first reviewed the literature on habitat selection by the focal species².

This scoring produced 4 scores (land cover, elevation, topographic position, distance from roads) for each pixel, each score being a number between 0 to 100. We then weighted each of the four factors by a weight between 0% and 100%, subject to the constraint that the 4 weights must sum to 100%. We calculated a weighted geometric mean³ using the 4 weighted scores to produce an overall habitat suitability score that was also scaled 1-10 (USFWS 1981). For each pixel of the landscape, the weighted geometric mean was calculated by raising each factor by its weight, and multiplying the factors:

$$\text{HabitatSuitabilityScore} = \text{Veg}^{W1} * \text{Elev}^{W2} * \text{Topo}^{W3} * \text{Road}^{W4}$$

² Clevenger et al.(2002) found that literature review significantly improved the fit between expert scores and later empirical observations of animal movement.

³ In previous linkage designs, we used arithmetic instead of geometric mean.

We used these habitat suitability scores to create a habitat suitability map that formed the foundation for the later steps.




Figure 21: Example moving window analysis which calculates the average habitat suitability surrounding a pixel. a) original habitat suitability model, b) 3x3-pixel moving window, c) 200m radius moving window

Identifying Potential Breeding Patches and Potential Population Cores

The habitat suitability map provides scores for each 30x30-m pixel. For our analyses, we also needed to identify – both in the Wildland blocks and in the Potential linkage area – areas of good habitat large enough to support reproduction. Specifically, we wanted to identify:

- *potential habitat patches*: areas large enough to support a breeding unit (individual female with young, or a breeding pair) for one breeding season. Such patches could be important stepping-stones for species that are unlikely to cross a potential linkage area within a single lifetime.
- *potential population cores*: areas large enough to support a breeding population of the focal species for about 10 years.

To do so, we first calculated the suitability of any pixel as the average habitat suitability in a neighborhood of pixels surrounding it. We averaged habitat suitability within a 3x3-pixel neighborhood (90 x 90 m², 0.81 ha) for less-mobile species, and within a 200-m radius (12.6 ha) for more-mobile species⁴. Thus each pixel had both a *pixel score* and a *neighborhood score*. Then we joined adjacent pixels of suitable habitat (pixels with neighborhood score < 5) into polygons that represented potential breeding patches or potential population cores. The minimum sizes for each patch type were specified by the biologists who provided scores for the habitat suitability model.

⁴ An animal that moves over large areas for daily foraging perceives the landscape as composed of relatively large patches, because the animal readily moves through small swaths of unsuitable habitat in an otherwise favorable landscape (Vos et al. 2001). In contrast, a less-mobile mobile has a more patchy perception of its surroundings. Similarly, a small island of suitable habitat in an ocean of poor habitat will be of little use to an animal with large daily spatial requirements, but may be sufficient for the animal that requires little area.

Identifying Biologically Best Corridors

The *biologically best corridor*⁵ (BBC) is a continuous swath of land that is predicted to be the best (highest permeability, lowest cost of travel) route for a species to travel from a potential population core in one wildland block to a potential population core in the other wildland block. *Travel cost* increases in areas where the focal species experiences poor nutrition or lack of suitable cover. *Permeability* is simply the opposite of travel cost, such that a perfectly permeable landscape would have a travel cost at or near zero.

We developed BBCs only for some focal species, namely species that (a) exist in both wildland blocks, or have historically existed in both and could be restored to them, (b) can move between wildland blocks in less time than disturbances such as fire or climate change will make the current vegetation map obsolete, and (c) move near the ground through the vegetation layer (rather than flying, swimming, or being carried by the wind), and (d) have habitat preferences that can reasonably be represented using GIS variables.

The close proximity of the wildland blocks would cause our GIS procedure to identify the BBC in this area where the wildland blocks nearly touch⁶. A BBC drawn in this way has 2 problems: (1) It could be unrealistic (previous footnote). (2) It could serve small wildlife populations near the road while failing to serve much larger populations in the rest of the protected habitat block. To address these problems, we needed to redefine the wildland blocks so that the facing edges of the wildland blocks were parallel to each other. Thus for purposes of BBC analyses, we redefined the wildland blocks such that distances between the edges of each one are nearly uniform.

We then identified potential population cores and habitat patches that fell completely within each wildland block. If potential population cores existed within each block, we used these potential cores as the starting and ending points for the corridor analysis. Otherwise, the start-end points were potential habitat patches within the wildland block or (for a wide-ranging species with no potential habitat patch entirely within a wildland block) any suitable habitat within the wildland block.

To create each biologically best corridor, we used the habitat suitability score as an estimate of the cost of movement through the pixel⁷. For each pixel, we calculated the lowest cumulative cost to that pixel from a starting point in one wildland block. We similarly calculated the lowest cumulative travel cost from the 2nd wildland block, and added these 2 travel costs to calculate the *total travel cost* for each pixel. The total travel cost thus reflects the lowest possible cost associated with a path between wildland blocks that passes through the pixel. Finally, we defined the biologically best corridor as the swath of pixels with the lowest total travel cost and a minimum width of 1000m (See *Figure 22* below). After developing a biologically best corridor for each species, we combined biologically best corridors to form a union of biologically best corridors (UBBC). If a species had two or more distinct we retained multiple strands if they had roughly equal travel cost and spacing among habitat patches.

⁵ Our approach has often been called Least Cost Corridor Analysis (Beier et al. 2006) because it identifies areas that require the least cost of travel (energetic cost, risk of mortality) to the animal. However, we avoid the words “least cost” because it is easily misunderstood as referring to the dollar cost of conserving land or building an underpass.

⁶ The GIS algorithm will almost always select a corridor 100 m long (width of a freeway) over a corridor 5 miles long, even if the habitat is much better in the longer corridor.

⁷ Levey et al. (2005) provide evidence that animals make movement decisions based on habitat suitability.

Patch Configuration Analysis

Although the UBBC identifies an optimum corridor between the wildland blocks, this optimum might be poor for a species with little suitable habitat in the potential linkage area. Furthermore, corridor analyses were not conducted for some focal species (see 3rd paragraph of previous section). To address these issues, we examined the maps of potential population cores and potential habitat patches for each focal species (including species for which a BBC was estimated) in relation to the UBBC. For each species, we examined whether the UBBC encompasses adequate potential habitat patches and potential habitat cores, and we compared the distance between neighboring habitat patches to the dispersal⁸ distance of the species. For those species (*corridor-dwellers*, above) that require multiple generations to move between wildland blocks, a patch of habitat beyond dispersal distance will not promote movement. For such species, we looked for potential habitat patches within the potential linkage area but outside of the UBBC. When such patches were within the species' dispersal distance from patches within the UBBC or a wildland block, we added these polygons to the UBBC to create a *preliminary linkage design*.




Figure 22: a) Landscape permeability layer for entire landscape, b) biologically best corridor composed of most permeable 10% of landscape

⁸ Dispersal distance is how far an animal moves from its birthplace to its adult home range. We used dispersal distances reported by the species expert, or in published literature. In some cases, we used dispersal distance for a closely-related species.

Minimum Linkage Width

Wide linkages are beneficial for several reasons. They (1) provide adequate area for development of metapopulation structures necessary to allow corridor-dwelling species (individuals or genes) to move through the landscape; (2) reduce pollution into aquatic habitats; (3) reduce edge effects such as pests, lighting, noise, nest predation and parasitism, and invasive species; (4) provide an opportunity to conserve natural fire regimes and other ecological processes; and (5) improve the opportunity of biota to respond to climate change.

To address these concerns, we established a minimum width of 1 km (0.62 mi) along the length of each branch of the preliminary linkage design, except where existing urbanization precluded such widening. Beier et al. (2006a and 2006b) widened bottlenecks first by adding natural habitats, and then by adding agricultural lands if no natural areas were available. Our Linkage Design was at least 1 km (0.62 mi) wide throughout, and so no widening due to bottlenecks was needed.

Minimum widths for individual species corridors were estimated based on home range values used to calculate potential habitat patch sizes, and whether or not the species was classified as a *corridor dweller* or *passage species* (see definition for focal species). Based on recommendations from Beier et al. (2008), individual models for corridor dwellers were more than 2 times the width of their home range over 90% of the length of the model, while passage species model widths were less than the width of their home range. Minimum widths for passage species were also maintained over 90% of the corridor model where possible. A few species were kept slightly below this width due to bottlenecks that remained after largely increasing the biologically best corridor slice. Home range widths were estimated from home range area assuming a 2:1 rectangle. It is especially important that the linkage will be useful in the face of climate change. Climate change scientists unanimously agree that average temperatures will rise 2 to 6.4 C over pre-industrial levels by 2100, and that extreme climate events (droughts and storms) will become more common (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005). Although it is less clear whether rainfall will increase or decrease in any location, there can be no doubt that the vegetation map in 2050 and 2100 will be significantly different than the map of current vegetation used in our analyses. Implementing a corridor design narrowly conforming to current distribution of vegetation types would be risky. Therefore, in widening terrestrial linkage strands, we attempted to maximize local diversity of aspect, slope, and elevation to provide a better chance that the linkage will have most vegetation types well-distributed along its length during the coming decades of climate change. Because of the diversity of focal species used to develop the UBBC, our preliminary linkage design had a lot of topographic diversity. Some widening of the UBBC was needed to increase the width of a few merged biologically best corridor strands.

Field Investigations

Although our analyses consider human land use and distance from roads, our GIS layers only crudely reflect important barriers that are only a pixel or two in width, such as freeways, canals, and major fences. Therefore we visited each linkage design area to assess such barriers and identify restoration opportunities. We documented areas of interest using GPS, photography, and field notes. We evaluated existing bridges, underpasses, overpasses, and culverts along highways as potential structures for animals to cross the highway, or as locations where improved crossing structures could be built. We noted recent (unmapped) housing and residential developments, major fences, and artificial night lighting that could impede animal movement, and opportunities to restore native vegetation degraded by human disturbance or exotic plant species.

Appendix B: Individual Species Modeling Parameters

Table 5: Habitat suitability scores and factor weights for each species (Majka et al. 2007). Scores range from 0 (worst) to 100 (best), with > 30 indicating avoided habitat, 30 – 59 occasionally used for non-breeding activities, 60 – 79 consistent use and breeding, and 80 – 100 highest survival and reproductive success.

	Badger	Black Bear	Black-tailed Jackrabbit	Coues' White-tailed Deer	Desert Bighorn Sheep
Factor Weights					
<i>Land Cover</i>	65	75	70	65	30
<i>Elevation</i>	7	10	10	5	10
<i>Topography</i>	15	10	10	15	50
<i>Distance from Roads</i>	13	5	10	15	10
Land Cover					
<i>Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	48	100	28	89	11
<i>Encinal</i>	48	100	50	100	11
<i>Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland</i>	44	78	11	72	11
<i>Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	52	100	50	89	11
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</i>	67	44	67	83	11
<i>Ponderosa Pine Woodland</i>	52	67	44	61	11
<i>Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland</i>	44	67	17	50	11
<i>Aspen Forest and Woodland</i>	41	56	22	56	11
<i>Juniper Savanna</i>	89	33	78	83	22
<i>Montane-Subalpine Grassland</i>	93	67	33	50	44
<i>Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe</i>	100	56	72	44	56
<i>Big Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	78	33	89	17	33
<i>Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland</i>	74	22	67	22	44
<i>Chaparral</i>	52	78	50	78	11
<i>Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub</i>	89	44	94	56	44
<i>Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub</i>	89	11	94	33	44
<i>Desert Scrub (misc)</i>	74	56	100	50	89
<i>Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland</i>	59	78	56	94	11
<i>Mat Saltbush Shrubland</i>	63	0	67	22	22
<i>Mesquite Upland Scrub</i>	74	44	72	72	33
<i>Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	74	22	89	22	44
<i>Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub</i>	63	56	100	22	78
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland</i>	70	44	78	83	22
<i>Sand Shrubland</i>	70	0	78	17	33
<i>Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub</i>	67	0	78	22	22
<i>Greasewood Flat</i>	41	11	61	61	33
<i>Riparian Mesquite Bosque</i>	41	56	61	78	11

	Badger	Black Bear	Black-tailed Jackrabbit	Coues' White-tailed Deer	Desert Bighorn Sheep
<i>Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	41	56	67	89	11
<i>Arid West Emergent Marsh</i>	26	56	11	56	0
<i>Active and Stabilized Dune</i>	22	0	61	6	0
<i>Badland</i>	37	0	22	6	0
<i>Barren Lands, Non-specific</i>	33	0	28	0	22
<i>Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop</i>	15	0	28	22	89
<i>Cliff and Canyon</i>	11	0	28	22	100
<i>Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland</i>	11	0	22	11	89
<i>Playa</i>	15	0	22	6	11
<i>Volcanic Rock Land and Cinder Land</i>	0	0	17	6	33
<i>Warm Desert Pavement</i>	11	0	17	0	11
<i>Wash</i>	22	22	56	22	11
<i>Invasive Grassland or Forbland</i>	63	0	61	44	44
<i>Invasive Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	26	0	56	67	11
<i>Recently Mined or Quarried</i>	7	0	0	11	0
<i>Agriculture</i>	48	44	50	33	0
<i>Developed, Medium - High Intensity</i>	0	0	11	0	0
<i>Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity</i>	30	0	44	17	0
<i>Open Water</i>	7	0	11	33	0
Elevation (ft)					
	0 - 1676: 100	0 - 762: 22	0 - 1829: 100	0 - 610: 33	0 - 899: 89
	1676 - 2438: 78	762 - 1219: 44	1829 - 2438: 67	610 - 914: 44	899 - 1006: 100
	2438 - 4000: 44	1219 - 1981: 100	2438 - 4000: 22	914 - 1219: 89	1006 - 2134: 78
		1981 - 2591: 89		1219 - 1829: 100	2134 - 4000: 33
		2591 - 4000: 67		1829 - 2438: 78	
				2438 - 4000: 33	
Topographic Position					
<i>Canyon Bottom</i>	56	78	72	100	22
<i>Flat - Gentle Slopes</i>	100	44	94	61	33
<i>Steep Slope</i>	26	78	67	94	100
<i>Ridgetop</i>	37	67	67	67	56
Distance from Roads					
	0 - 250: 44	0 - 100: 11	0 - 250: 11	0 - 610: 33	0 - 1000: 44
	250 - 15000: 100	100 - 500: 67	250 - 500: 44	610 - 914: 44	1000 - 15000: 100
		500 - 1500: 100	500 - 1000: 78	914 - 1219: 89	
			1000 - 15000: 100	1219 - 1829: 100	
				1829 - 2438: 78	
				2438 - 4000: 33	

	Desert Box Turtle	Giant Spotted Whiptail	Gila Monster	Jaguar	Javelina
Factor Weights					
<i>Land Cover</i>	40	70	70	60	50
<i>Elevation</i>	15	30	10	5	30
<i>Topography</i>	20	0	10	15	20
<i>Distance from Roads</i>	25	0	10	20	0
Land Cover					
<i>Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	28	89	33
<i>Encinal</i>	44	44	50	89	67
<i>Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	11	78	44
<i>Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	50	78	33
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</i>	0	0	44	89	56
<i>Ponderosa Pine Woodland</i>	0	0	0	67	44
<i>Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0	67	22
<i>Aspen Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0	44	0
<i>Juniper Savanna</i>	33	0	0	78	33
<i>Montane-Subalpine Grassland</i>	0	0	0	67	22
<i>Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe</i>	89	33	56	100	89
<i>Big Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0	67	11
<i>Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland</i>	0	0	0	56	0
<i>Chaparral</i>	44	67	44	67	78
<i>Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub</i>	56	67	78	89	78
<i>Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub</i>	44	0	33	67	67
<i>Desert Scrub (misc)</i>	56	0	78	67	89
<i>Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland</i>	0	0	0	78	22
<i>Mat Saltbush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0	56	0
<i>Mesquite Upland Scrub</i>	78	33	67	67	89
<i>Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0	44	0
<i>Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub</i>	56	0	100	56	100
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland</i>	0	0	44	67	0
<i>Sand Shrubland</i>	89	0	0	44	0
<i>Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub</i>	89	0	0	44	33
<i>Greasewood Flat</i>			0	78	0
<i>Riparian Mesquite Bosque</i>	100	67	56	100	100
<i>Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	100	100	56	100	89
<i>Arid West Emergent Marsh</i>	78	89	89	89	56
<i>Active and Stabilized Dune</i>	0	0	0	11	22

	Desert Box Turtle	Giant Spotted Whiptail	Gila Monster	Jaguar	Javelina
<i>Badland</i>	0	0	0	11	11
<i>Barren Lands, Non-specific</i>	33	0	0	0	11
<i>Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop</i>	0	0	0	44	22
<i>Cliff and Canyon</i>	0	0	89	0	33
<i>Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland</i>	0	0	89	0	0
<i>Playa</i>	33	0	89	0	22
<i>Volcanic Rock Land and Cinder Land</i>	0	0	0	11	11
<i>Warm Desert Pavement</i>	0	0	100	11	22
<i>Wash</i>	33	56	44	22	100
<i>Invasive Grassland or Forbland</i>	56	0	78	56	56
<i>Invasive Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	89	0	67	78	56
<i>Recently Mined or Quarried</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Agriculture</i>	56	67	0	11	33
<i>Developed, Medium - High Intensity</i>	0	67	11	0	33
<i>Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity</i>	56	78	100	0	67
<i>Open Water</i>	56	89	0	33	0
Elevation (ft)					
	0 - 579: 0	0 - 610: 0	0 - 518: 67	0 - 1219: 78	0 - 1524: 100
	579 - 792: 67	610 - 701: 56	518 - 1219: 100	1219 - 1829: 100	1424 - 2134: 78
	792 - 1676: 100	701 - 1219: 100	1219 - 1463: 67	1829 - 2438: 78	2134 - 4000: 0
	1676 - 1981: 56	1219 - 1402: 67	1463 - 1737: 33	2438 - 4000: 67	
	1981 - 4000: 11	1402 - 1524: 11	1737 - 4000: 0		
		1524 - 4000: 0			
Topographic Position	78	0	100	100	100
<i>Canyon Bottom</i>	100	44	56	56	100
<i>Flat - Gentle Slopes</i>	67	0	100	89	33
<i>Steep Slope</i>	67	0	100	67	67
<i>Ridgetop</i>		0			
Distance from Roads	0 - 500: 56		0 - 1000: 56	0 - 250: 1	
	500 - 1500: 78		1000 - 3000: 78	250 - 500: 33	
	500 - 15000: 100		3000 - 15000: 100	500 - 1000: 56	
				1000 - 2000: 89	
				2000 - 15000: 100	

