

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
1	Accessibility	I also do not think I would be fair to handicapp people if it is a wilderness area as they would not be able to use motorized wheelchairs	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA
2	Accessibility	This would not give access for the elderly or handicapped as they would not be able to walk through the area. As it is now we can drive our vehicle there and enjoy the scenery.	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA
3	Accessibility	People with disabilities, elderly, and toddlers (1-5) are unable to experieance these lands which are also theres.	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA
4	Accessibility	The road through Mills Canyon provide good accessability for all as well as conserving the environment.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
5	Accessibility	It would only further restrict access to the area, and restrict use for some of us.	Thank you for your comment.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
6	Accessibility	There is no reason whatsoever to change the current conditions at Mill Canyon. If anything, the road should be continued through the south west side and onto.. . I-25	There is no public right of way across private land on the west side of Mills Canyon. The road that goes up the west side of canyon, up Canon Vercere, is closed to protect public health and safety.	Access and Boundaries p. 3 "The only public access to the Canadian River PWA is from NFSR 600. There are also roads across private ranch lands on either side of the Canadian River Canyon PWA."
7	Accessibility	Access for the disabled/elderly is a concern.	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA
8	Accessibility	limiting accessibility of handicap people to the area.	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA
9	Accessibility	would limit use for physically challenged people	Wheelchairs and motorized wheelchairs, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, are a permissible use in wilderness. ATVs do not meet the definition of a wheelchair. Other forms of mechanized transport are also prohibited. Motorized access to the campground and interpretive sites will not be affected.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
10	Boundaries	the Wilderness evaluation boundary could be extended to the pinyon-juniper forests and the grasslands below the rim.	<p>The boundary of the rim was selected because it is the most manageable boundary for the potential wilderness area. The rim is a natural barrier to prevent intrusion of motorized vehicles from the east and west of the canyon. Extending the boundary above the rim would conflict with the ability to effectively manage the area as wilderness. Acreage adjustments along the rim do little to increase the wilderness attributes. □</p> <p>□ Extending the boundary above the rim would also conflict with land management activities in the pinyon-juniper area. This information will be updated in the final report.</p>	p. 7 "An addition to the potential wilderness area onto the upland area does not contribute much to the capability of the potential wilderness area and would greatly decrease the manageability of the area because of the flat open terrain of the area above the canyon rim. "
11	Boundaries	we feel you will find plenty of opportunities to expand the boundaries of a Mills Canyon Wilderness above the rim of the canyon and onto pinyon-juniper forests and grasslands.	<p>The boundary of the rim was selected because it is the most manageable boundary for the potential wilderness area. The rim is a natural barrier to prevent intrusion of motorized vehicles from the east and west of the canyon. Extending the boundary above the rim would conflict with the ability to effectively manage the area as wilderness. Acreage adjustments along the rim do little to increase the wilderness attributes. □</p> <p>□ Extending the boundary above the rim would also conflict with land management activities in the pinyon-juniper area. This information will be updated in the final report.</p>	See 10

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
12	Boundaries	the Forest Service should be aware of the frequent use of the road across the river from the new campground that goes to a popular camping area down the western bank of the river to a stand of cottonwoods. This road should remain open and outside the recommended Wilderness boundaries.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	p. 6"...a boundary change that extends the excluded road system to the very popular cottonwood grove south and west of Mills Canyon Campground would also diminish the opportunities for solitude and wilderness characteristics. "
13	Boundaries	extend Wilderness evaluation boundary lines -- to the pinon-juniper forests and the grasslands above the rim	<p>The boundary of the rim was selected because it is the most manageable boundary for the potential wilderness area. The rim is a natural barrier to prevent intrusion of motorized vehicles from the east and west of the canyon. Extending the boundary above the rim would conflict with the ability to effectively manage the area as wilderness. Acreage adjustments along the rim do little to increase the wilderness attributes. □</p> <p>□ Extending the boundary above the rim would also conflict with land management activities in the pinyon-juniper area. This information will be updated in the final report.</p>	See 10

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
14	Boundaries	Given its remoteness and its constricted access points, a Canadian River Wilderness would be easily managed.	Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other points of access. There are two roads going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability on pages 5 and 6.	NA