	Kit Fox	Lowland Leopard Frog	Mountain Lion	Mule Deer
Factor Weights				
<i>Land Cover</i>	75	60	70	80
<i>Elevation</i>	0	30	0	0
<i>Topography</i>	15	0	10	15
<i>Distance from Roads</i>	10	10	20	5
Land Cover				
<i>Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	22	0	100	67
<i>Encinal</i>	33	44	100	78
<i>Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland</i>	17	0	78	78
<i>Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	17	33	100	78
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</i>	22	33	100	56
<i>Ponderosa Pine Woodland</i>	17	0	67	56
<i>Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	67	22
<i>Aspen Forest and Woodland</i>	6	0	78	100
<i>Juniper Savanna</i>	78	33	67	67
<i>Montane-Subalpine Grassland</i>	22	0	44	67
<i>Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe</i>	100	44	56	89
<i>Big Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	67	0	44	78
<i>Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland</i>	67	0	44	44
<i>Chaparral</i>	44	44	78	67
<i>Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub</i>	100	44	44	44
<i>Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub</i>	100	44	44	44
<i>Desert Scrub (misc)</i>	100	44	44	44
<i>Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland</i>	56	0	78	67
<i>Mat Saltbush Shrubland</i>	72	0	44	22
<i>Mesquite Upland Scrub</i>	56	44	67	78
<i>Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	67	0	44	56
<i>Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub</i>	78	44	33	78
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland</i>	67	33	89	56
<i>Sand Shrubland</i>	89	0	56	33
<i>Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub</i>	100	0	56	44
<i>Greasewood Flat</i>	83	0	44	44
<i>Riparian Mesquite Bosque</i>	61	44	67	78
<i>Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	50	44	89	78
<i>Arid West Emergent Marsh</i>	11	100	22	56
<i>Active and Stabilized Dune</i>	72	0	22	0
<i>Badland</i>	11	0	44	11
<i>Barren Lands, Non-specific</i>	11	0	22	0
<i>Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop</i>	11	0	44	22
<i>Cliff and Canyon</i>	11	0	44	33

	Kit Fox	Lowland Leopard Frog	Mountain Lion	Mule Deer
<i>Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland</i>	11	0	44	33
<i>Playa</i>	11	44	0	44
<i>Volcanic Rock Land and Cinder Land</i>	22	0	11	22
<i>Warm Desert Pavement</i>	11	0	11	11
<i>Wash</i>	44	44	33	89
<i>Invasive Grassland or Forbland</i>	67	44	33	56
<i>Invasive Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	44	44	56	78
<i>Recently Mined or Quarried</i>	0	0	22	44
<i>Agriculture</i>	33	44	0	44
<i>Developed, Medium - High Intensity</i>	11	33	0	11
<i>Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity</i>	33	44	22	56
<i>Open Water</i>	0	89	11	0
Elevation (ft)				
		0 - 274: 67		
		274 - 1219: 100		
		1219 - 1676: 78		
		1676 - 2134: 44		
		2134 - 4000: 0		
Topographic Position				
Canyon Bottom	33	100	100	89
Flat - Gentle Slopes	100	56	78	89
Steep Slope	56	89	78	67
Ridgetop	67	67	67	44
Distance from Roads				
	0 - 50 : 33	0 - 100: 22	0 - 200: 22	0 - 250: 33
	50 - 250: 78	100 - 500: 56	200 - 500: 44	250 - 1000: 78
	250 - 500: 89	500 - 1000: 78	500 - 1000: 56	1000 - 15000: 100
	500 - 15000: 100	1000 - 1500: 100	1000 - 1500: 89	
	11		1500 - 15000: 100	

	Sonoran Desert Toad	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	Sonoran Whipsnake
Factor Weights			
<i>Land Cover</i>	5	30	30
<i>Elevation</i>	50	25	10
<i>Topography</i>	25	40	45
<i>Distance from Roads</i>	20	5	15
Land Cover			
<i>Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Encinal</i>	33	33	100
<i>Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	100
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Woodland</i>	0	0	100
<i>Ponderosa Pine Woodland</i>	0	0	56
<i>Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Aspen Forest and Woodland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Juniper Savanna</i>	67	0	78
<i>Montane-Subalpine Grassland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe</i>	89	22	89
<i>Big Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Chaparral</i>	67	0	100
<i>Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub</i>	89	44	89
<i>Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub</i>	67	56	33
<i>Desert Scrub (misc)</i>	89	67	78
<i>Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Mat Saltbush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Mesquite Upland Scrub</i>	100	33	89
<i>Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub</i>	100	100	100
<i>Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland</i>	67	0	100
<i>Sand Shrubland</i>	89	0	0
<i>Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub</i>	89	0	0
<i>Greasewood Flat</i>	0	44	0
<i>Riparian Mesquite Bosque</i>	100	56	89
<i>Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	89	0	89
<i>Arid West Emergent Marsh</i>	56	0	78
<i>Active and Stabilized Dune</i>	33	0	0
<i>Badland</i>	0	0	0
<i>Barren Lands, Non-specific</i>	33	0	0
<i>Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop</i>	56	0	78
<i>Cliff and Canyon</i>	56	0	56
<i>Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland</i>	56	0	0
<i>Playa</i>	78	22	0
<i>Volcanic Rock Land and Cinder Land</i>	0	0	67
<i>Warm Desert Pavement</i>	56	44	0
<i>Wash</i>	78	78	67
<i>Invasive Grassland or Forbland</i>	78	11	22
<i>Invasive Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</i>	78	0	0
<i>Recently Mined or Quarried</i>	67	0	0
<i>Agriculture</i>	67	0	0
<i>Developed, Medium - High Intensity</i>	44	0	0
<i>Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity</i>	67	33	56
<i>Open Water</i>	67	0	0

	Sonoran Desert Toad	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	Sonoran Whipsnake
<i>Elevation (ft)</i>			
	0 - 1402: 100	0 - 610: 78	0 - 427: 56
	1402 - 1600: 67	610 - 914: 100	427 - 610: 78
	1600 - 1768: 56	914 - 1524: 78	610 - 1707: 100
	1768 - 4000: 22	1524 - 2134: 33	1707 - 2286: 56
		2134 - 4000: 0	2286 - 4000: 0
<i>Topographic Position</i>			
Canyon Bottom	100	100	100
Flat - Gentle Slopes	100	100	33
Steep Slope	44	44	100
Ridgetop	44	44	100
<i>Distance from Roads</i>			
	0 - 200: 5	0 - 250: 56	0 - 500: 56
	200 - 1000: 67	250 - 500: 67	500 - 1000: 67
	1000 - 3000: 89	500 - 1000: 78	1000 - 2000: 78
	3000 - 15000: 100	1000 - 15000: 100	2000 - 15000: 100

Appendix C: Individual Species Analysis

Badger, *Taxidea taxus*

Justification for Selection

Because of their large home ranges, many parks and protected lands are not large enough to ensure protection of a badger population, or even an individual (NatureServe 2005). Consequently, badgers have suffered declines in recent decades in areas where grasslands have been converted to intensive agricultural areas, and where prey animals such as prairie dogs and ground squirrels have been reduced or eliminated (NatureServe 2005). Badgers are also threatened by collisions with vehicles while attempting to cross highways intersecting their habitat (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004, NatureServe 2005).



Photo courtesy Randy Babb, AGFD

Distribution

Badgers are found throughout the western United States, extending as far east as Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana (Long 1973). They are found in open habitats throughout Arizona.

Habitat Associations

Badgers are primarily associated with open habitats such as grasslands, prairies, and shrublands, and avoid densely wooded areas (New Mexico Game and Fish Department 2004). They may also inhabit mountain meadows, marshes, riparian habitats, and desert communities including creosote bush, juniper and sagebrush habitats (Long and Killingley 1983). They prefer flat to gentle slopes at lower elevations, and avoid rugged terrain (Apps et al. 2002).

Spatial Patterns

Overall yearly home range of badgers has been estimated as 8.5 km² (Long 1973). Goodrich and Buskirk (1998) found an average home range of 12.3 km² for males and 3.4 km² for females, found male home ranges to overlap more than female ranges (male overlap = 0.20, female = 0.08), and estimated density as 0.8 effective breeders per km². Messick and Hornocker (1981) found an average home range of 2.4 km² for adult males and 1.6 km² for adult females, and found a 20% overlap between a male and female home range. Nearly all badger young disperse from their natal area, and natal dispersal distances have been recorded up to 110 km (Messick and Hornocker 1981).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Badgers prefer grasslands and other open habitats on flat terrain at lower elevations. They do not show an aversion to roads (Apps et al. 2002), which makes them sensitive to high road mortality. Vegetation received an importance weight of 65%, while elevation, topography, and

distance from roads received weights of 7%, 15%, and 13%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – We defined minimum potential habitat patch size as 2 km², which is an average of the home range found for both sexes by Messick and Hornocker (1981), and equal to the female home range estimated by Goodrich and Buskirk (1998), minus 1 standard deviation. Minimum potential population core size was defined as 10 km², approximately enough area to support 10 effective breeders, allowing for a slightly larger male home range size and 20% overlap of home ranges (Messick and Hornocker 1981). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species’ large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. However, a biologically best corridor for badger was not included for badger in the linkage design, due to its length, and presence of suitable habitat elsewhere throughout the linkage design.

Results and Discussion

Union of biologically best corridors – The majority of the linkage design captures optimal and suboptimal but used habitat for badger (see *Figure 23* below). Most of the linkage design is also with a potential population core for badger (see *Figure 24* below).




Figure 23: Map of Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro habitat suitability for badger




Figure 24: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for badger

Black Bear, *Ursus americanus*

Justification for Selection

Black bears require a variety of habitats to meet seasonal foraging demands and have naturally low population densities, making them especially vulnerable to habitat fragmentation (Larivière 2001).

Distribution

Black bears are widely distributed throughout North America, ranging from Alaska and Canada to the Sierra Madre Occidental and Sierra Madre Oriental of Mexico (Larivière 2001). In Arizona, they are found primarily in forested areas from the South Rim of the Grand Canyon to mountain ranges in the southeastern part of the state (Hoffmeister 1986).

Habitat Associations

Black bears are primarily associated with mountainous ranges throughout Arizona. Within these areas they use a variety of vegetation types, ranging from semidesert grasslands to encinal woodlands and montane conifer forests (Hoffmeister 1986). Encinal woodlands and conifer-oak woodlands are optimal habitat, providing food such as acorns (LeCount 1982; LeCount et al. 1984; Cunningham 2004). In autumn, black bears use grass and shrub mast as well as prickly pear found in desert scrub (S. Cunningham, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). In many locations throughout Arizona, black bears are found in riparian communities (Hoffmeister 1986), and prefer to bed in locations with 20-60% slopes (S. Cunningham, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Spatial Patterns

Individual black bears do not have territorial interactions, and home ranges of both sexes commonly overlap. Home ranges are generally larger in locations or years of low food abundance, and smaller when food is plentiful and have been observed to range from 2 - 170 km² (Larivière 2001). Daily foraging movements are also dependent on food supply, and have been observed to range from 1.4 – 7 km (Larivière 2001). Males have larger dispersal distances than females, as females stay close to their natal range, and males must migrate to avoid larger males as their mother comes back into estrus (Schwartz & Franzmann 1992). Depending on vegetation, females may disperse up to 20 km, while males often move 20-150 km (S. Cunningham, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Cover is the most important factor for black bears, so vegetation was assigned an importance weight of 75%. Elevation and topography each received a weight of 10%, and distance from roads received a weight of 5%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – We defined minimum potential habitat patch size as 10 km², since this is the minimum amount of optimum habitat necessary to support a female and cub (Bunnell and Tait 1981; S. Cunningham, pers. comm.). Minimum potential habitat core size was defined as 50km², or five

times the minimum patch size. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species' large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Black bear was classified as a passage species based on dispersal distances (S. Cunningham, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for black bear in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro BBC is present. Habitat scores ranged from 0 to 97.5, with an average suitability score of 71.8 (S.D: 22.4; see *Figure 25* below). The majority of the BBC in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage (77.0%) is occupied by a potential population core, with a small portion (0.6%) occupying suitable habitat smaller than a patch, and the rest occupying non-suitable habitat (see *Figure 26* below). Most of the BBC (93.1%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 27* below). The BBC was measured at 48.8 km (30.3 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The majority of the rest of the linkage design captures occasionally used habitat for black bear. Mountainous areas within the linkage offer additional optimal habitat.




Figure 25: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for black bear




Figure 26: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for black bear




Figure 27: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro black bear biologically best corridor

Black-tailed Jackrabbit, *Lepus californius*

Justification for Selection

Black-tailed jackrabbits are important seed dispersers (Best 1996) and are frequently killed by roads (Adams and Adams 1959). They also serve as prey for predators such as hawks, eagles, owls, coyotes, badgers, foxes, and bobcats (Hoffmeister 1986; Best 1996).

Distribution

Black-tailed jackrabbits are common through western North America. They range from western Arkansas and Missouri to the Pacific Coast, and from Mexico northward to Washington and Idaho (Best 1996). They are found throughout the lower elevations of Arizona (Lowe 1978).

Habitat Associations

This species primarily prefers open country, and will typically avoid areas of tall grass or forest where visibility is low (Best 1996). In Arizona, black-tailed jackrabbits prefer mesquite, sagebrush, pinyon juniper, and desert scrub (Hoffmeister 1986). They are also found in sycamore, cottonwood, and rabbitbrush habitats (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Dense grass and/or shrub cover is necessary for resting (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Black-tailed jackrabbits are known to avoid standing water, making large canals and rivers possible population barriers (Best 1996).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Spatial Patterns

Home range size varies considerably for black-tailed jackrabbits depending upon distances between feeding and resting areas. Home ranges have been reported from less than 1 sq km to 3 sq km in northern Utah (NatureServe 2005); however, daily movements of several miles to find suitable forage may be common in southern Arizona, with round trips of up to 10 miles each day possible (Hoffmeister 1986). Best (1993) estimated home range size to be approximately 100 ha.

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Due to this species' strong vegetation preferences, vegetation received an importance weight of 70%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads each received weights of 10%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – We defined minimum potential habitat patch size as 100 hectares (Best 1993), and minimum potential habitat core size was defined as 500 ha, or five times the minimum patch size. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Black-tailed jackrabbit was considered a passage species based on the length of daily movement patterns in southern Arizona (Hoffmeister 1986) and distance between wildland blocks used in analysis.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate significant amounts of suitable habitat for black-tailed jackrabbits within the BBC used in the Santa/Catalina - Galiuro linkage. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 27.8 to 99.4, with an average suitability of 93.5 (S.D: 9.0; see *Figure 28* below). Almost the entire BBC (99.6%) is occupied by a potential population core (see *Figure 29* below). Most of the BBC (90.0%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 30* below). The BBC was measured at 51.6 km (32.1 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures considerably more optimal and suboptimal but used habitat and potential population cores for black-tailed jackrabbit in the linkage design.




Figure 28: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for black-tailed jackrabbit




Figure 29: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for black-tailed jackrabbit




Figure 30: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro black-tailed jackrabbit biologically best corridor

Coues' White-tailed Deer, *Odocoileus virginianus couesi*

Justification for Selection

Coues' white-tailed deer are sensitive to human disturbance (Galindo et al. 1993; Ockenfels et al. 1991) and are prey for mountain lions, jaguars, coyotes, bobcats, black bears, and eagles (Knipe 1977; Leopold 1959; Ligon 1927; Ockenfels et al. 1991). They are also important game species. Local populations of these deer have become extinct (apparently due to natural causes) in some small Arizona mountain ranges and connectivity is necessary for natural recolonization to occur.



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

White-tailed deer range throughout most of the coterminous United States, into southern Canada (Smith 1991). As a small-sized, long-eared subspecies of white-tailed deer, Coues' white-tailed deer are found primarily in the mountain ranges of southeastern Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, and northern Mexico (Knipe 1977).

Habitat Associations

The chief habitat association of Coues' white-tailed deer is oak or oak-pinyon-juniper woodlands Hoffmeister 1986; Knipe 1977). They also use chaparral, desert scrub, and mesquite habitats, and forage primarily on shrubs and trees (Gallina et al. 1981). Cacti and grasses are generally not used, and are of little importance to foraging (Gallina et al. 1981; Henry & Sowls 1980; Ockenfels et al. 1991). Coues' white-tailed deer favor canyons and moderately steep slopes, and are usually found within several kilometers of water (Evans 1984; Ligon 1951; Ockenfels et al. 1991). Elevation does not appear to constrain the species; however, vegetation associated with elevation does. Coues' white-tailed deer are susceptible to human disturbance – particularly hunting, dogs, cattle grazing, and roads (Galindo et al. 1993; Ockenfels et al. 1993).

Spatial Patterns

White-tailed deer are not territorial, and may have large overlap of home ranges (Smith 1991). Female home ranges in the Santa Rita Mountains were found to average 5.18 km², while male home ranges averaged 10.57 km² (Ockenfels et al. 1991). Knipe (1977) speculated that Coues' white-tailed deer have a home range from 5-16 km². Galindo-Leal (1992) estimated the density of Coues' white-tailed deer to range from 0.82-14.21 deer/km² in the Michilia Biosphere Reserve of Mexico, while Leopold (1959) estimated a density of 12-15 deer/km² in an undisturbed area of the Sierra Madre Occidental mountain area of Mexico. While this species does not migrate, it does shift habitat use seasonally, eating fruits (nuts, beans, berries) in summer, forbs and browse in fall, and evergreen browse in winter (McCulloch 1973; Welch 1960). Dispersal distance for young males at two areas in southern Texas established new areas of use 4.4±1.0 km and 8.2±4.3 km, respectively, from the center of their autumn home range (McCoy et al. 2005).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Due to this species’ strong preferences for woodlands and shrubs, vegetation received an importance weight of 65%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads receive weight of 5%, 15%, and 15%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – We defined minimum patch size for Coues’ white-tailed deer as 5.2 km², the average home range for females in the Santa Rita Mountains (Ockenfels 1991). While this species exhibits high home range overlap, we defined minimum core size as 26 km², or five times minimum patch size, to ensure potential cores could account for seasonal movements and use of different habitats. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species’ large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Coues’ white-tailed deer was considered a passage species based on large home ranges (Ockenfels et al. 1991) and dispersal distances (McCoy et al. 2005), and the distance between wildland blocks used in analysis. The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for Coues’ white-tailed deer in the trimmed BBC used within the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100.0, with an average suitability of 71.3 within the trimmed BBC (S.D: 18.5; see *Figure 31* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (86.0%) is occupied by a potential population core, with a small portion containing suitable habitat smaller than a patch (0.2%), and the rest containing non-suitable habitat (see *Figure 32* below). All of the trimmed BBC (100.0%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 33* below). The trimmed BBC was measured at 47.5 km (29.5 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional suitable habitat and potential population cores for Coues’ white-tailed deer.




Figure 31: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for Coues' white-tailed deer




Figure 32: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for Coues' white-tailed deer



Figure 33: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Coues' white-tailed deer trimmed biologically best corridor

Desert Bighorn Sheep, *Ovis canadensis nelsoni*

Justification for Selection

Bighorn sheep populations have suffered massive declines in the last century, including local extinctions. Human activities such as alteration of bighorn sheep habitat, urbanization, and grazing by domestic sheep have been largely responsible for population declines (Johnson and Swift 2000; Krausman 2000). These declines, along with barriers to movement such as roads and range fences, have created small, isolated groups of bighorn sheep with a highly fragmented distribution (Singer et al. 2000; Bleich et al. 1990). Isolated bighorn populations are more susceptible to extirpation than large, contiguous populations due to climate change, fire, or disease, especially introduced diseases from domestic sheep (Gross et al. 2000; Singer et al. 2000; Epps et al. 2004).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

Bighorn sheep are found throughout western North America from the high elevation alpine meadows of the Rocky Mountains to low elevation desert mountain ranges of the southwestern United States and northern Mexico (Shackleton 1985). Specifically, their range extends from the mountains and river breaks of southwestern Canada south through the Rocky Mountains and Sierra Nevada, and into the desert mountains of the southwest United States and the northwestern mainland of Mexico (NatureServe 2005). In Arizona, desert bighorns can be found from Kanab Creek and the Grand Canyon west to Grand Wash, as well as in westernmost Arizona eastward to Aravaipa Canyon. Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep are located near Morenci, AZ, north towards Alpine, AZ, and in West Clear Creek near Camp Verde, AZ.

Habitat Associations

Bighorn sheep habitat includes mesic to xeric grasslands found within mountains, foothills, and major river canyons (Shackleton 1985). These grasslands must also include precipitous, rocky slopes with rugged cliffs and crags for use as escape terrain (Shackleton 1985; Alvarez-Cardenas et al. 2001; Rubin et al. 2002; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Slopes >80% are preferred by bighorn sheep, and slopes <40% are avoided (Alvarez-Cardenas et al. 2001). Dense forests and chaparral that restrict vision are also avoided (NatureServe 2005). In Arizona, the desert bighorn subspecies (*O. Canadensis nelsoni*) is associated with feeding grounds that include mesquite, ironwood, palo verde, catclaw coffeeberry, bush muhly, jojoba, brittlebrush, calliandra, and galleta (Hoffmeister 1986). Water is an important and limiting resource for desert bighorn sheep (Rubin et al. 2002). Where possible, desert bighorn will seek both water and food from such plants as cholla, prickly pear, agave, and especially saguaro fruits (Hoffmeister 1986). Bighorn sheep will also occasionally graze on shrubs such as sagebrush, mountain mahogany, cliffrose, and blackbrush (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Elevation range for bighorn sheep varies across their range from 0 – 3660 m (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004), but in Arizona the desert bighorn subspecies is found from 100 – 1000m elevation, with the best habitat found from 900 – 1000 m in the jojoba communities (Hoffmeister 1986; Alvarez-Cardenas et al. 2001).

Spatial Patterns

Home ranges for bighorn sheep vary depending upon population size, availability and connectivity of suitable habitat, and availability of water resources (Singer et al. 2001). Home ranges have been reported to range from 6.1 km² to 54.7 km² (Singer et al. 2001). One desert bighorn sheep study in Arizona reports an average home range of 16.9 ± 3.38 km² for ewes, and home ranges for males that increased with age from 11.7 km² for a one year old to 37.3 km² for a 6 year old (Shackleton 1985). Bighorn sheep that live in higher elevations are known to migrate between an alpine summer range to a lower elevation winter range in response to seasonal vegetation availability and snow accumulation in the higher elevations (Shackleton 1985; NatureServe 2005). Maximum distances for these seasonal movements are about 48 km (Shackleton 1985). Desert bighorns on low desert ranges do not have separate seasonal ranges (Shackleton 1985). Bighorns live in groups, but for most of the year males over 3 years of age live separate from maternal groups consisting of females and young (Shackleton 1985).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Due to this species’ strong topographic preferences, topographic position received an importance weight of 50%, while vegetation, elevation, and distance from roads received weights of 30%, 10%, and 10%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*. *Patch size and configuration analysis* – We defined minimum potential habitat patch size as 16.9 km² (Shackleton 1985), and minimum potential habitat core size was defined as 84.5 km², or five times the minimum patch size. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species’ large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Desert bighorn sheep was considered a passage species due movement distances capable during seasonal movements at higher elevations (Shackleton 1985) and the distances of wildland blocks used in this analysis.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for desert bighorn sheep within the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 95.4, with an average suitability of 63.7 (S.D: 20.4; see *Figure 34* below). Most, 63.4%, of the BBC is occupied by a potential population core, with 3.4% occupied by a suitable habitat smaller than a patch, and 33.2% occupied by non-suitable habitat (see *Figure 35* below). Most of the BBC (92.3%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 36* below). The corridor was measured at 42.6 km (26.4 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures some additional optimal and suboptimal but used habitat for desert bighorn sheep. However, the majority of additional habitat captured by the linkage design is only occasionally used.




Figure 34: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for desert bighorn sheep




Figure 35: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches desert bighorn sheep




Figure 36: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro desert bighorn sheep biologically best corridor

Desert Box Turtle, *Terrapene ornate luteola*

Justification for Selection

The desert box turtle is uncommon in Arizona, and its habitat continues to be limited by recent residential developments (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). Habitat alterations from agriculture also may be eliminating populations in some areas of its range (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004). This turtle is sensitive to highway traffic, and automobiles are considered a significant cause of mortality (Pima Co., Arizona 2001).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

The desert box turtle's range encompasses south-central New Mexico south to central Chihuahua and Sonora, Mexico, and from west Texas across southern New Mexico to the eastern base of the Baboquivari Mountains (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). In Arizona, the desert box turtle occurs in Pima and Santa Cruz counties (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004). This species has historically occurred in the Santa Cruz Valley, but may have been extirpated (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Habitat Associations

This species is associated with arid and semiarid regions, and is found in grasslands, plains, and pastures (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004). It prefers open prairies with herbaceous vegetation and sandy soil (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004). This turtle also occurs in rolling grass and shrub land, as well as open woodlands with herbaceous understory (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). Specifically, it is common to mesquite-dominated bajada and abundant in bajada grasslands, grassland flats, and mesquite-dominated flats, but uncommon in rocky slopes and bajada desertscrub (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004). This turtle has been observed taking refuge in subterranean mammal burrows, especially those of the kangaroo rat (Plummer 2004). Elevation range for this species is 0 to 2000 meters, but elevations of 1,200 to 1,600 meters are most suitable (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). In arid regions such as the linkage planning area, this species is dependent on inhabitable sections of riparian bottoms (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Spatial Patterns

Due to extended periods of unfavorable weather conditions within its range, the desert box turtle is active only a few weeks out of the year (Plummer 2004). During activity, it requires up to 12 ha for its home range, including land with moist soil that is not compacted (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). One study in Cochise County, Arizona reported average home ranges of 1.1 ha in a dry year and 2.5 ha in a wet year (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). Another study at Fort Huachuca found home ranges that varied from 1.6 ha to 12.4 ha, with an average of 8.5 ha (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). Daily movements include early morning and late afternoon excursions to flat water sites, including cattle tanks (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2004; Plummer 2004).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 40%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 15%, 20%, and 25%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 5 ha, and minimum potential core size was defined as 50 ha (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Desert box turtle was considered a corridor dweller due to its small home range size and limited movements (Pima Co., Arizona 2001).

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for desert box turtle within the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 88.3 (S.D: 14.3) (see *Figure 37* below). Most of the BBC (97.7%) is occupied by potential population cores (see *Figure 38* below). Most of the BBC (93.5%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 39* below). The corridor was measured at 68.4 km (42.5 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional optimal and suboptimal but used habitats for desert box turtle.




Figure 37: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for desert box turtle




Figure 38: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for desert box turtle




Figure 39: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro desert box turtle biologically best corridor

Giant Spotted Whiptail, *Aspidoscelis burti stictogrammus*

Justification for Selection

The giant spotted whiptail is thought to be stable; however, little is known of its population trends (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001). This species has a limited distribution, and is listed as Forest Service Sensitive (1999) and Bureau of Land Management Sensitive (2000; Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001). Although the giant spotted whiptail is not considered to be migratory, corridors are needed to connect disjunct populations (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). They are adversely impacted by habitat alteration due to overgrazing of riparian vegetation (Pima Co., Arizona 2001).



Photo courtesy Randy Babb, AGFD

Distribution

This lizard's range is limited to southeastern Arizona including the Santa Catalina, Santa Rita, Pajarito, and Baboquivari Mountains. It is also known to exist in the vicinity of Oracle, Pinal County, and Mineral Hot Springs, Cochise County. Outside of Arizona, the giant spotted whiptail is found in Guadalupe Canyon in extreme southwest New Mexico and northern Sonora, Mexico (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001).

Habitat Associations

Giant spotted whiptails are found in the riparian areas of lower Sonoran life zones, as well as mountain canyons, arroyos, and mesas in arid and semi-arid regions (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). These lizards inhabit dense shrubby vegetation, often among rocks near permanent and intermittent streams, as well as open areas of bunch grass within these riparian habitats (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001). They are able to access lowland desert along stream courses (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). Elevation ranges of suitable habitat are from 2,200 to 5,000 feet (670 to 1,500m) (Pima Co., Arizona 2001).

Spatial Patterns

Giant spotted whiptails require only 2-4 ha for their home range (Rosen et al. 2002). Within this area, they rely on a mosaic of open spaces and cover of dense thickets of thorny scrub while foraging (Pima Co., Arizona 2001). These lizards are not migratory, and hibernate in winter.

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 70%, while elevation received a weight of 30%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum patch size was defined as 4 ha, while minimum core size was defined as 25 ha. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Giant spotted whiptail was considered a corridor dweller in this analysis due to their small home range sizes (Rosen et al. 2002).

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate limited, but some suitable habitat for giant spotted whiptail in the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 59.1 (S.D: 37.8; see Figure 40 below). Some, 48.9%, of the BBC is occupied by potential population cores, with 1.4% occupied by potential habitat patches, 1.4% occupied by suitable habitat smaller than a patch, and the remainder by non-suitable habitat (see Figure 41 below). Most of the BBC (94.1%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see Figure 42 below). The corridor was measured at 75.9 km (47.1 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures some additional suboptimal but used and occasionally used habitat for giant spotted whiptail. However, the majority of additional habitat suitability captured by the linkage design was scored as strongly avoided.




Figure 40: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for giant spotted whiptail




Figure 41: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for giant spotted whiptail




Figure 42: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro giant spotted whiptail biologically best corridor

Gila Monster, *Heloderma suspectum*

Justification for Selection

Gila monsters are state-listed in every state in which they occur, and are listed as Threatened in Mexico (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Gila monsters are susceptible to road kills and fragmentation, and their habitat has been greatly affected by commercial and private reptile collectors (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2002, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002).

Distribution

Gila monsters range from southeastern California, southern Nevada, and southwestern Utah down throughout much of Arizona and New Mexico.



Photo courtesy Randy Babb, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Gila monsters live on mountain slopes and washes where water is occasionally present. They prefer rocky outcrops and boulders, where they dig burrows for shelter (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Individuals are reasonably abundant in mid-bajada flats during wet periods, but after some years of drought conditions, these populations may disappear (Phil Rosen and Matt Goode, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). The optimal elevation for this species is between 1700 and 4000 ft.

Spatial Patterns

Home ranges from 13 to 70 hectares, and 3 to 4 km in length have been recorded (Beck 2005). Gila Monsters forage widely, and are capable of long bouts of exercise, so it is assumed that they can disperse up to 8 km or more (Rose and Goode, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 10%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 35%, 45%, and 10%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 100 ha, and minimum potential core size was defined as 300 ha (Rosen and Goode, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team; Beck 2005). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. While Gila monster may be capable of dispersal of up to 8 km or more, the species was classified as a corridor dweller in this analysis due to distance between wildland blocks. The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for Gila monster in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 89.0 (S.D: 12.0; see *Figure 43* below). Almost the entire trimmed BBC (99.6%) is occupied by potential population cores (see *Figure 44* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (98.8%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 45* below). The trimmed corridor was measured at 54.0 km (33.6 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional optimal and suboptimal but used habitat for Gila monster.




Figure 43: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for Gila monster




Figure 44: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for Gila monster




Figure 45: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro trimmed Gila monster biologically best corridor

Jaguar, *Panthera onca*

Justification for Selection

Jaguars are listed both as a federally endangered species without critical habitat, and as Wildlife Special Concern species by the state of Arizona. They have suffered from a loss of habitat and hunting by ranchers, and persistence in Arizona is contingent on habitat corridors which allow movement from source populations in Mexico (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2004).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

Jaguars have a limited range in Mexico, Guatemala, and Argentina, and are rare in the United States, Bolivia, Panama, Costa Rica, and Honduras, Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela (Seymour 1989). The largest known populations of jaguars exist in the Amazonian rainforest of Brazil. Within Arizona, they historically occurred in the southeastern part of the state, with several recorded sightings in central Arizona and as far north as the south rim of the Grand Canyon (Hoffmeister 1986).

Habitat Associations

Jaguars are adaptable to a variety of conditions, and are most often found in areas with sufficient prey, cover, and water supply (Seymour 1989). Within Arizona, habitat preferences are not clear; however, the species appears to prefer scrub and grasslands, evergreen forest, and conifer forest & woodlands (Hatten et al. 2003). It has been suggested that their apparent preference for grasslands may reflect movement corridors from the Sierra Madres of Mexico into southeast Arizona, rather than a preference for this habitat type (Hatten et al. 2003). Jaguars have a strong preference for water, and are often found within several kilometers of a water source such as perennial rivers or cienegas (Hatten et al. 2003; Arizona Game and Fish Department 2004). They also appear to prefer intermediate to rugged terrain, and seem to be especially sensitive to human disturbance (Hatten et al. 2003; Menke & Hayes 2003).

Spatial Patterns

The home range of jaguars may vary from 10 to 170 km², with smaller home ranges in rain forests, and larger home ranges recorded in open habitats (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2004). In Brazil, the average density of jaguars was approximately one animal per 25 km², with one female ranging up to 38 km², and one male ranging more than 90 km² (Schaller & Crawshaw 1980).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 60%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 5%, 15%, and 20%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum patch size for jaguar was defined as 41 km² and minimum core size as 205 km². To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species' large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Jaguar was classified as passage species in this analysis due to large home range sizes (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2004), and distance between wildland blocks. The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for jaguar in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 83.5 (S.D: 15.5; see Figure 46 below). Almost the entire trimmed BBC (97.9%) is occupied by a potential population core (see Figure 47 below). Most of the trimmed BBC (93.2%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see Figure 48 below). The trimmed corridor was measured at 45.1 km (28.0 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional optimal and suboptimal but used habitat for jaguar.




Figure 46: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for jaguar




Figure 47: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for jaguar




Figure 48: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro trimmed jaguar biologically best corridor

Javelina, *Tayassu tajacu*

Justification for Selection

Young javelina are probably prey items for predators such as coyotes, bobcats, foxes (Hoffmeister 1986), and jaguars (Seymour 1989). Although they habituate well to human development, their herds require contiguous patches of dense vegetation for foraging and bed sites (Hoffmeister 1986; Ticer et al. 2001; NatureServe 2005). Roads are dangerous for urban dwelling javelina (Ticer et al. 1998). Javelina are an economically important game species (Ticer et al. 2001).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

Javelina are found from Northern Argentina and northwestern Peru to north-central Texas, northwestern New Mexico, and into central Arizona (NatureServe 2005). Specifically in Arizona, they occur mostly south of the Mogollon Rim and west to Organ Pipe National Monument (Hoffmeister 1986).