15	Boundaries	The boundaries proposed in the evaluation report are inadequate.	The boundaries of the proposed area meet the requirements for inventory of potential wilderness areas under FSH 1909.12 Chapter 70.	NA
16	Boundaries	plenty of opportunities to expand the boundaries of a Wilderness area above the rim of the canyon and onto pinyon-juniper forests and grasslands.	<p>The boundary of the rim was selected because it is the most manageable boundary for the potential wilderness area. The rim is a natural barrier to prevent intrusion of motorized vehicles from the east and west of the canyon. Extending the boundary above the rim would conflict with the ability to effectively manage the area as wilderness. Acreage adjustments along the rim do little to increase the wilderness attributes. □</p> <p>□ Extending the boundary above the rim would also conflict with land management activities in the pinyon-juniper area. This information will be updated in the final report.</p>	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
17	Boundaries	the road across the river from the new campground that goes to a popular camping area down the western bank of the river to a stand of cottonwoods. This road should remain open and outside the recommended Wilderness boundaries.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	See 12
18	Boundaries	[BOUNDARY CHANGE] from Caprock to Caprock is fine except for State land	The agency does not have authority over non-federal lands within wilderness areas. Adjusting the boundary of the potential wilderness area to remove all State trust lands and adjacent federal land would diminish the acreage to below 5,000 acera and affect its capability.	p. 2 "The Canadian River PWA is approximately 6,033 acres, of which 5,448 acres are National Grassland and 584 are State lands. " plus footnote
19	Boundaries	That road is important to a lot of people, all the way to the end, for many people.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	See 12
20	Boundaries	Extend the boundary around the road all the way to the cottonwoods and exclude roads to the rock slab table and to Ship Rock from the evaluation area boundary.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand and ship rock would extend the cherrystemmed road area. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area. The rock slab is currently excluded from the PWA.	p. 6 " . Likewise, a boundary change that extends the excluded road system to the very popular cottonwood grove south and west of Mills Canyon Campground would also diminish the opportunities for solitude and wilderness characteristics. The same logic means the exclusion of roads accessing Ship rock and the rock slab table from the PWA would make the area less manageable. "

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
21	Boundaries	Don't change boundary because it doesn't provide good enough access, don't add to boundary	Thank you for your comment.	NA
22	Boundaries	The road exclusion from the boundary does not go so far as to allow motorized areas to the popular picnic area around the cottonwood grove.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	See 12
23	Boundaries	would like to see more of the surrounding grasslands included in this boundary. Perhaps making it a National Conservation Area. The grassland surrounding Mills Canyon is a particularly unique feature.	Recommendation as a National Conservation Area is outside the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation; however, alternative designations to wilderness may be considered as part of the overall plan revision process.	NA
24	Boundaries	Please do not change the boundary of the proposed area [PARAPHRASE]	Thank you for your comment.	NA
25	Boundaries	Do not change boundary of proposed area [PARAPHRASE] The boundary along the rim of the canyon is a good boundary to control access to the area.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
26	Boundaries	Would not like any boundaries - the proposed area needs to be reevaluated.	The boundaries of the proposed area meet the requirements for inventory of potential wilderness areas under FSH 1909.12 Chapter 70.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
27	Boundaries	Would like to see change to boundary of proposed area - State Trust land should not be included in the boundary. [PARAPHRASE]	The agency does not have authority over non-federal lands within wilderness areas. Adjusting the boundary of the potential wilderness area to remove all State trust lands and adjacent federal land would diminish the acreage to below 5,000 acres and affect its capability.	See 18
28	Boundaries	Would like to see change to boundary of proposed area - State Trust land should not be included in the boundary. [PARAPHRASE]	The agency does not have authority over non-federal lands within wilderness areas. Adjusting the boundary of the potential wilderness area to remove all State trust lands and adjacent federal land would diminish the acreage to below 5,000 acres and affect its capability.	See 18
29	Boundaries	Please do not change the boundary of the proposed area. [PARAPHRASE]	Thank you for your comment.	NA
30	Boundaries	Is the State Land included in the evaluation boundary of 6,000 acres?	The agency does not have authority over non-federal lands within wilderness areas. Adjusting the boundary of the potential wilderness area to remove all State trust lands and adjacent federal land would diminish the acreage to below 5,000 acres and affect its capability.	See 18

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