Habitat Associations

Javelina have adapted to a variety of plant communities, varied topography, and diverse climatic conditions (Ticer et al. 2001). However, javelina confine themselves to habitats with dense vegetation (Ticer et al. 2001; Hoffmeister 1986; NatureServe 2005), and rarely are found above the oak forests on mountain ranges (Hoffmeister 1986). Javelina prefer habitat types such as areas of open woodland overstory with shrubland understory, desert scrub, and thickets along creeks and old stream beds (Ticer et al. 1998; Hoffmeister 1986). They also will forage in chaparral (Neal 1959; Johnson and Johnson 1964). Prickly pear cactus provides shelter, food, and water (Ticer et al. 2001; Hoffmeister 1986). Other plants in javelina habitat include palo verde, jojob, ocotillo, catclaw, and mesquite (Hoffmeister 1986). Javelina habituate well to human development, as long as dense vegetation is available (Ticer et al. 2001). Their elevation range is from 2000 to 6500 feet (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002).

Spatial Patterns

Javelina live in stable herds, though occasionally some individuals may move out of the herd to join another or establish their own (Hoffmeister 1986). Home ranges for herds have been reported as 4.7 km² in the Tortolita Mountains (Bigler 1974), 4.93 km² near Prescott (Ticer et al. 1998), and between 1.9 and 5.5 ha in the Tonto Basin (Ockenfels and Day 1990). Dispersal of javelina has not been adequately studied, but they are known to be capable of extensive movements of up to several kilometers (NatureServe 2005).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation as it relates to both forage and cover requirements is very important for javelina. Sowls (1997) lists climate, vegetation, and topography as important factors in javelina habitat use. For this species', vegetation received an importance weight of 50%, while elevation and topography received weights of 30% and 20%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum habitat patch size for javelina was defined as 44 ha, based on an estimate for a single breeding season for one "herd" of one breeding pair. The estimate for minimum habitat core size is 222 ha, based on an estimate of 10 breeding seasons for 1 herd of mean size 9 to 12 animals (Chasa O'Brien, personal comm. with the CorridorDesign Team). The calculation of area is based upon 3 different estimates of density of animals/ha in south-central and southern Arizona. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Javelina was classified as passage species in this analysis due to their known capability of extensive movements (NatureServe 2005).

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for javelina in the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 33.2 to 100, with an average suitability of 91.6 (S.D: 10.8; see *Figure 49* below). Almost the entire BBC (99.6%) is occupied by a potential population core (see *Figure 50* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (99.3%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 51* below). The corridor was measured at 52.0 km (32.3 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional optimal and suboptimal but used habitat for javelina.




Figure 49: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for javelina




Figure 50: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for javelina




Figure 51: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro javelina biologically best corridor

Kit Fox, *Vulpes macrotis*

Justification for Selection

Kit fox are susceptible to habitat conversion and fragmentation due to agricultural, urban, and industrial development.

Distribution and Status

Kit fox are found throughout arid regions of several states in the western U.S., including Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, Nevada, California, Colorado, Idaho, and Oregon (NatureServe 2006). They historically ranged throughout all major desert regions of North America, including the Sonora, Chihuahuan, and Mohave Deserts, as well as the Painted Desert and much of the Great Basin Desert (McGrew 1979). Within Arizona, Kit fox are found in desert grasslands and desert scrub throughout much of southern and western parts of the state.



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Kit fox are mostly associated with desert grasslands and desert scrub, where they prefer sandy soils for digging their dens (Hoffmeister 1986). Most dens are found in easily diggable clay soils, sand dunes, or other soft alluvial soils (McGrew 1979; Hoffmeister 1986).

Spatial Patterns

Spatial use is highly variable for kit fox, depending on prey base, habitat quality, and precipitation (Zoellick and Smith 1992; Arjo et al. 2003). One study in western Utah found a density of 2 adults per 259 ha in optimum habitat, while an expanded study in Utah found density to range from 1 adult per 471 ha to 1 adult per 1,036 ha (McGrew 1979). Arjo et al. (2003) reported home range size from 1,151-4,308 ha. In Arizona, one study found an average home range size of 980 ha for females, and 1,230 ha for males; however, home ranges the authors also reported 75% overlap of paired males and females (Zoellick and Smith 1992).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model –Vegetation received an importance weight of 75%, while topography and distance from roads received weights of 15% and 10%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – In our analyses, we defined minimum patch size for kit fox as 259 ha and minimum core size as 1,295 ha. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species' large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. However, a biologically best corridor for kit fox was not included in the linkage design, due to its length, and ample suitable habitat for the species elsewhere.

Results and Discussion

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly optimal and suboptimal but used habitat (see Figure 52 below) for kit fox, and encompasses numerous potential population cores (see Figure 53 below).




Figure 52: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for kit fox




Figure 53: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for kit fox

Lowland Leopard Frog, *Rana yavapaiensis*

Justification for Selection

This species has a limited distribution and is susceptible to road mortality. They have lost much of their habitat due to development, fragmentation, and water manipulation, and have been negatively impacted by bullfrogs, crayfish, and chytrid fungus (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001).

Distribution and Status

The lowland leopard frog historically ranged throughout low elevation sites in the lower Colorado River and its tributaries in Arizona, New Mexico, California, Nevada, and northern Mexico. Within Arizona, the species is found in the Colorado River near Yuma, and south of the Mogollon Rim (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001).



Photo courtesy Thomas Jones, AGFD

Habitat Associations

This species is 100% dependent on aquatic habitat. They can occur in aquatic systems ranging from desert grasslands to pinyon-juniper. Generally, effective corridors would tend to be in stream bottoms (like Cienega Creek, where it still occurs) and connecting to stock ponds and mountain springs or tinajas via major washes, especially those with intermittent, rather than ephemeral flow (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). Optimal elevation for this species is from 900 to 4,000 ft, although it can be found at higher elevations (Lannoo 2005; P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Spatial Patterns

Very small but suitable sites as small as 0.05 ha, such as stock tanks, exceptional springs, or maintained frog pools, can sustain populations of leopard frogs (Fernandez 1996; P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). The longest recorded movement from a known population of leopard frogs is 5km, although the species could potentially disperse up to 16 km from a huge, burgeoning population (Platz 1990; Rosen & Schwalbe 1997, 1998).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 60%, while elevation and distance from roads received weights of 30% and 10%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum patch size was defined as 0.05 ha, while minimum core size was defined as 0.1 ha (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. However, a biologically best corridor for lowland leopard frog was not included in the linkage design, due the species mostly occurring in the matrix and not the wildland blocks.

Results and Discussion

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional suboptimal but used habitat (see *Figure 54* below) for lowland leopard frog, and encompasses numerous potential population cores (see *Figure 55* below). However, the suitability of this habitat may be overrepresented as data for intermittent and perennial water sources was not available, or included in the modeling process.




Figure 54: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for lowland leopard frog




Figure 55: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for lowland leopard frog

Mountain Lion, *Puma concolor*

Justification for Selection

Mountain lions occur in low densities across their range and require a large area of connected landscapes to support even minimum self sustaining populations (Beier 1993; Logan and Sweanor 2001). Connectivity is important for hunting, seeking mates, avoiding other mountain lions or predators, and dispersal of juveniles (Logan and Sweanor 2001).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Distribution

Historically, mountain lions ranged from northern British Columbia to southern Chile and Argentina, and from coast to coast in North America (Currier 1983). Presently, the mountain lion's range in the United States has been restricted, due to hunting and development, to mountainous and relatively unpopulated areas from the Rocky Mountains west to the Pacific coast, although isolated populations may still exist elsewhere (Currier 1983). In Arizona, mountain lions are found throughout the state in rocky or mountainous areas (Hoffmeister 1986).

Habitat Associations

Mountain lions are associated with mountainous areas with rocky cliffs and bluffs (Hoffmeister 1986; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). They use a diverse range of habitats, including conifer, hardwood, mixed forests, shrubland, chaparral, and desert environments (NatureServe 2005). They are also found in pinyon/juniper on benches and mesa tops (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002). Mountain lions are found at elevations ranging from 0 to 4,000 m (Currier 1983).

Spatial Patterns

Home range sizes of mountain lions vary depending on sex, age, and the distribution of prey. One study in New Mexico reported annual home range size averaged 193.4 km² for males and 69.9 km² for females (Logan and Sweanor 2001). This study also reported daily movements averaging 4.1 km for males and 1.5 km for females (Logan and Sweanor 2001). Dispersal rates for juvenile mountain lions also vary between males and females. Logan and Sweanor's study found males dispersed an average of 102.6 km from their natal sites, and females dispersed an average of 34.6 km. A mountain lion population requires 1000 - 2200 km² of available habitat in order to persist for 100 years (Beier 1993). These minimum areas would support about 15-20 adult cougars (Beier 1993).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – While mountain lions can be considered habitat generalists, vegetation is still the most important factor accounting for habitat suitability, so it received an importance weight of 70%, while topography received a weight of 10%, and distance from roads received a weight of 20%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum patch size for mountain lions was defined as 79 km², based on an average home range estimate for a female in excellent habitat (Logan and Sweanor 2001);

Dickson and Beier 2002). Minimum core size was defined as 395 km², or five times minimum patch size. To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species' large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Mountain lion was classified as a passage species for this analysis based on large home range sizes (Logan and Sweanor 2001; Dickson and Beier 2002). The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for mountain lion in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 74.7 (S.D: 18.7; see *Figure 56* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (89.0%) is occupied by a potential population core (see *Figure 57* below). Almost all of the trimmed BBC (99.7%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 58* below). The trimmed corridor was measured at 47.1 km (29.2 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures additional optimal, suboptimal, and occasionally used habitat for mountain lion.




Figure 56: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for mountain lion




Figure 57: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for mountain lion




Figure 58: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro trimmed mountain lion biologically best corridor

Mule Deer, *Odocoileus hemionus*

Justification for Selection

Mule deer are widespread throughout Arizona, and are an important prey species for carnivores such as mountain lion, jaguar, bobcat, and black bear (Anderson and Wallmo 1984). Road systems may affect the distribution and welfare of mule deer (Sullivan and Messmer 2003).

Distribution

Mule deer are found throughout most of western North America, extending as far east as Nebraska, Kansas, and western Texas. In Arizona, mule deer are found throughout the state, except for the Sonoran desert in the southwestern part of the state (Anderson and Wallmo 1984).



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Mule deer in Arizona are categorized into two groups based on the habitat they occupy. In northern Arizona mule deer inhabit yellow pine, spruce-fir, buckbrush, snowberry, and aspen habitats (Hoffmeister 1986). The mule deer found in the yellow pine and spruce-fir live there from April to the beginning of winter, when they move down to the pinyon-juniper zone (Hoffmeister 1986). Elsewhere in the state, mule deer live in desert shrub, chaparral or even more xeric habitats, which include scrub oak, mountain mahogany, sumac, skunk bush, buckthorn, and manzanita (Wallmo 1981; Hoffmeister 1986).

Spatial Patterns

The home ranges of mule deer vary depending upon the availability of food and cover (Hoffmeister 1986). Home ranges of mule deer in Arizona Chaparral habitat vary from 2.6 to 5.8 km², with bucks' home ranges averaging 5.2 km² and does slightly smaller (Swank 1958, as reported by Hoffmeister 1986). Average home ranges for desert mule deer are larger. Deer that require seasonal migration movements use approximately the same winter and summer home ranges in consecutive years (Anderson and Wallmo 1984). Dispersal distances for male mule deer have been recorded from 97 to 217 km, and females have moved 180 km (Anderson and Wallmo 1984). Two desert mule deer yearlings were found to disperse 18.8 and 44.4 km (Scarborough and Krausman 1988).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation has the greatest role in determining deer distributions in desert systems, followed by topography (Jason Marshal, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). For this reason, vegetation received an importance weight of 80%, while topography and distance from roads received weights of 15% and 5%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum patch size for mule deer was defined as 9 km² and minimum core size as 45 km². To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability

model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the species' large spatial requirements.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Mule deer was classified as a passage species for this analysis based on recorded dispersal distances (Anderson and Wallmo 1984; Scarbrough and Krausman 1988) and distance between wildland blocks.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for mule deer in the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 89.5, with an average suitability of 72.3 (S.D: 14.6; see Figure 59 below). Most of the BBC (95.1%) is occupied by a potential population core (see Figure 60 below). Almost all of BBC (92.1%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see Figure 61 below). The corridor was measured at 40.2 km (25.0 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional optimal, and suboptimal but used habitat for mule deer.




Figure 59: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for mule deer




Figure 60: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for mule deer




Figure 61: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro mule deer biologically best corridor

Sonoran Desert Toad, *Incilius alvarius* (Formerly *Bufo alvarius*)

Justification for Selection

This species is thought to be potentially susceptible to extirpation or demographic impact from road mortality due to its large size, conspicuous activity, numerous observations of road-killed adults, presumed long natural lifespan, and apparent declines in road-rich urban zones (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Distribution

Sonoran desert toads range from southeastern California to southwestern New Mexico (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 2002).



Photo courtesy Randy Babb, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Sonoran desert toads appear capable of occupying any vegetation type, from urbanized park to their maximum elevation. Roads can have a massive mortality impact and presumed population impact, but some populations live near roads that may be peripheral or marginal to the core habitat (P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). Breeding is naturally concentrated in canyons and upper bajada intermittent streams, and on valley floors in major pools, but not naturally frequent on intervening bajadas. With stock ponds, breeding can occur anywhere on the landscape, but valley centers and canyons likely remain as the core areas (P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Spatial Patterns

Little is known about spatial patterns for this species. Rosen (personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team) estimates the smallest area of suitable habitat necessary to support a breeding group for 1 breeding season to be 25 ha, based on limited knowledge of movements and smallest occupied patches in Tucson. Based on unpublished data by Cornejo, adults appear to be highly mobile, and long distance movements (5 km to be conservative) seem likely (P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model –Vegetation received an importance weight of 5%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 50%, 25%, and 20%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 25 ha, and minimum potential core size was defined as 100 ha (Rosen and Mauz 2001; Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Although Sonoran desert toad appears to be mobile, the species was classified as a corridor dweller for this analysis. This was based on its assumed capability of completing movements up to 5km (P. Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team), which are well

less than distances between wildland blocks. The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for Sonoran desert toad in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 70.3 (S.D: 19.7; see *Figure 62* below). Most of the BBC (84.7%) is occupied by a potential population core (see *Figure 63* below). Almost all of BBC (97.0%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 64* below). The corridor was measured at 44.1 km (27.4 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional optimal, and suboptimal but used habitat for Sonoran desert toad.




Figure 62: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for Sonoran desert toad




Figure 63: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for Sonoran desert toad




Figure 64: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Sonoran desert toad biologically best corridor

Sonoran Desert Tortoise, *Gopherus morafkai* (Formerly *Gopherus agassizii*)

Justification for Selection

The Mojave desert tortoise is listed as Threatened by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Sonoran desert tortoise was listed as a Candidate species on December 14, 2010 (FR75No239). Both desert tortoise species are vulnerable to habitat fragmentation, and need connectivity to maintain genetic diversity. Their ability to survive may be limited because of the potential for adult road-kill mortality (Edwards et al. 2003).

Distribution

Desert tortoises are found in deserts throughout California, southeastern Nevada, southwestern Utah, and Arizona. Although once referred to as separate populations of the same species (*Gopherus agassizii*), desert tortoises have now been recognized as two distinct species: the Mojave desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*), which occurs north and west of the Colorado River, and the Sonoran desert tortoise (*Gopherus morafkai*), which occurs south and east of the Colorado River. Murphy et al. (2011), referred to these species with the common names Agassiz's desert tortoise (Mojave desert tortoise), and Morafka's desert tortoise (Sonoran desert tortoise), though AGFD currently does not utilize these common names. Sonoran desert tortoises occur in Pima, Pinal, Yavapai, Mohave, La Paz, Graham, Santa Cruz, Maricopa, Gila, and Yuma Counties within Arizona.



Photo courtesy Audrey Owens, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Tortoises are dependent on soil type and rock formations for shelter. Typical tortoise habitat in the Sonoran Desert is rocky outcrops (Bailey et al. 1995) and bajadas. Zylstra and Steidl (2008) found that tortoises occupied east-facing slopes, and are less likely to occupy north facing slopes. However, AGFD unpublished data has found juveniles mostly on north-facing slopes, and adults on west-facing slopes. Desert tortoises also use burrows excavated into hardened caliche along incised washes (Averill-Murray et al. 2002a). Desert tortoises are obligate herbivores (Ofteidal 2002) so vegetation is an important part of their habitat. However, desert tortoises also occur over a wide range of vegetation (Sinaloan thornscrub - Mojave Desert), so vegetation is therefore a variable resource. Desert tortoises eat both annual and perennial plants. Diets of Sonoran desert tortoises vary among populations in response to seasonal availability of plant species and in response to precipitation amounts (Martin and van Devender 2002). They have even been observed consuming dried plant materials during periods of drought (Averill-Murray et al. 2002b). Optimal habitat is within Arizona Upland Sonoran desert scrub and Move desert scrub, between elevations of 900 and 4,200 feet. However, there have been populations observed in an oak woodland forest at 5,200 feet in the Rincon, Atascosa and Pajarito mountains (van Devender 2002, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2010a), and one in the ponderosa pine dominated coniferous community in the Rincon Mountains at 7,808 feet (Aslan et al. 2003).

Spatial Patterns

Mean home range estimates (minimum convex polygon) from 5 different studies at 6 different sites across the Sonoran Desert are between 7 and 23 ha (Averill-Murray et al. 2002b). Density of tortoise populations

can range from 20 to upwards of 150 individuals per square mile (from 23 Sonoran Desert populations, Averill-Murray et al. 2002b). Desert tortoises are a long-lived species, with estimates of longevity between 60 and 100 years, and a generation time of 12 to 15 years (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2010a). While long-distance movements of desert tortoises appear uncommon, but a few have been observed and are likely important for the long-term viability of populations (Edwards et al. 2004). Desert tortoises may move more than 30km during long-distance movements (Barrett et al. 1990; Averill-Murray and Klug 2000; Edwards 2003).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 30%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 25%, 40%, and 5%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 15 ha, and minimum potential core size was defined as 50 ha (Rosen and Mauz 2001, Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Although long-distance tortoise movements may occur and are likely important for the species (Barrett et al. 1990; Averill-Murray and Klug 2000; Edwards 2003), Sonoran desert tortoise was classified as a corridor dweller in this analysis due to small home range sizes (Averill-Murray et al. 2002b).

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for Sonoran desert tortoise in the BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 71.9 (S.D: 22.6; see *Figure 65* below). Most of the BBC (81.3%) is occupied by potential population cores, with a small portion occupied by suitable habitat smaller than a patch (1.0%; see *Figure 66* below). Almost all of BBC (92.9%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 67* below). The corridor was measured at 74.3 km (46.2 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional suboptimal but used and occasionally used habitat for Sonoran desert tortoise, as well as some additional potential population cores.




Figure 65: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for Sonoran desert tortoise




Figure 66: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for Sonoran desert tortoise




Figure 67: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro Sonoran desert tortoise biologically best corridor

Sonoran Whipsnake, *Masticophis bilineatus*

Justification for Selection

Wide-ranging, active, diurnal snakes including whipsnakes and racers are usually observed to disappear when urban road networks become dense, and the assumption is that road mortality plays a large role (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Distribution

The Sonoran whipsnake is mainly found in the Sonoran desert of Mexico, but also occurs within southern Arizona and New Mexico.



Photo courtesy Randy Babb, AGFD

Habitat Associations

This species tends to prefer areas with rugged topography, and will also use mid-to-high elevation riparian flats. This species is mobile, may occur along or move along desert and grassland washes, and thus might occasionally traverse areas of flat non-habitat between mountains, like some other larger reptiles. Preferred land cover types include Encinal, Pine-Oak Forest, Pinyon-Juniper Woodland, Chaparral, Creosotebush - Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub, and Paloverde-Mixed-Cacti Desert Scrub.

Spatial Patterns

Home range has been estimated as 50 ha for this species (Parizek et al. 1995). Little is known about dispersal distance, but a telemetry study found one large male to move up to 1 km per day (Parizek et al. 1995). Based on observations of other whipsnakes, movement events of up to 4.5 km may be feasible (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Vegetation received an importance weight of 30%, while elevation, topography, and distance from roads received weights of 10%, 45%, and 15%, respectively. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 50 ha, and minimum potential core size was defined as 250 ha (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). To determine potential habitat patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 3x3 neighborhood moving window analysis.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. Sonoran whipsnake was classified as a corridor dweller based on length of assumed movement events (Phil Rosen, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team). The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate ample suitable habitat for Sonoran whipsnake in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 0 to 100, with an average suitability of 94.1 (S.D: 13.0; see *Figure 68* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (98.6%) is occupied by potential population cores (see *Figure 69* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (90.7%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 70* below). The trimmed corridor was measured at 42.5 km (26.4 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional optimal and occasionally used habitat for Sonoran whipsnake, as well as additional potential population cores.




Figure 68: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for Sonoran whipsnake




Figure 69: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for Sonoran whipsnake




Figure 70: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro trimmed Sonoran whipsnake biologically best corridor

White-nosed Coati, *Nasua narica*

Justification for Selection

White-nosed coatis are primarily forest species, and may serve as prey for top carnivores such as mountain lion (New Mexico Game and Fish Department 2004). They also appear to be dispersal-limited, and sensitive to roads and habitat fragmentation.

Distribution

White-nosed coatis are found in southern Arizona and New Mexico, and Texas, and throughout Mexico and Central America (Gompper 1995). In Arizona, coatis are found as far north as the Gila River, and throughout southeastern Arizonan forests.



Photo courtesy George Andrejko, AGFD

Habitat Associations

Coatis are primarily a forest species, preferring shrubby and woodland habitats with good horizontal cover (Gompper 1995; C. Hass, personal comm.). While they do not have strong topographic preferences, they are generally found within several miles of water, and prefer riparian habitats if available (Gompper 1995). In Arizona, elevation places no constraints on habitat use, as this species are found from sea level to mountains exceeding 10,000 feet. While they are not a desert species, coatis will move through desert scrub and shrublands when moving between forested areas (Hoffmeister 1986).

Spatial Patterns

Female coatis and their yearlings (both sexes) live in groups of up to 25 individuals, while males are solitary most of the year (Hoffmeister 1986). In southeastern Arizona, average home range of coati troops was calculated as 13.57 km² (Hass 2002). Home ranges of males overlapped other males up to 61% and overlapped troops up to 67%, while home ranges of troops overlapped each other up to 80% (Hass 2002). Virtually nothing is known about dispersal distance in coatis, and radioed animals have not dispersed more than a few kilometers (Christine Hass, personal comm.). Females are philopatric, but males have been observed at large distances from known coati habitat, and tend to get hit by cars. While successful dispersal of any distance is unknown, it is thought that males may disperse up to 5 km (Christine Hass, personal comm. with CorridorDesign Team).

Conceptual Basis for Model Development

Habitat suitability model – Due to this species’ strong vegetation preferences, vegetation received an importance weight of 95%, while distance from roads received a weight of 5%. For specific scores of classes within each of these factors, see *Table 5*. The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Patch size and configuration analysis – Minimum potential habitat patch size was defined as 13.6 km², the average home range observed in southeastern Arizona by Hass (2002). Minimum potential habitat core size was defined as 68 km², or five times minimum patch size. To determine potential habitat

patches and cores, the habitat suitability model for this species was first averaged using a 200m radius moving window analysis due to the large spatial requirements for coati groups.

Biologically best corridor analysis – We used the methods described in Appendix A to identify the biologically best corridor for this species. White-nosed coati was classified as a passage species based on large home range size (Hass 2002). The original biologically best corridor for this species was trimmed to eliminate “bubble” areas resulting from increasing the width of the other portions of the corridor.

Results and Discussion

Initial biologically best corridor – Modeling results indicate suitable habitat for white-nosed coati in the trimmed BBC used in the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design. Habitat suitability scores ranged from 12.3 to 100, with an average suitability of 64.2 (S.D: 13.0; see *Figure 71* below). The majority of the trimmed BBC (56.0%) is occupied by potential population cores, while a small portion is occupied by potential habitat patches (1.5%) and suitable habitat smaller than a patch (2.2%; see *Figure 72* below). Most of the trimmed BBC (95.5%) was greater than its estimated needed minimum width (see *Figure 73* below). The trimmed corridor was measured at 48.3 km (30.0 mi) in length between wildland blocks used for analysis.

Union of biologically best corridors – The linkage design captures mostly additional suboptimal but used and occasionally used habitat for white-nosed coati, as well as additional potential population cores and potential habitat patches.




Figure 71: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro habitat suitability for white-nosed coati




Figure 72: Map of Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro potential habitat patches for white-nosed coati




Figure 73: Width along the Catalina/Rincon - Galiuro trimmed white-nosed coati biologically best corridor

Appendix D: Species Occurrence in the Linkage Design

The following table represents Heritage Data Management System (HDMS) element occurrence data within the linkage design. This element occurrence data represents observations which are of a reproductive significance to the species, and thus indicate biologically important observations which are crucial for management decisions. (Key: ESA = Federal Endangered Species Act, USFS = US Forest Service, BLM = US Bureau of Land Management, State = Arizona Game and Fish Department, SC = Species of Concern, LT = Listed as threatened, S = Sensitive, WSC = Wildlife Species of Concern, SR = Salvage restricted, collection only with permit. CorridorDesign species are those species previously modeled by the CorridorDesign Team of Northern Arizona University in Arizona Missing Linkages reports. SDCP species are those considered priority vulnerable, or federally listed as threatened and endangered and included in Pima County’s Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan).

Table 6: Species Occurrence in the linkage design as identified through Arizona Heritage Data Management System element occurrence data

Taxonomic Group	Common Name	Scientific Name	ESA	USFS	BLM	STATE	Corridor Design	SDCP
Amphibian	Chiricahua Leopard Frog	<i>Lithobates chiricahuensis</i>	LT			WSC	Yes	Yes
Amphibian	Lowland Leopard Frog	<i>Rana yavapaiensis</i>	SC	S	S	WSC	Yes	Yes
Bird	American Peregrine Falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	SC	S	S	WSC	No	No
Bird	Common Black-Hawk	<i>Buteogallus anthracinus</i>		S		WSC	No	No
Bird	Mississippi Kite	<i>Ictinia mississippiensis</i>				WSC	No	No
Bird	Northern Beardless-Tyrannulet	<i>Camptostoma imberbe</i>		S			No	No
Bird	Northern Goshawk	<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	SC	S	S	WSC	No	No
Bird	Northern Gray Hawk	<i>Buteo nitidus maxima</i>	SC	S		WSC	No	No
Bird	Rufous-winged Sparrow	<i>Peucaea carpalis</i>					No	Yes
Bird	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>	LE			WSC	No	Yes
Bird	Thick-billed Kingbird	<i>Tyrannus crassirostris</i>		S		WSC	No	No
Bird	Tropical Kingbird	<i>Tyrannus melancholicus</i>				WSC	No	No
Bird	Yellow-billed Cuckoo (Western U.S. DPS)	<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>	PS:C	S		WSC	No	Yes
Bird	Zone-tailed Hawk	<i>Buteo albonotatus</i>		S			No	No
Burd	Northern Buff-breasted Flycatcher	<i>Empidonax fulvifrons pygmaeus</i>	SC	S		WSC	No	No
Fish	Desert Pupfish	<i>Cyprinodon macularius</i>	LE			WSC	No	Yes
Fish	Desert Sucker	<i>Catostomus clarkii</i>	SC	S	S		No	Yes
Fish	Gila Chub	<i>Gila intermedia</i>	LE			WSC	No	Yes
Fish	Gila Longfin Dace	<i>Agosia chrysogaster chrysogaster</i>	SC	S	S		No	Yes
Fish	Gila Topminnow	<i>Poeciliopsis occidentalis occidentalis</i>	LE			WSC	No	Yes
Fish	Sonora Sucker	<i>Catostomus insignis</i>	SC	S	S		No	Yes
Fish	Speckled Dace	<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>	SC		S		No	No
Invertebrate	Galiuro Talussnail	<i>Sonorella galiurensis</i>					No	Yes

Taxonomic Group	Common Name	Scientific Name	ESA	USFS	BLM	STATE	Corridor Design	SDCP
Invertebrate	Posta Quemada Talussnail	<i>Sonorella rinconensis</i>					No	Yes
Mammal	Arizona Gray Squirrel	<i>Sciurus arizonensis</i>		S			Yes	No
Mammal	Brazilian Free-tailed Bat	<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>					No	No
Mammal	Cave Myotis	<i>Myotis velifer</i>	SC		S		No	No
Mammal	Greater Western Bonneted Bat	<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	SC	S	S		No	No
Mammal	High Netting Concentration	Bat Foraging Area					No	No
Mammal	Hoary Bat	<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>					No	No
Mammal	Lesser Long-nosed Bat	<i>Leptonycteris curasoae yerbabuena</i>	LE			WSC	No	No
Mammal	Mexican Long-tongued Bat	<i>Choeronycteris mexicana</i>	SC	S	S	WSC	No	Yes
Mammal	Mexican Spotted Owl	<i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i>	LT			WSC	No	Yes
Mammal	Mexican Woodrat	<i>Neotoma mexicana</i>					No	No
Mammal	Pocketed Free-tailed Bat	<i>Nyctinomops femorosaccus</i>		S			No	No
Mammal	Silver-haired Bat	<i>Lasionycteris noctivagans</i>					No	No
Mammal	Western Red Bat	<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i>		S		WSC	No	Yes
Mammal	Western Yellow Bat	<i>Lasiurus xanthinus</i>		S		WSC	No	Yes
Mammal	Yellow-nosed Cotton Rat	<i>Sigmodon ochrognathus</i>	SC	S			No	No
Mammal		Bat Colony					No	No
Plant	Aravaipa Sage	<i>Salvia amissa</i>	SC	S	S		No	No
Plant	Arizona Fleabane	<i>Erigeron arizonicus</i>					No	No
Plant	Arizona Giant Sedge	<i>Carex ultra</i>		S	S		No	No
Plant	Ball Moss	<i>Tillandsia recurvata</i>					No	No
Plant	Bigelow's Tansy-aster	<i>Machaeranthera bigelovii</i> var. <i>bigelovii</i>					No	No
Plant	Catalina Beardtongue	<i>Penstemon discolor</i>		S		HS	No	No
Plant	Chihuahuan Sedge	<i>Carex chihuahuensis</i>		S			No	No
Plant	Chiricahua Mountain Brookweed	<i>Samolus vagans</i>		S			No	No
Plant	Huachuca Water-umbel	<i>Lilaeopsis schaffneriana</i> var. <i>recurva</i>	LE			HS	No	Yes
Plant	Lemmon Cloak Fern	<i>Notholaena lemmonii</i>	SC				No	No
Plant	Lemmon's Stevia	<i>Stevia lemmonii</i>		S			No	No
Plant	Lyre-leaved Twistflower	<i>Streptanthus carinatus</i>					No	No
Plant	Mexican Broomspurge	<i>Euphorbia gracillima</i>					No	No
Plant	Mock-pennyroyal	<i>Hedeoma dentatum</i>					No	No
Plant	Needle-spined Pineapple Cactus	<i>Echinomastus erectocentrus</i> var. <i>erectocentrus</i>	SC			SR	No	Yes
Plant	Nodding Blue-eyed Grass	<i>Sisyrinchium cernuum</i>		S			No	No
Plant	Palm Canyon Justicia	<i>Justicia sonorae</i>					No	No
Plant	Pima Indian Mallow	<i>Abutilon parishii</i>	SC	S	S	SR	No	No
Plant	San Carlos Wild-buckwheat	<i>Eriogonum capillare</i>	SC			SR	No	No

Taxonomic Group	Common Name	Scientific Name	ESA	USFS	BLM	STATE	Corridor Design	SDCP
Plant	Sinaloa Milkweed Vine	<i>Cynanchum ligulatum</i>					No	No
Plant	Stag-horn Cholla	<i>Opuntia versicolor</i>				SR	No	No
Plant	Trumpet Morning-glory	<i>Ipomoea tenuiloba</i>					No	No
Plant		<i>Opuntia engelmannii</i> var. <i>flavispina</i>				SR	No	No
Reptile	Desert Box Turtle	<i>Terrapene ornata luteola</i>			S		Yes	Yes
Reptile	Giant Spotted Whiptail	<i>Aspidoscelis burti stictogrammus</i>	SC	S			Yes	Yes
Reptile	Hooded Nightsnake	<i>Hypsiglena sp. nov.</i>					No	No
Reptile	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	<i>Gopherus agassizii</i> (Sonoran Population)	C	S		WSC	Yes	No
Reptile	Western Black Kingsnake	<i>Lampropeltis getula nigrita</i>					No	No

Appendix E: Creation of Linkage Design

To create the final Linkage Design, we combined biologically best corridors for all focal species modeled, and made several adjustments to the union of biologically best corridors (see *Figure 74* below):

- We trimmed biologically best corridors with “bubble areas” created from widening the strands to meet width requirements over 90% of the corridor where possible. Some corridor dwellers were slightly below the ideal width kept along 90% of the corridor. This was due to certain habitat limitations that did not increase bottlenecks. Trimming biologically best corridors had little effect on the mean habitat suitability located within each corridor.
- We buffered the union of biologically best corridors 300m to remove modeling relicts and edge effects based on recommendations from Majka et al. (2007).
- We added stretches of the San Pedro River, not already included in the linkage design, and buffered the river 200m to capture riparian habitat based on recommendations from Majka et al. (2007).




Figure 74: Progression of the Santa Catalina/Rincon – Galiuro linkage design

Appendix F: Update and Description of Land Cover

Vegetation classes have been derived from the Southwest Regional GAP analysis (ReGAP) land cover layer. To simplify the layer from 77 to 46 classes, we grouped similar vegetation classes into slightly broader classes by removing geographic and environmental modifiers (e.g. Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub and Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub got lumped into “Desert Scrub”, Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland was simplified to Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland).

As mentioned in the Linkage Design Methods (Appendix A), ReGAP was originally classified in 2001 using imagery from previous years. However, significant development had occurred throughout the State since that time. Since development can impact wildlife by fragmenting habitat, and is a major category in ReGAP driving these corridor models, using this dataset for analysis without addressing this issue would have ignored the impact of development in our linkage design. In order to properly address recent levels of development, private lands where development is most likely to occur, previously categorized as non-developed in ReGAP were examined. Areas with development present were digitized and categorized according to ReGAP as Developed, Open Space – Low Intensity, or Developed, Open Space – High Intensity based on ReGAP descriptions (see below). These areas were then appended to the land cover raster used in the analysis.