31	Boundaries	If a Wilderness area is not to be given a buffer zone, then conversely and logically, outside sights and sounds are not to be considered as detractions from the area itself	There is no intent from the Forest Service to create a buffer zone. The draft PWA Report disclosed the impacts of the cherrystemmed road on the area's capability. Outside sights and sounds are one of many criteria considered as part of the capability analysis. The road corridor and campground would force wilderness users seeking solitude to move further up and down the canyon in order to find it.	"A GIS analysis using viewpoints along the road every half mile and campground in the excluded area estimates that 36% of the PWA is visually impacts by the presence of the road and developed facilities. This means that from approximately a third of the PWA, a visitor might see a car on the road, or see people in the campground or at the interpretive site. This drastically reduces the opportunities for solitude and a primitive experience in an area this small" p. 7
32	Boundaries	From a conservation biology perspective, long cherrystems can potentially degrade the ecological integrity of an area, but it is an accepted practice to allow well used routes to remain open for access to a Wilderness area.	Section 2(c) 3 of the Wilderness Act of 1964 states that a wilderness area should have " at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." The cherry stem roads dominate the north 3rd of the canyon and is in close proximity to the western private land boundary of the area. The associated crossing and historic developments do not result in an "untrammelled" area and do have an impact on the manageability of the area for "primitive and unconfined recreation" and "solitude."	See 31
33	Boundaries	Please note that NMWA would support extending the cherrystem of FR600 to include the cottonwood gallery on the west side of the river. This is because it is clearly important to the local community.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	See 10

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
34	Boundaries	It is not a case of multiple access points that must be controlled, but rather a few points off of one main route (K600). NMWA's field work shows that there are some key choke points that could be utilized and we would be happy to partner with the FS to help put up the needed signs and barriers.	Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other points of access. There are two roads going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability on pages 5 and 6.	NA
35	Boundaries	these barriers would be built at or outside of the Wilderness boundary, so the "outside sights and sounds" argument above applies here as well. With any fence or barrier, one would not need to walk far to be out of its view. They are used throughout the Wilderness Preservation System.	Regardless of the outcome of the wilderness evaluation process, Mills Canyon is a special area in the plan and will have management direction specific to its unique characteristics.	Manageability p. 6 and 7
36	Boundaries	Again, the FS is wrongly using outside sights and sounds to lower the area's wilderness rating. NMWA, the state's leading Wilderness advocacy group, sees K600 as an important public resource because of the incredible country to which it provides access to.	There is no intent from the Forest Service to create a buffer zone. The draft PWA Report disclosed the impacts of the cherrystemmed road on the area's capability. Outside sights and sounds are one of many criteria considered as part of the capability analysis. The road corridor and campground would force wilderness users seeking solitude to move further up and down the canyon in order to find it.	See 31
37	Boundaries	The road to the cottonwood gallery on the west side of the river should remain open.	Allowing road use to the cottonwood stand would extend the cherrystemmed road by about a mile. A change of this nature would further diminish or detract from the capability, and in particular, the solitude in the area.	See 10

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
38	Congressional Designations	I appose such designation for this area.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
39	Congressional Designations	I would not want to see Mills Canyon a Wilderness area.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
40	Congressional Designations	The New Mexico Wilderness Alliance requests that the Forest Service recommend Mills Canyon for Wilderness designation.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
41	Congressional Designations	For the reasons clearly stated above, the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance strongly suggests that the Forest Service recommend the Canadian River Potential Wilderness Area for Wilderness designation under the 1964 Wilderness Act.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
42	Cultural Resources	It is also a part of our Historical Heritage	Thank you for your comment.	NA
43	Cultural Resources	The FS notes the concrete water crossing and vehicle barriers to protect historical sites as non-wilderness characteristics. Again, these fall under the "outside sights and sounds argument" noted above and should have no bearing on this evaluation.	Only some of the historic structures associated with the Mills Orchard and Ranch are outside of the potential wilderness boundary. Historic structures can detracted untrammed appearance of the area. This was addressed under criteria number 7 in Appendix A of the report, which will be clarified.	p. 9 "The standing historic adobe structures within the Potential Wilderness Area have been stabilized and will likely require future maintenance to retain their integrity. Movement of the materials for site stabilization would require motorized vehicles because the quantity of materials needed cannot be found in the canyon."
44	Cultural Resources	The historic structures are, again, outside the boundaries.	Only some of the historic structures associated with the Mills Orchard and Ranch are outside of the potential wilderness boundary. Historic structures can detracted untrammed appearance of the area. This was addressed under criteria number 7 in Appendix A of the report, which will be clarified.	See 43

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
45	Easements/RO Ws	A wilderness designation would limit access to private land in-holdings, state trust, and Bureau of Land Management lands.	Access to all non-Forest Service lands within the current PWA boundary, would follow the regulations 36 CFR 251 Land Uses.	NA
46	Easements/RO Ws	The RMP should recognize the necessity of giving the State Land Office road access to Trust Lands to permit maximizing revenue for the State Trust institutions.	Access to all non-Forest Service lands within the current PWA boundary, would follow the regulations 36 CFR 251 Land Uses.	See 45
47	Ecosystem Health/Restoration	If designated as Wilderness, would area still be managed sustainably (particularly when it comes to fuels and fire)?	Many management tools can continue to be used in the area, if it is designated a wilderness. Grazing, where established, can continue subject to Forest Service regulation, Fences, fire, chemicals, and water developments are allowed when minimum tool requirements are met and the project meets wilderness management objectives. Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 outlines these uses and prohibitions, such as no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motor boats, etc. within a wilderness area.	p. 17 "Managing prescribed fire will be unsafe without the use of motorized equipment and is unlikely to continue to occur on a regular basis. This may result in the area having a less natural vegetation structure and composition, additional fuel loading and an increase in potential for high intensity wildfires."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
48	Ecosystem Health/Restoration	Efforts to prescribe fire, enhance wildlife values, and restore the river corridor should continue in earnest.	Restoration projects planned in the foreseeable future were planned considering the use of mechanized equipment wilderness designation would make this harder to complete.	
49	Facilities	I believe there are already enough government restrictions on the camp ground area already.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
50	Facilities	Interpretive facilities could actually enhance wilderness values. As in the fence/barrier example mentioned above, the actual look of the facilities will be the key. The facilities are a way to educate the public about the wilderness values surrounding the historic sites. This commonly occurs at existing Wilderness areas.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
51	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	We Support increased Forest Service presence in Mills Canyon	Nationally, field presence is a concern of the agency and the public. The Grasslands have requested additional law enforcement assistance from the Washington Office. There is also the potential of having a volunteer campground host at the new campground.	NA
52	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	You're going to have to get more law enforcement for this.	Nationally, field presence is a concern of the agency and the public. The Grasslands have requested additional law enforcement assistance from the Washington Office. There is also the potential of having a volunteer campground host at the new campground.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
53	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	There are 77,000 acres of FS land in Harding Co. It needs at least one FS employee.	This is beyond the scope of the wilderness evaluation process.	NA
54	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	FS process publicized the area as a result of this process, potentially increasing vandalism, trash, and OHV/vehicle traffic;	Thank you for your comment.	NA
55	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	enforcement,	Nationally, field presence is a concern of the agency and the public. The Grasslands have requested additional law enforcement assistance from the Washington Office. There is also the potential of having a volunteer campground host at the new campground.	NA
56	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	Many of the manageability problems can be traced to the simple fact that the FS has no regular presence in the Kiowa National Grasslands.	Nationally, field presence is a concern of the agency and the public. The Grasslands have requested additional law enforcement assistance from the Washington Office. There is also the potential of having a volunteer campground host at the new campground.	NA
57	FS Presence/Law Enforcement	Potential Wilderness proposal could create a Forest Service presence to patrol the area.	Nationally, field presence is a concern of the agency and the public. The Grasslands have requested additional law enforcement assistance from the Washington Office. There is also the potential of having a volunteer campground host at the new campground.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
58	Grazing	In order to improve the habitat and ecosystem I believe that cattle should be allowed to graze in the total Mills Canyon Area.	The 1964 Wilderness Act allows for existing grazing to continue. The method of access to manage improvements and cattle would be determined using the minimum tool requirements as required by Forest Service policy, if the area were to be designated as wilderness.	Effects of Recommendations section p. 16-18
59	Grazing	Some ranchers depend on this canyon for making a living.	The 1964 Wilderness Act allows for existing grazing to continue. The method of access to manage improvements and cattle would be determined using the minimum tool requirements as required by Forest Service policy, if the area were to be designated as wilderness.	See 58
60	Grazing	Maintaining cattle grazing fees is important.	The 1964 Wilderness Act allows for existing grazing to continue. The method of access to manage improvements and cattle would be determined using the minimum tool requirements as required by Forest Service policy, if the area were to be designated as wilderness.	See 58
61	Grazing	make sure to protect grazing so it continues,	The 1964 Wilderness Act allows for existing grazing to continue. The method of access to manage improvements and cattle would be determined using the minimum tool requirements as required by Forest Service policy, if the area were to be designated as wilderness.	See 58
62	Grazing	maintaining grazing would be difficult (e.g., retrieving cattle in emergency situations, access to manage cattle, etc.),	The 1964 Wilderness Act allows for existing grazing to continue. The method of access to manage improvements and cattle would be determined using the minimum tool requirements as required by Forest Service policy, if the area were to be designated as wilderness.	See 58

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
63	Health and Safety	Wilderness Areas are extremely hard/difficult and almost impossible to look for lost/injured people and render first aid in due to the restrictions on motorized vehicles and helicopters.	Use of motorized and mechanized equipment can be authorized in case of emergency affecting the health and safety of people or property.	p. 17 " Typical wilderness users have a certain expectation of self-reliance. Access into the area by the NFSR 600 will always be a used to assist in emergency extraction by motorized means."