What follows is a description of each class found in the linkage area, taken largely from the document, Landcover Descriptions for the Southwest Regional GAP Analysis Project (Available from <http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap>)

EVERGREEN FOREST (2 CLASSES) – Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20% of total vegetation cover. More than 75 percent of the tree species maintain their leaves all year. Canopy is never without green foliage.

Encinal (Oak Woodland) – Encinal occurs on foothills, canyons, bajadas and plateaus in the Sierra Madre Occidentale and Sierra Madre Orientale in Mexico, extending north into Trans-Pecos Texas, southern New Mexico and sub-Mogollon Arizona. These woodlands are dominated by Madrean evergreen oaks along a low-slope transition below Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland (CES305.796) and Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (CES305.797). Lower elevation stands are typically open woodlands or savannas where they transition into desert grasslands, chaparral or in some cases desertscrub. Common evergreen oak species include *Quercus arizonica*, *Quercus emoryi*, *Quercus intricata*, *Quercus grisea*, *Quercus oblongifolia*, *Quercus toumeyii*, and in Mexico *Quercus chihuahuensis* and *Quercus albocincta*. Madrean pine, Arizona cypress, pinyon and juniper trees may be present, but do not codominate. Chaparral species such as *Arctostaphylos pungens*, *Cercocarpus montanus*, *Purshia spp.*, *Garrya wrightii*, *Quercus turbinella*, *Frangula betulifolia* (= *Rhamnus betulifolia*), or *Rhus spp.* may be present but do not dominate. The graminoid layer is usually prominent between trees in grassland or steppe that is dominated by warm-season grasses such as *Aristida spp.*, *Bouteloua gracilis*, *Bouteloua curtipendula*, *Bouteloua rothrockii*, *Digitaria californica*, *Eragrostis intermedia*, *Hilaria belangeri*, *Leptochloa dubia*, *Muhlenbergia spp.*, *Pleuraphis jamesii*, or *Schizachyrium cirratum*, species typical of Chihuahuan Piedmont Semi-Desert Grassland (CES302.735). This system includes seral stands dominated by shrubby Madrean oaks typically with a strong graminoid layer. In transition areas with drier chaparral systems, stands of chaparral are not dominated by Madrean oaks, however, Madrean Encinal may extend down along drainages.

Pinyon-Juniper Woodland – These woodlands occur on warm, dry sites on mountain slopes, mesas, plateaus, and ridges. Severe climatic events occurring during the growing season, such as frosts and drought, are thought to limit the distribution of pinyon-juniper woodlands to relatively narrow altitudinal belts on mountainsides. In the southern portion of the Colorado Plateau in northern Arizona and northwestern New Mexico, *Juniperus monosperma* and hybrids of *Juniperus spp* may dominate or

codominate tree canopy. *Juniperus scopulorum* may codominate or replace *Juniperus osteosperma* at higher elevations. In transitional areas along the Mogollon Rim and in northern New Mexico, *Juniperus deppeana* becomes common. In the Great Basin, Woodlands dominated by a mix of *Pinus monophylla* and *Juniperus osteosperma*, pure or nearly pure occurrences of *Pinus monophylla*, or woodlands dominated solely by *Juniperus osteosperma* comprise this system.

GRASSLANDS-HERBACEOUS (1 CLASS) – Areas dominated by grammanoid or herbaceous vegetation, generally greater than 80% of total vegetation.

Semi-Desert Grassland and Shrub Steppe – Comprised of *Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe* and *Piedmont Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe*. Semi-Desert Shrub is typically dominated by graminoids (>25% cover) with an open shrub layer, but includes sparse mixed shrublands without a strong graminoid layer. Steppe Piedmont Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe is a broadly defined desert grassland, mixed shrub-succulent or xeromorphic tree savanna that is typical of the Borderlands of Arizona, New Mexico and northern Mexico [Apacherian region], but extends west to the Sonoran Desert, north into the Mogollon Rim and throughout much of the Chihuahuan Desert. It is found on gently sloping bajadas that supported frequent fire throughout the Sky Islands and on mesas and steeper piedmont and foothill slopes in the Chihuahuan Desert. It is characterized by a typically diverse perennial grasses. Common grass species include *Bouteloua eriopoda*, *B. hirsuta*, *B. rothrockii*, *B. curtipendula*, *B. gracilis*, *Eragrostis intermedia*, *Muhlenbergia porteri*, *Muhlenbergia setifolia*, *Pleuraphis jamesii*, *Pleuraphis mutica*, and *Sporobolus airoides*, succulent species of *Agave*, *Dasyllirion*, and *Yucca*, and tall shrub/short tree species of *Prosopis* and various oaks (e.g., *Quercus grisea*, *Quercus emoryi*, *Quercus arizonica*).

SCRUB-SHRUB (6 CLASSES) – Areas dominated by shrubs, less than 5 meters tall with shrub canopy typically greater than 20% of total vegetation. This class includes true shrubs, young trees in an early successional stage or trees stunted from environmental conditions.

Chaparral – This ecological system occurs across central Arizona (Mogollon Rim), western New Mexico and southwestern Utah and southeast Nevada. It often dominates along the mid-elevation transition from the Mojave, Sonoran, and northern Chihuahuan deserts into mountains (1000-2200 m). It occurs on foothills, mountain slopes and canyons in dryer habitats below the encinal and *Pinus ponderosa* woodlands. Stands are often associated with more xeric and coarse-textured substrates such as limestone, basalt or alluvium, especially in transition areas with more mesic woodlands.

Creosotebush – Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub – This cover type includes xeric creosotebush basins and plains and the mixed desert scrub in the foothill transition zone above, sometimes extending up to the lower montane woodlands. Vegetation is characterized by *Larrea tridentata* alone or mixed with thornscrub and other desert scrub such as *Agave lechuguilla*, *Aloysia wrightii*, *Fouquieria splendens*, *Dasyllirion leiophyllum*, *Flourensia cernua*, *Leucophyllum minus*, *Mimosa aculeaticarpa* var. *biuncifera*, *Mortonia scabrella* (= *Mortonia sempervirens* ssp. *scabrella*), *Opuntia engelmannii*, *Parthenium incanum*, *Prosopis glandulosa*, and *Tiquilia greggii*. Stands of *Acacia constricta* *Acacia neovernicosa* or *Acacia greggii* dominated thornscrub are included in this system, and limestone substrates appear important for at least these species. Grasses such as *Dasyochloa pulchella*, *Bouteloua curtipendula*, *Bouteloua eriopoda*, *Bouteloua ramosa*, *Muhlenbergia porteri* and *Pleuraphis mutica* may be common, but generally have lower cover than shrubs.

Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub – This ecological system forms the vegetation matrix in broad valleys, lower bajadas, plains and low hills in the Mojave and lower Sonoran deserts. This desert scrub is characterized by a sparse to moderately dense layer (2-50% cover) of xeromorphic microphyllous and broad-leaved shrubs. *Larrea tridentata* and *Ambrosia dumosa* are typically dominants, but many different shrubs, dwarf-shrubs, and cacti may codominate or form typically sparse understories.

Desert Scrub (misc) – Comprised of Succulent Desert Scrub, Mixed Salt Desert Scrub, and Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub. Vegetation is characterized by a typically open to moderately dense shrubland.

Mesquite Upland Scrub – This ecological system occurs as upland shrublands that are concentrated in the extensive grassland-shrubland transition in foothills and piedmont in the Chihuahuan Desert. Vegetation is typically dominated by *Prosopis glandulosa* or *Prosopis velutina* and succulents. Other desert scrub that may codominate or dominate includes *Acacia neovermicos*, *Acacia constricta*, *Juniperus monosperma*, or *Juniperus coahuilensis*. Grass cover is typically low.

Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub - This ecological system occurs on hillsides, mesas and upper bajadas in southern Arizona. The vegetation is characterized by a diagnostic sparse, emergent tree layer of *Carnegia gigantea* (3-16 m tall) and/or a sparse to moderately dense canopy codominated by xeromorphic deciduous and evergreen tall shrubs *Parkinsonia microphylla* and *Larrea tridentata* with *Prosopis* sp., *Olneya tesota*, and *Fouquieria splendens* less prominent. The sparse herbaceous layer is composed of perennial grasses and forbs with annuals seasonally present and occasionally abundant. On slopes, plants are often distributed in patches around rock outcrops where suitable habitat is present.

WOODY WETLAND (2 CLASSES) – Areas where forest or shrubland vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of vegetative cover and the soil or substrate is periodically saturated with or covered with water.

Riparian Mesquite Bosque – This ecological system consists of low-elevation (<1100 m) riparian corridors along intermittent streams in valleys of southern Arizona and New Mexico, and adjacent Mexico. Dominant trees include *Prosopis glandulosa* and *Prosopis velutina*. Shrub dominants include *Baccharis salicifolia*, *Pluchea sericea*, and *Salix exigua*.

Riparian Woodland and Shrubland – This system is dependent on a natural hydrologic regime, especially annual to episodic flooding. Occurrences are found within the flood zone of rivers, on islands, sand or cobble bars, and immediate streambanks. In mountain canyons and valleys of southern Arizona, this system consists of mid- to low-elevation (1100-1800 m) riparian corridors along perennial and seasonally intermittent streams. The vegetation is a mix of riparian woodlands and shrublands. Throughout the Rocky Mountain and Colorado Plateau regions, this system occurs within a broad elevation range from approximately 900 to 2800 m., as a mosaic of multiple communities that are tree-dominated with a diverse shrub component.

BARREN LANDS (3 CLASSES) – Barren areas of bedrock, desert pavement, scarps, talus, slides, volcanic material, glacial debris, sand dunes, strip mines, gravel pits and other accumulation of earthen material. Generally, vegetation accounts for less than 15% of total cover.

Barren Lands, Non-specific – Barren areas of bedrock, desert pavement, scarps, talus, slides, volcanic material, glacial debris, sand dunes, strip mines, gravel pits and other accumulation of earthen material. Generally, vegetation accounts for less than 15% of total cover.

Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop – This ecological system is found from subalpine to foothill elevations and includes barren and sparsely vegetated landscapes (generally <10% plant cover) of steep cliff faces, narrow canyons, and smaller rock outcrops of various igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic bedrock types. Also included are unstable scree and talus slopes that typically occur below cliff faces. Species present are diverse and may include *Bursera microphylla*, *Fouquieria splendens*, *Nolina bigelovii*, *Opuntia bigelovii*, and other desert species, especially succulents. Lichens are predominant lifeforms in some areas. May include a variety of desert shrublands less than 2 ha (5 acres) in size from adjacent areas.

Wash

Appendix G: Literature Cited

- Adams, H.B. and L. Adams. 1959. Black-tailed jackrabbit carcasses on the highways in Nevada, Idaho, and California. *Ecology* 40: 718-720.
- Alvarez-Cardenas, S., I. Guerrero-Cardenas, S. Diaz, P. Calina-Tessaro, and S. Gallina. 2001. The variables of physical habitat selection by the desert bighorn sheep (*Ovis Canadensis weemsi*) in the Sierra del Mechudo, Baja California Sur, Mexico. *Journal of Arid Environments* 49: 357-374.
- Anderson, A.E. and O.C. Wallmo. 1984. *Mammalian Species* 219: 1-9. Mule deer.
- Apps, C.D., N.J. Newhouse, and T.A. Kinley. 2002. Habitat associations of American badgers in southeastern British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 80: 1228-1239.
- Arizona Department of Transportation. 2008. Final Report: I-10 Bypass Study. Available online at: http://www.azdot.gov/mpd/systems_planning/PDF/i10bypass/I10_BypassStudy_Final_012008.pdf.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2001. *Cenidophorus burti stictigrammus*. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. 5 pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2001. *Rana yavapaiensis*. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. 6 pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2002. *Heloderma suspectum cinctum*. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. 5 pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2004. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Ohoenix, AZ. 7 pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2006. Wildlife Mortality and Corridor Use near Highway 77, Oro Valley to Catalina, Pima County, Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Tucson AZ, 12pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2007. Arizona Striped Whipsnake. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. 4 pp.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2009a. Guidelines for solar development in Arizona. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. Available online: <http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/documents/FinalSolarGuidelines03122010.pdf>.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2009b. Wildlife friendly guidelines, community and project planning. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. Available online: http://www.azgfd.gov/pdfs/w_c/WildlifeFriendlyDevelopment.pdf.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012a. Arizona's State Wildlife Action Plan: 2011-2021. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona, USA.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012b. The Pima County wildlife connectivity assessment: Report on stakeholder input. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. Available online: http://www.azgfd.gov/w_c/documents/PimaCountyWildlifeConnectivityAssessment.pdf.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012c. Wildlife compatible fencing. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. Available online: http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/documents/110125_AGFD_fencing_guidelines.pdf.
- Arjo, W.M., T.J. Bennett, and A.J. Kozlowski. 2003. Characteristics of current and historical kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*) dens in the Great Basin Desert. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 81: 96-102.
- Aslan, C.E., A. Schaeffer, and D.E. Swann. 2003. *Gopherus agassizii* (desert tortoise) elevational range. *Herpetological Review* 34:57.
- Averill-Murray, R.C., B.E. Martin, S.J. Bailey, and E.B. Wirt. 2002a. Activity and behavior of the Sonoran desert tortoise in Arizona. Pages 135-158 in Van Devender, T.R., editor. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona, USA. 388pp.
- Averill-Murray, R.C., A.P. Woodman, and J.M. Howland. 2002b. Population ecology of the Sonoran desert tortoise in Arizona. Pages 109-134 in Van Devender, T.R., editor. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona, USA. 388pp.
- Avian Power Line Interaction Committee. 2006. Suggested practices for avian protection on power lines: The state of the art in 2006. Edison Electric Institute, APLIC, and the California Energy Commission. Washington, D.C and Sacramento, CA, USA.
- Baily, S.J. C.R. Schwalbe, and C.H. Lowe. 1995. Hibernaculum use by a population of desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*) in the Sonoran Desert. *Journal of Herpetology* 29:361-369.
- Barnes, T. and Adams, L. 1999. A Guide to Urban Habitat Conservation Planning: University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service.

- Barnum, S.A. 2003. Identifying the best locations along highways to provide safe crossing opportunities for wildlife: a handbook for highway planners and designers. Colorado Department of Transportation.
- Barrett S.L., J.A. Humphrey, and S.D. Harper. 1990. Desert tortoise reintroduction and mitigation assessment study: Final report. Bureau of Reclamation, Arizona Projects Office, Central Arizona Project, Phoenix, USA.
- Beck, D.E. 2005. Biology of Gila Monsters and Beaded Lizards. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Beier, P. 1993. Determining minimum habitat areas and habitat corridors for cougars. *Conservation Biology* 7: 94-108.
- Beier, P. and S. Loe. 1992. A checklist for evaluating impacts to wildlife corridors. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 20: 434-40.
- Beier, P., Garding E., and D. Majka. 2006a. Arizona Missing Linkages: Tucson – Tortolita – Santa Catalina Mountains Linkage Design. Report to Arizona Game and Fish Department. School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University.
- Beier, P., Majka D., and T. Bayless. 2006b. Arizona Missing Linkages: Ironwood-Picacho Linkage Design. Report to Arizona Game and Fish Department. School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University.
- Beier, P., Majka, D., and W. Spencer. 2008. Forks in the road: Choices in procedures for designing wildland linkages. *Conservation Biology* 22(4):836-851.
- Belsky, A.J., A. Matzke, and S. Uselman. 1999. Survey of livestock influences on stream and riparian ecosystems in the western United States. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 54: 419-431.
- Best, T. 1996. *Lepus californicus*. *Mammalian Species* 530: 1-10.
- Blair, R.B. 1996. Land use and avian species diversity along an urban gradient. *Ecological Applications* 6:506-519.
- Blair, R.B. 1999. Birds and butterflies along an urban gradient: surrogate taxa for assessing biodiversity? *Ecological Applications* 9:164-170.
- Blair, R.B. and A.E. Launer. 1997. Butterfly diversity and human land use: species assemblages along an urban gradient. *Biological Conservation* 80:113-125.
- Bleich, V.C., J.D. Wehausen, and S.A. Holl. 1990. Desert-dwelling mountain sheep: Conservation implications of a naturally fragmented distribution. *Conservation Biology* 4: 383-390.
- Bristow, K.D., J. A. Wennerlund, R. E. Schweinsburg, R. J. Olding, and R. E. Lee. Habitat use and movements of desert bighorn sheep near the Silver Bell Mine, Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department Technical Report 25. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. 57 pp.
- Brooks, M.L. and B. Lair. 2005. Ecological effects of vehicular routes in a desert ecosystem. Report prepared for the United States Geological Survey, Recoverability and Vulnerability of Desert Ecosystems Program.
- Brown, D.E. 1993. Early History. pp. 1 – 11 in R.M Lee, Ed. *The Desert Bighorn Sheep in Arizona*. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona, USA.
- Brown, C.F. and P.R. Krausman. 2003. Habitat characteristics of three leporid species in southeastern Arizona. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 67: 83-89.
- Brudin III, C.O. 2003. Wildlife use of existing culverts and bridges in north central Pennsylvania. ICOET 2003.
- Bunnell, F.L. and D.E.N. Tait. 1981. Population dynamics of bears-implications. Pages 75 - 98 in C. W. Fowler and T. D Smith, Eds. *Dynamics of Large Mammal Populations*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York. USA.
- Cain, A.T., V.R. Tuovila, D.G. Hewitt, and M.E. Tewes. 2003. Effects of a highway and mitigation projects on bobcats in Southern Texas. *Biological Conservation* 114: 189-197.
- Campbell, J.A. and W.W.Lamar. 1989. *The Venomous Reptiles of Latin America*. Comstock Publishing Associates: A Division of Cornell University Press. Ithaca, New York.
- City of Tucson. 2012. City of Tucson Avra Valley Habitat Conservation Plan. Draft. Tucson, Arizona, USA.
- Clevenger, A.P. and N. Waltho. 2000. Factors influencing the effectiveness of wildlife underpasses in Banff National Park, Alberta, Canada. *Conservation Biology* 14: 47-56.
- Clevenger, A.P. and N. Waltho. 2005. Performance indices to identify attributes of highway crossing structures facilitating movement of large mammals. *Biological Conservation* 121: 453-464.
- Clevenger, A.P., B. Chruszcz, and K. Gunson. 2001. Drainage culverts as habitat linkages and factors affecting passage by mammals. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 38: 1340-1349.
- Clevenger, A.P., B. Chruszcz, and K.E. Gunson. 2003. Spatial patterns and factors influencing small vertebrate fauna road-kill aggregations. *Biological Conservation* 109: 15-26.
- Clevenger, A.P., J. Wierzchowski, B. Chruszcz, and K. Gunson. 2002. GIS-generated, expert-based models for identifying wildlife habitat linkages and planning mitigation passages. *Conservation Biology* 16:503-514.