64	Health and Safety	How would you fight a wild fire without adequate equipment in place?	Suppression strategies for wildfires are developed depending on size, terrain, forecasted weather, and available resources with firefighter health and safety being critical. Use of motorized and mechanized equipment are not excluded in situations where life and property is threatened by a designated wilderness.	p. 17 " Managing prescribed fire will be unsafe without the use of motorized vehicles and is unlikely to continue to occur on a regular basis. This may result in the area having a less natural vegetation structure and composition. "
65	Health and Safety	Medical emergency evacuations (e.g., allowing helicopters, etc.) are important.	Use of motorized and mechanized equipment can be authorized in case of emergency affecting the health and safety of people or property.	See 63
66	Health and Safety	safety issues (if more people, protection and safety may be an issue),	Use of motorized and mechanized equipment can be authorized in case of emergency affecting the health and safety of people or property.	See 63
67	Health and Safety	This limited access would also impede ability to control wildfires, thus increasing risk to private property and natural resource attributes that could be damaged.	Due to the nature of the mixed ownership pattern around Mills Canyon, the agency will use an appropriate response to wildfire for control and suppression.	See 64

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
68	Invasive Plants	Invasive species such as salt cedar in the springs, seeps and along the Canadian River within the Canyon are a major problem affecting habitats, contributes to dewatering and disrupts the structure of desirable native plant communities. Other watershed improvement projects may also require use of machinery ranging from chainsaws to large earth moving equipment.	Invasive plant management projects in the canyon for the foreseeable future would involve aerial spraying and mechanized equipment to control salt cedar. The timeframe expected for these activities is 5 to 20 years. Invasive species detract from the naturalness and decrease the capability of the PWA. See p. 7 of the report.	p. 17 "Unobligated grazing allotments, at the time of designation, will not be available for use in the future.."
69	Invasive Plants	The presence of non-native, invasive riparian vegetation and sounds of human activities on adjacent lands further detract from the areas naturalness.	Invasive plant management projects in the canyon for the foreseeable future would involve aerial spraying and mechanized equipment to control salt cedar. The timeframe expected for these activities is 5 to 20 years. Invasive species detract from the naturalness and decrease the capability of the PWA. See p. 7 of the report.	See 68
70	Invasive Plants	Certain restoration activities, such as targeted, on the ground removal of invasives area allowed in Wilderness areas therefore, after any potential Wilderness designation small scale work could be done within the Wilderness boundaries to keep the tamarisk from returning and to assure a healthy, native riparian system.	The area impacted and species of invasive plants within the PWA does not lend themselves solely to hand or nonmechanical treatments.	p. 17 "Salt cedar treatments will go forward in the short term (5 to 10 years). In the long term, re-introduction of invasive plants along the river will not be easily contained or eliminated because of the difficulty in removing the seed source. Reintroduction of salt cedar could lead to the spread of salt cedar or other invasive species throughout the riparian area and onto adjacent nonfederal lands."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
71	Invasive Plants	the tamarisk infestation should not in any way detract from the Wilderness quality of the area as it can be removed prior to any possible Wilderness designation.	Invasive plant management projects in the canyon for the foreseeable future would involve aerial spraying and mechanized equipment to control salt cedar. The timeframe expected for these activities is 5 to 20 years. Invasive species detract from the naturalness and decrease the capability of the PWA. See p. 7 of the report.	See 68
72	Invasive Plants	after any potential Wilderness designation small scale work could be done within the Wilderness boundaries to keep the tamarisk from returning and to assure a healthy, native riparian system.	The area impacted and species of invasive plants within the PWA does not lend themselves solely to hand or nonmechanical treatments.	See 70
73	Invasive Plants	would make control of salt cedar more difficult and thus adversely affect downstream land owners.	Invasive plant management projects in the canyon for the foreseeable future would involve aerial spraying and mechanized equipment to control salt cedar. The timeframe expected for these activities is 5 to 20 years. Invasive species detract from the naturalness and decrease the capability of the PWA. See p. 7 of the report.	See 68
74	Invasive Plants	It is too small. It has a large weed problem. It is not conducive to a wilderness area, in that it is too narrow and too small.	Thank you for your comment.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