- Colby, B. and S. Wishart. 2002. Riparian areas generate property value premium for landowners. Agricultural and Resource Economics, Arizona State University, Tucson, AZ. 15p. Available online: <http://ag.arizona.edu/arec/pubs/riparianreportweb.pdf>.
- Conservation Biology Institute. 2005. Analysis of General Plan-2020 San Diego County. Encinitas, Ca. 27pp.
- Cunningham, S.C. and W. Ballard. 2004. Effects of wildfire on black bear demographics in central Arizona. Wildlife Society Bulletin 32: 928-937.
- Currier, M.P. 1983. *Felis Concolor*. Mammalian Species 200: 1-7.
- Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2006. Endangered and Threatened Wildland and Plants. Final Rule to Remove the Arizona Cistinct Population Segment of the Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy-owl from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. Federal Register Vol. 71, No. 72, pp. 19452-19458.
- D'Antonio, C. and L.A. Meyerson. 2002. Exotic plant species as problems and solutions in ecological restoration: a synthesis. Restoration Ecology 10: 703-713.
- Defenders of Wildlife. 2006. On the line: The impacts of immigration policy on wildlife and habitat in the Arizona borderlands. Washington, D.C. Available online: http://www.defenders.org/publications/on_the_line_report.pdf.
- Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. 2011. Apprehensions by the U.S. Border Patrol: 2005-2010. Available at <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ois-apprehensions-fs-2005-2010.pdf>.
- Dickson, B.G. and P. Beier. 2002. Home range and habitat selection by adult cougars in southern California. Journal of Wildlife Management 66:1235-1245.
- Dodd, C.K, W.J. Barichivich, and L.L. Smith. 2004. Effectiveness of a barrier wall and culverts in reducing wildlife mortality on a heavily traveled highway in Florida. Biological Conservation 118: 619-631.
- Dodd, N., J. Gagnon, S. Boe, A. Manzo, and R. Schweinsburg. 2007. Evaluation of measures to minimize wildlife-vehicle collisions and maintain wildlife permeability across highways – State Route 260, Arizona, USA. Final Report 540 (2002 – 2006). Arizona Transportation Research Center, Arizona Department of Transportation, Phoenix, AZ, USA, Available online: http://www.azdot.gov/TPD/ATRC/publications/project_reports/PDF/AZ540.pdf
- Donnelly, R. and J.M. Marzluff. 2004. Importance of reserve size and landscape context to urban bird conservation. Conservation Biology 18:733-745.
- Edwards, T. 2003. Desert tortoise conservation genetics. Unpublish M.S. thesis, University of Arizona, Tucson, USA.
- Edwards, T., E.W. Stitt, C.R. Schwalbe, and D.E. Swann. 2004. Natural History Notes: *Gopherus Agassizii* (Desert Tortoise). Movement. Herpetological Review 35:381-382
- Environmental Law Institute. 2003. Conservation thresholds for land use planners. Washington D.C. Available online: www.elistore.org.
- Epps, C.W., D.R. McCullough, J.D. Wenaus, V.C. Bleich, and J.L. Rechel. 2004. Effects of climate change on population persistence of desert-dwelling mountain sheep in California. Conservation Biology 18: 102-113.
- Evink, G.L. 2002. Interaction between roadways and wildlife ecology. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Fernandez, Philip J., and Philip C. Rosen. December 31, 1996. Final Report: Effects of the Introduced Crayfish *Orconectes virilis* on Native Aquatic Herpetofauna in Arizona. Submitted to AGFD Heritage Fund. 51pp.
- Fabre, J. and Cayla, C. 2009. Riparian restoration efforts in the Santa Cruz River Basin. Water Resources Research Center, University of Arizona. Available online: http://ag.arizona.edu/azwater/files/Riparian_Restoration_Efforts.pdf
- Fernandez, P.J. 1996. A facility for captive propagation of Chiricahua Leopard Frogs, *Rana chiricahuensis*. Advances in Herpetoculture 1: 7-12.
- Findley, J.S., A.H. Harris, D.E. Wilson, and C. Jones. 1975. Mammals of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. xxii + 360 pp.
- Fisher, R.A. and J.C. Fischenich. 2000. Design recommendations for riparian corridors and vegetated buffer strips. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. ERDC-TN-EMRRPSR-24. Available online
- Forman, R.T.T., D., Sperling, J.A. Bissonette, A.P. Clevenger, C.D. Cutshall, V.H. Dale, L. Fahrig, R. France, C.R. Goldman, K. Heanue, J.A. Jones, F.J. Swanson, T. Turrentine, and T.C. Winter. 2003. Road ecology: science and solutions. Island Press: Washington, D.C.
- Friesen, L.E., P.F.J. Eagles, and R.J. Mackay. 1995. Effects of residential development on forest-dwelling neotropical migrant songbirds. Conservation Biology 9:1408-1414.

- Gagnon, J.W., N.L. Dodd, S.C. Sprague, K. Ogren, and R. Schweinsburg. 2010. Preacher Canyon wildlife fence and crosswalk enhancement project evaluation: State Route 260. Final Report - Project JPA 04-088, prepared by Arizona Game and Fish Department for Arizona Department of Transportation.
- Galindo-Leal, C., A. Morales, and M. Weber. 1993. Distribution and abundance of Coues' deer and cattle in Michilia Biosphere Reserve, Mexico. *Southwestern Naturalist* 38: 127-135.
- Gallina, S., E. Maury, and V. Serrano. 1981. Food habits of white-tailed deer. Pages 133-148 in P.F. Ffolliot and S. Gallina, eds. *Deer biology, habitat requirements, and management in western North America*. Inst. De Ecol. Publ. 9, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico. 238 pp.
- Germaine, S.S. and B.F. Wakeling. 2001. Lizard species distributions and habitat occupation along an urban gradient in Tucson, Arizona, USA. *Biological Conservation* 97:229-237.
- Germaine, S.S., S.S. Rosenstock, R.E. Schweinsburg, and W.S. Richardson. 1998. Relationships among breeding birds, habitat, and residential development in greater Tucson, Arizona. *Ecological Applications* 8:680-691.
- Germano, D.J. 1992. Longevity and age-size relationships of populations of desert tortoises. *Copeia* 1992: 367-374.
- Gompper, M.E. 1995. *Nasua Narica*. *Mammalian Species* 487: 1-10.
- Goodrich, J.M. and S.W. Buskirk. 1998. Spacing and ecology of North American badgers (*Taxidea taxus*) in a prairie-dog (*Cynomys leucurus*) complex. *Journal of Mammalogy* 78: 171-179.
- Gross, J.E., F.J. Singer, and M.E. Moses. 2000. Effects of disease, dispersal, and area on bighorn sheep restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 25-37.
- Halloran, A.F. and W.E. Blanchard. 1954. Carnivores of Yuma County, Arizona. *American Midland Naturalist* 51: 481-487.
- Harrington, J.L. and M.R. Conover. 2006. Characteristics of ungulate behavior and mortality associated with wire fences. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34(5):1295-1305.
- Hart, D.D., T.E. Johnson, K.L. Bushaw-Newton, R.J. Horowitz, A.T. Bednarek, D.F. Charles, D.A. Kreeger, and D.J. Velinsky. 2002. Dam removal: challenges and opportunities for ecological research and river restoration. *Bioscience* 52: 669- 681.
- Hass, C.C. 2002. Home-range dynamics of white-nosed coatis in southeastern Arizona. *Journal of Mammalogy* 83: 934-946.
- Hatten, J.R., A. Averill-Murray, and W.E. Van Pelt. 2003. Characterizing and mapping potential jaguar habitat in Arizona. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report 203. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Haynes, L., J. Lambertson, C. Craddock, S. Prendergast, C. Prendergast, M. Colvin, B. Isaacs, E. Isaacs, R. Maxwell, S. Bless, D. Siegel, T. Dee, M. Culver, J. Koprowski. 2010. Mountain lions and bobcats of the Tucson Mountains: Monitoring population status and landscape connectivity. University of Arizona Wild Cat Research and Conservation. School of Natural Resources and Environment. University of Arizona. Tucson, AZ.
- Henry, R.S. and L.K. Sows. 1980. White-tailed deer of the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Arizona. Univ. Arizona Coop. Park Resour. Stud. Unit Tech. Rep. 6, Tucson, 85 pp.
- Hoffmeister, D.F. 1986. *Mammals of Arizona*. The University of Arizona Press and The Arizona Game and Fish Department. 602 pp.
- Jennings, W.B. 1997. Habitat use and food preferences of the desert tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii*, in the Western Mojave Desert and impacts of off-road vehicles. *Proceedings: Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Tortoises and turtles – An International Conference*: pp. 42-45.
- Johnson, T.L. and D.M. Swift. 2000. A test of a habitat evaluation procedure for Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 47-56.
- Kamler, J.F. and P.S. Gipson. 2000. Home Range, Habitat Selection, and Survival of Bobcats, *Lynx rufus*, in a Prairie Ecosystem in Kansas. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 114 (3): 388-94.
- Kiesecker, J.M. and A.R. Blaustein. 1998. Effects of Introduced Bullfrogs and Smallmouth Bass on Microhabitat Use, Growth, and Survival of Native Red-Legged Frogs (*Rana aurora*). *Conservation Biology* 12: 776-787.
- Knipe, T. 1977. The Arizona whitetail deer. Arizona Game and Fish Department Special Report 6, Phoenix, 108 pp.
- Krausman, P.R. 1997. The influence of landscape scape on the management of desert bighorn sheep. pp 349 – 367 in J.A. Bissonette, Ed. *Wildlife and landscape ecology: effects of pattern and scale*, Springer-Verlad, New York.
- Krausman, P.R. 2000. An Introduction to the restoration of bighorn sheep. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 3-5.

- Krueper, D.J. 1993. Conservation priorities in naturally fragmented and human-altered riparian habitats of the arid West. USDA Forest Service. General Technical Report RM-43. Available online: www.birds.cornell.edu/pifcapemay/krueper.htm.
- Kupferberg, S.J. 1997. Bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*) invasion of a California river: the role of larval competition. *Ecology* 78: 1736-1751.
- Lambeck, R. 1997. Focal species: a multi-species umbrella for nature conservation. *Conservation Biology* 11: 849-856.
- Lanoo, M. (editor). 2005. Amphibian Declines: The Conservation Status of United States Species. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Larivière, S. 2001. *Ursus americanus*. *Mammalian Species* 647: 1-11
- Lee, P., C. Smyth, and S. Boutin. 2004. Quantitative review of riparian buffer width guidelines from Canada and the United States. *Journal of Environmental Management* 70:165-180.
- LeCount, A.L. 1982. Characteristics of a central Arizona black bear population. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46:861-868.
- Leopold, A.S. 1959. White-tailed deer. *Odocoileus virginianus*. Pages 507-513 in *Wildlife of Mexico: the game birds and mammals*. Univ. California Press, Berkeley. 568 pp.
- Levey, D., B.M. Bolker, J.T. Tewksbury, S. Sargent, and N. Haddad. 2005. Effects of Landscape Corridors on Seed Dispersal by Birds. *Science* 309: 146-148.
- Lite, S.J. and J.C. Stromberg. 2005. Surface water and ground-water thresholds for maintaining Populus – Salix forests, San Pedro River, Arizona. *Biological Conservation* 125:153–167.
- Little, S.J. 2003. The influence of predator-prey relationships on wildlife passage evaluation. ICOET 2003.
- Logan, K.A. and L.L. Sweanor. 2001. Desert Puma: Evolutionary Ecology and Conservation of an Enduring Carnivore. Island Press, Washington D.C. 463 pp.
- Long, C.A. 1973. *Taxidea taxus*. *Mammalian Species* 26: 1-4.
- Long, C.A. and C.A. Killingley. 1983. *The badgers of the world*. Charles C. Thomas Publishing, Springfield, IL.
- Lovich, J. and J. Ennon. 2011. *Wildlife Conservation and Solar Energy Development in the Desert Southwest, United States*. *Bioscience* 61(12): 982-992.
- Lowe, C.H. 1978. *The Vertebrates of Arizona*. The University of Arizona Press. Tucson, Arizona. 270pp.
- Lowe, C.H. and P.A. Holm 1991 *The amphibians and reptiles at Saguaro National Monument* Technical Report No. 37, Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit, University of Arizona, Tucson
- Lowery, S.F. and S.T. Blackman. 2007. Twin Peaks Road wildlife linkages project Rattlesnake Pass, Marana, Arizona. Prepared for Town of Marana, Pima County, Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department. November 2007.
- Lowery, S.F., D.D. Grandmaison, and S.T. Blackman. 2010. Wildlife mortality along the Ajo Highway – State Route 86 transportation corridor. A wildlife linkages research project, Tucson, Arizona. Prepared for Arizona Department of Transportation Tucson District Office, Pima County, Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department. March 2011
- Luckenbach, R.A., and R.B. Bury. 1983. Effects of off-road vehicles on the biota of the Algodones Dunes, Imperial County, California. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 20: 265-286.
- Majka, D., J. Jenness, and P. Beier. 2007. CorridorDesigner: ArcGIS tools for designing and evaluating corridors. Available at <http://corridordesign.org>.
- Malo, J.E., F. Suarez, and A. Diez. 2004. Can we mitigate animal-vehicle accidents using predictive models. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41: 701-710.
- Maret, T.J., J.D. Snyder, and J.P. Collins. Altered drying regime controls distribution of endangered salamanders and introduced predators. *Biological Conservation* 127: 129-138.
- Marshall, R.M., S. Anderson, M. Batcher, P. Comer, S. Cornelius, R. Cox, A. Gondor, D. Gori, J. Humke, R. Paredes Aguilar, I.E. Parra, and S. Schwartz. 2000. *An Ecological Analysis of Conservation Priorities in the Sonoran Desert Ecoregion*. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy Arizona Chapter, Sonoran Institute, and Instituto del Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora with support from Department of Defense Legacy Program, Agency and Institutional partners. 146 pp.
- Mata, C., I. Hervas, J. Herranz, F. Suarez, and J.E. Malo. 2005. Complementary use by vertebrates of crossing structures along a fences Spanish motorway. *Biological Conservation* 124: 397-405.
- McCoy, J.E., D.G. Hewitt, and F.C. Bryant. 2005. Dispersal by yearling male white-tailed deer and implications for management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 69: 366–376.

- McCulloch, C.Y. 1973. Seasonal diets of mule and white-tailed deer. Pages 1-38 in Deer nutrition in Arizona chaparral and desert habitats. AZGFD Spec. Rep. 3, Phoenix, 68 pp.
- McDonald, W., and C.C. St Clair. 2004. Elements that promote highway crossing structure use by small mammals in Banff National Park. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41: 82-93.
- McGrew, J.C. 1979. *Vulpes macrotis*. *Mammalian Species* 123: 1-6.
- McKinney, T. and T. Smith. 2007. US93 bighorn sheep study: Distribution and trans-highway movements of desert bighorn sheep in northwestern Arizona.
- Menke, K.A. and C.L. Hayes. 2003. Evaluation of the relative suitability of potential jaguar habitat in New Mexico. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Messick, J.P. and M.G. Hornocker. 1981. Ecology of the badger in southwestern Idaho. *Wildlife Monographs* 76.
- Murphy R.W., K.H. Berry, T. Edwards, A.E. Leviton, A. Lathrop, and J.D. Riedle. 2011. The dazed and confused identity of Agassiz's land tortoise, *Gopherus agassizii* (Testudines, Testudinidae) with the description of a new species, and its consequences for conservation. *ZooKeys* 113: 39-71.
- Naiman, R.J., H. Decamps and M. Pollock. The role of riparian corridors in maintaining regional biodiversity. *Ecological Applications* 3: 209-212.
- National Academy of Sciences. 2002. Riparian areas: functions and strategies for management. National Academy Press. Washington D. C. 436 p.
- National Park Service. 2008. The fight to save saguaros. Available online: http://www.buffelgrass.org/sites/default/files/FightSaveSaguaros_buffelgrass_Nov08.pdf.
- NatureServe. 2005. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 4.6. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>. (Accessed: November 29, 2005).
- New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2002. Biota Information System of New Mexico. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish electronic database, BISON, Version 1/2004, Santa Fe, New Mexico. <http://nrmnhp.unm.edu/bisonm/bisonquery.php>. Accessed 9 September 2005.
- Ng, S.J., J.W. Dole, R.M. Sauvajot, S.P.D. Riley, and T.J. Valone. 2004. Use of highway undercrossings by wildlife in southern California. *Biological Conservation* 115: 499-507.
- Ockenfels, R.A. and G.I. Day. 1990. Determinants of collared peccary home-range size in central Arizona. In *Managing wildlife in the southwest* (Krausman, P.R. and N.S. Smith, eds), Arizona chapter of the Wildlife Society, Phoenix, Arizona. Pps 76-81.
- Ockenfels, R.A., D.E. Brooks, and C.H. Lewis. 1991. General ecology of Coues' white-tailed deer in the Santa Rita Mountains. AZGFD Tech Rep. 6, Phoenix. 73 pp.
- Odell, E.A. and R.L. Knight. 2001. Songbird and medium-sized mammal communities associated with exurban development in Pitkin County, Colorado. *Conservation Biology* 15:1143-1150.
- Oftedal, O.T. 2002. Nutritional ecology of the desert tortoise in the Mohave and Sonoran deserts. Pp. 194-241 in Van Devender, T.R. (ed) *The Sonoran Desert Tortoise. Natural History, Biology, and Conservation*. Univ. of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Olsen, D.M. and E. Dinnerstein. 1998. The Global 200: A Representation approach to Conserving the Earth's Most Biologically Valuable Ecoregions. *Conservation Biology* 12:502-515.
- Parkyn, S. 2004. Review of riparian buffer zone effectiveness. MAF Technical Paper No: 2004/05. Available online: www.maf.govt.nz/publications.
- Peris, S. and J. Morales. 2004. Use of passages across a canal by wild mammals and related mortality. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*. 50: 67-72.
- Pima County. 2001. Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan: Priority Vulnerable Species. Unpublished report by Pima County, Arizona. Available online: <http://www.pima.gov/cmo/sdcp/reports/d10/014PRI.PDF>. (Accessed May 1, 2012).
- Pima County. 2002a. Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan: An invasive species management program for Pima County. Available online: <http://www.pima.gov/cmo/sdcp/reports%5Cd26%5C136INVSP.PDF>.
- Pima County. 2002b. Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan: Riparian Priorities. Available online: <http://www.pima.gov/cmo/sdcp/reports/d25/133RIPAR.PDF>.
- Pima County. 2008. Tucson Mountain Park Management Plan. Tucson, Arizona, USA. Available online: http://www.pima.gov/nrpr/parks/tmp/TMP_Mgmt_Plan_Rpt_May08.pdf.
- Pima County. 2009. Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. Online resource. Tucson, Arizona. Available at <http://www.pima.gov/sdcp>.

- Pima County. 2011. Protecting our land, water, and heritage: Pima County's voter-supported conservation efforts. Available online: http://www.pima.gov/cmo/admin/Reports/ConservationReport/PDF/POL_lg.pdf.
- Platz, J.E., R.W. Clarkson, J.C. Rorabaugh, and D.M. Hillis. 1990. *Rana berlandieri*: recently introduced populations in Arizona and southeastern California. *Copeia* 1990: 324-333.
- Plummer, M.V. 2004. Seasonal Inactivity of the Desert Box Turtle, *Terrapene ornata luteola*, at the species' southwestern range limit in Arizona. *Journal of Herpetology* 38: 589-593.
- Rautenstrauch, K.R., and P.R. Krausman. 1989. Preventing mule deer drownings in the Mohawk Canal, Arizona. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 17: 280-286.
- Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County. 2011. Our mobility. Available at <http://www.rtamobility.com/documents/OurMobilityMay2011.pdf>.
- Riley, S.P.D., R.M. Sauvajot, D. Kamradt, E.C. York, C. Bromley, T.K. Fuller, and R.K. Wayne. 2003. Effects of urbanization and fragmentation on bobcats and coyotes in urban southern California *Conservation Biology* 17: 566-576.
- Riley, S.P.D. 2006. Spatial Ecology of Bobcats and Gray Foxes in Urban and Rural Zones of a National Park. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70(5):1425-1435.
- Rosen, P.C. 2003. Avra Valley snakes: Marana survey report for Tucson shovel-nosed snake (*Chionactis occipitalis klauberi*). Final Report on Shovel-Nosed Snake submitted to the Town of Marana. September 3, 2003.
- Rosen, P.C. 2008. 2007 Survey Results for the Tucson Shovel-nosed Snake (*Chionactis occipitalis klauberi*), with Evidence for Ecological Change in South-Central Arizona. Unpublished report submitted to the Town of Marana and the Arizona Game and Fish Department
- Rosen, P.C., R.B. Duncan, P.A. Holm, T.B. Persons, S.S. Sartorius, and C.R. Schwalbe. 2002. Status and ecology of the Giant Spotted Whiptail (*Cnemidophorus burti stictogrammus*) in Arizona. Final Report to Arizona Game & Fish Department, Heritage Grant (IIPAM program) I99018. 128 pp.
- Rosen, P.C. and C. H. Lowe. 1994. Highway mortality of snakes in the Sonoran Desert of southern Arizona. *Biological Conservation* 68: 143-148.
- Rosen, P.C., S.S. Sartorius, C.R. Schwalbe, P.A. Holm, and C.H. Lowe. October 9-13, 1996. Herpetology of the Sulphur Springs Valley, Cochise County, Arizona. The Future of Arid Grasslands: Identifying Issues, Seeking Solutions. Tucson, Arizona and Selected Ranches in Southern Arizona, Southwestern New Mexico, and Northern Sonora.
- Rosen, P.C. and C.R. Schwalbe. 1997. Bullfrog impacts on sensitive wetland herpetofauna, and Herpetology of the San Bernardino National Wildlife Refuge. Final Report to Arizona Game & Fish Dept. Heritage Program, and USFWS. 30 pp.
- Rosen, P.C. and C.R. Schwalbe. 1998. Status of native and introduced species of herpetofauna at San Bernardino National Wildlife Refuge. Final Report for Project I96056 to Arizona Game & Fish Dept. Heritage Program, and USFWS. 52 pp.
- Rottenborn, S.C. 1999. Predicting impacts of urbanization on riparian bird communities. *Biological Conservation* 88:289-299.
- Rubin, E.S., W.M. Boyce, C.J. Stermer, and S.G. Torres. 2002. Bighorn sheep habitat use and selection near an urban environment. *Biological Conservation* 104: 251-263.
- Ruediger, B. 2001. High, wide, and handsome: designing more effective wildlife and fish crossings for roads and highways. ICOET 2001.
- Salmon, M. 2003. Artificial night lighting and sea turtles. *Biologist* 50(4): 163-168
- Savage, M. 2004. Community monitoring for restoration projects in Southwestern riparian communities. National Community Forestry Center Southwest Working Paper No. 16. Forest Guild. Santa Fe, NM.
- Scarborough, D.L., and P.R. Krausman. 1988. Sexual selection by desert mule deer. *Southwestern Naturalist* 33: 157-165.
- Schaller, G.B. and P.G. Crawshaw, Jr. 1980. Movement patterns of jaguar. *Biotropica* 12: 161-168.
- Schwartz, C.C. and A.W. Franzmann. 1992. Dispersal and survival of subadult black bears from the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 56: 426-431.
- Seymour, K.L. 1989. *Panthera onca*. *Mammalian Species* 340: 1-9.
- Shackleton, D.M. 1985. *Ovis canadensis*. *Mammalian Species* 230: 1-9.
- Shafroth, P.B., J.C. Stromberg, and D.T. Patten. 2002. Riparian vegetation response to altered disturbance and stress regimes. *Ecological Applications* 12: 107-123.

- Singer, F.J., C.M. Papouchis, and K.K. Symonds. 2000. Translocations as a tool for restoring populations of bighorn sheep. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 6-13.
- Singer, F.J., M.E. Moses, S. Bellew, and W. Sloan. 2000. Correlates to colonizations of new patches by translocated populations of bighorn sheep. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 66-74.
- Singer, F.J., V.C. Bleich, and M.A. Gudorf. 2000. Restoration of Bighorn Sheep Metapopulations in and Near Western National Parks. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 14-24.
- Singer, F.J., L.C. Zeigenfuss, and L. Spicer. 2001. Role of Patch Size, Disease, and Movement in Rapid Extinction of Bighorn Sheep. *Conservation Biology* 15: 1347-1354.
- Smith, W.P. 1991. *Odocoileus virginianus*. *Mammalian Species* 388: 1-13.
- Southern Arizona Buffelgrass Coordination Center. 2007. Buffelgrass invasion in the Sonoran Desert: Imminent risks and unavoidable mitigation. Available online: <http://www.buffelgrass.org/sites/default/files/invasion.pdf>
- Sowls, L.K. 1997. Javelinas and other peccaries: their biology, management, and use. Second edition. Texas A and M University, College Station, Texas, USA.
- Springer, A.E., J.M. Wright, P.B. Shafroth, J.C. Stromberg, and D.T. Patten 1999. Coupling ground-water and riparian vegetation models to simulate riparian vegetation changes due to a reservoir release. *Water Resources Research* 35: 3621-3630.
- Stebbins, R.C. 1985. *A Field Guide to western reptiles and amphibians*, second edition, revised Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass. 336 pp.
- Stralberg, D. and B. Williams. 2002. Effects of residential development and landscape composition on the breeding birds of Placer County's foothill oak woodlands. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-184.
- Stromberg, J. 2000. Parts 1-3: Restoration of riparian vegetation in the arid Southwest: challenges and opportunities. *Arizona Riparian Council Newsletter* vol. 13 no. 1-3. Arizona Riparian Council. Tempe, Arizona. Available online: <http://azriparian.asu.edu/newsletters.htm>.
- Stromberg, J.C., J.A. Tress, S.D. Wilkins, and S. Clark. 1992. Response of velvet mesquite to groundwater decline. *Journal of Arid Environments* 23:45-58.
- Stromberg, J.C., M.R. Sommerfield, D.T. Patten, J. Fry, C. Kramer, F. Amalfi, and C. Christian. 1993. Release of effluent into the Upper Santa Cruz River, Southern Arizona: ecological considerations. Pp. 81-92 in M. G. Wallace, ed. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Effluent Use Management*. American Water Resources Association, Tucson, AZ.
- Stromberg, J.C. 1997. Growth and survivorship of Fremont cottonwood, Goodding willow, and salt cedar seedlings after large floods in central Arizona. *Great Basin Naturalist* 57:198-208.
- Sullivan T.L. and T.A. Messmer. 2003. Perceptions of deer-vehicle collision management by state wildlife agency and department of transportation administrators. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 31:163-173.
- Ticer, C.L., R.A. Ockenfels, J.C. DeVos Jr., and T.E. Morrell. 1998. Habitat use and activity patterns of urban-dwelling javelina. *Urban Ecosystems* 2:141-151.
- The Nature Conservancy. 2012. Places We Protect. Online Resource. Available at: <http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/arizona/placesweprotect/san-pedro-river.xml>
- Ticer, C.L., T.E. Morrell, and J.C. DeVos Jr. 2001. Diurnal bed-site selection of urban-dwelling javelina in Prescott, Arizona. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65:136-140.
- Tohono O'odham Nation. 2011. Kitt Peak Linkage wildlife crossings retrofit: A staged implementation approach, State Route 86, Mileposts 130 – 136, Pima County, Arizona, USA. Tohono O'odham Nation Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Vegetation Management Program wildlife connectivity proposal to the Pima County RTA.
- Town of Oro Valley. 2008. Arroyo Grande Planning Area General Plan Amendment. Powerpoint available at <http://www.orovalleyaz.gov/Assets/assets/DIS/Planning/pdf/Arroyo+Grande+Open+House+Power+Point+Presentation.pdf>.
- Tucson Audubon Society Arizona Important Bird Areas Program. 2012. Online Resource. Tucson, Arizona. Available at: <http://aziba.org>.
- Tull, J.C. and P.R. Krausman. 2001. Use of a wildlife corridor by desert mule deer. *The Southwestern Naturalist* 46:81-86.
- Turner, D.S., S. Brandes, M. Fishbein, and P.W. Hirt. 1995. Preserve Design for maintaining biodiversity in the Sky Island region. In: L.F. De Bano, P.F. Ffolliott, A. Ortega-Rubio, G.J. Gottfried, R.H. Hamre, and C.B.

- Edminster (tech. cords.). 1995. Biodiversity and Management of the Madrean Archipelago: the sky islands of southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico. Gen. Tech. Report RM-GTR-264. Ft. Collins, Colorado: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. pp. 524-530.
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 2009. Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and possible Resource Management Plan amendments for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project in Arizona and New Mexico. FR Doc. E9-12512. Available at http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/nm/programs/more/lands_and_realty/sunzia/sunzia_docs.Par.38874.File.dat/SunZiaFRN.pdf.
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 2012. Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Resource Management Plan Amendments (EIS/RMPA) for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. Available online at: http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/prog/more/lands_realty/sunzia_southwest_transmission/deis/sunzia_deis_vol_ume.html.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1981. Standards for the development of Suitability Index Models. Division of Ecological Services. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., USA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Gila Topminnow General Species Information. Unpublished abstract compiled by the Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Phoenix, AZ. Available from <http://www.fws.gov/arizonaes/Southwes.htm>. (Accessed January 27, 2006).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Species Information: Threatened and Endangered Animals and Plants website: <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/wildlife.html#Species> (Accessed January 4, 2006).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2010. 12-month Finding on a Petition to List the Tucson Shovel-Nosed Snake (*Chionactis occipitalis klauberi*) as Threatened or Endangered with Critical Habitat. Federal Register 75: 16050-16065.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: 12-month finding on a petition to list the Sonoran population of the desert tortoise as Endangered or Threatened. Fed. Reg. 75, 78094-78146.
- Van Wieren, S.E. and P.B. Worm. 2001. The use of a motorway wildlife overpass by large mammals. *Netherlands Journal of Zoology* 51: 97-105.
- Vander Haegen, W.M., G.R. Orth, and L.M. Aker. 2005. Ecology of the western gray squirrel in south-central Washington. Progress report. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia. 41pp.
- Vohies, C.T., and W.P. Taylor. 1933. The life histories and ecology of jack rabbits, *Lepus alleni* and *Lepus californicus* spp., in relation to grazing in Arizona. University of Arizona College Agricultural Technical Bulletin 49: 471-587.
- Vos, C.C., J. Verboom, P.F.M. Opdam, and C.J.F. Ter Braak. 2001. Toward ecologically scaled landscape indices. *The American Naturalist* 183: 24-41.
- Wallmo, O.C. 1981. Mule and Black-tailed deer of North America. University of Nebraska Press. Lincoln and London. 605 pp.
- Webb, R.H. and H.G. Wilshire. 1983. Environmental effects of off-road vehicles: impacts and management in arid regions. New York : Springer-Verlag.
- Welch, J.M. 1960. A study of seasonal movements of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus Couesi*) in the Cave Creek Basin of the Chiricahua Mountains. M.S. Thesis, Univ. Arizona, Tucson, 79 pp.
- Wenger, S.J. 1999. A review of the scientific literature on riparian buffer width, extent and vegetation. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, Public Service and Outreach, Institute of Ecology. 59 p.
- Wenger, S.J. and L. Fowler. 2000. Protecting stream and river corridors. Policy Notes, Public Policy Research Series vol 1, no. 1. Carl Vinson Institute of Government, University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Available online: <http://www.cviog.uga.edu/publications/pprs/96.pdf>.
- Wilbor, S. 2005. Audubon's important bird areas program's avian habitat conservation plan: U.S. Upper Santa Cruz River Riparian Corridor, Santa Cruz County, Arizona. Audubon Society, Tucson, AZ. Available online: <http://www.tucsonaudubon.org/azibaprogram/UpperSantaCruzRiverAvianHabitatConsPlan.doc>.
- Wissmar, R.C. 2004. Riparian corridors of Eastern Oregon and Washington: Functions and sustainability along lowland-arid to mountain gradients. *Aquatic Sciences* 66: 373-387.
- Woolf, A. and Hubert, GF. 1998. Statue and Management of Bobcats in the United States over Three Decades: 1970– 1990. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* vol. 26, n 2, p 287-293.

- Yanes, M., J.M. Velasco, and F. Suárez. 1995. Permeability of roads and railways to vertebrates: the importance of culverts. *Biological Conservation* 71: 217-222.
- Zeigenfuss, L.C., F.J. Singer, and M.A. Gudorf. 2000. Test of a modified habitat suitability model for bighorn sheep. *Restoration Ecology* 8: 38-46.
- Zoellick, B.W. and N.S. Smith. 1992. Size and spatial organization of home ranges of kit foxes in Arizona. *Journal of Mammalogy* 73: 83.

Appendix H: Data Requests

To obtain a copy of the GIS data or field investigation photographs for use in your local planning efforts please contact the Habitat Program at AGFD's Tucson regional office at (520) 628-5376 or the Department's GIS Program at gis@azgfd.gov.

Additional tools are available from AGFD to help planners identify wildlife resources in a project planning area. These tools include the *Species and Habitat Conservation Guide* (SHCG), a model depicting areas of wildlife conservation potential, and *HabiMap™ Arizona*, an online data viewing platform that serves as an exploration tool for AGFD's wildlife datasets. Site-specific reports on wildlife species of concern and federally-listed threatened and endangered species are available through the *Online Environmental Review Tool*. All of these tools, along with additional resources such as helpful guidelines documents, can be accessed on AGFD's "Planning for Wildlife" web page at <http://www.azgfd.gov/WildlifePlanning>.

For a more in depth description of GIS wildlife corridor modeling approaches and to download ArcGIS modeling tools developed by scientists at Northern Arizona University please see the CorridorDesign website at <http://corridordesign.org>. Here you will also find a number of completed Arizona Missing Linkage designs (2007 – 2008) produced by the CorridorDesign team through funding provided by the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Heritage Fund.