75	Invasive Plants	How would salt cedar and other noxious weeds be controlled?	Invasive plant management projects in the canyon for the foreseeable future would involve aerial spraying and mechanized equipment to control salt cedar. The timeframe expected for these activities is 5 to 20 years. Invasive species detract from the naturalness and decrease the capability of the PWA. See p. 7 of the report.	See 68
76	Invasive Plants	NMWA supports efforts to remove non-native species from the river corridor.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
77	Invasive Plants	Tamarisks should be removed and restored with native species.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
78	Invasive Plants	The FS needs to rapidly initiate a comprehensive restoration action for the tamarisk inflicted areas. Removal of invasives are allowed in Wilderness areas.	The area impacted and species of invasive plants within the PWA does not lend themselves solely to hand or nonmechanical treatments.	See 70
79	Invasive Plants	Invasive tamarisk should be removed to restore the area's natural balance.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
80	Land Ownership	Clearly there are key parcels of state and private lands in and near the CRPWA that need to be acquired by the FS. Highest on the list would be the private and state parcels across from the campground, followed by the state parcels in and adjacent to the southern boundary, and then the state land north of K600 where it starts to descend in to the canyon.	Exchange or purchase of nonfederal land within the perimeter of a designated wilderness requires concurrence from the landowner.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
81	Motorized Use	Until its designation as Wilderness by Congress, the Forest Service should close unneeded routes in the area and step up enforcement against illegal ATV use.	If the area is recommended, the Forest Service will protect the area's wilderness values until it is designated.	NA
82	Motorized Use	The time has come to ban ALL ORV use in Mills Canyon and nearby areas to be protected, including the grasslands and pinyon-juniper forests along the canyon rim as well as the canyon slopes and bottom.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
83	Motorized Use	All illegal routes should be closed. Then Wilderness status that includes the pinyon-juniper forest and grasslands above would protect this area for my daughter's children.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
84	Motorized Use	The main obstacle to management as wilderness is the difficulty of excluding ORVs That's a big one. However, that obstacle must be faced whether a wilderness is designated or not.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
85	Motorized Use	Off road vehicles are a scourge that should be prohibited from the area.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
86	Motorized Use	I hope the forest service bans all ORV use in Mills Canyon as the first step in developing a rational and sustainable natural resources management plan	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
87	Motorized Use	indiscriminate use of motorized vehicles for years. The negative affects on wildlife habitats are well documented, and is specifically cited within the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS) and also included as a major threat specific to the shortgrass prairie ecosystem within the unique Mills Canyon area.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
88	Motorized Use	OHV use is not appropriate	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
89	Motorized Use	Some people thought there should be no OHV use allowed, others thought it should be allowed in designated areas.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
90	Motorized Use	<p>Under this section, the FS states the problems with controlling access including:□ "...protect the wilderness character would require closing existing and frequently used FS roads.."□ This appears to be another non-issue. We assume that K600 and K601 are the implied roads and there would be no need to close them. Regardless of Wilderness designation, the FS must increase efforts to stop illegal vehicle use upstream and downstream of the campground area.</p>	<p>The report is intended to be an analysis of the Canadian River are as a potential wilderness and not a decision document. Currently, most motorized use in the canyon is not prohibited. The upcoming Travel Management process will analyze the road system in the canyon to make final decisions on which routes remain open. Any closures in the canyon would require education and enforcement to make them effective. However, some routes, on the bottom, do pose a boundary manageability issue from the perspective of potential wilderness. This is statement of current condition and is not intended to project what the future road system in the canyon may be.</p>	NA
91	Motorized Use	<p>Currently, motorized recreation is legally limited to sight-seeing down to the canyon bottom for scenery and investigation of historical sites. Therefore, nothing would change.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.</p>	NA
92	Motorized Use	<p>The main obstacle to management as wilderness is the difficulty of excluding ORVs. That's a big one. However, that obstacle must be faced whether a wilderness is designated or not:</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.</p>	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
93	Motorized Use	Initial and continuing costs to exclude ORVs will be considerable; easier to justify these expenses in defense of a wilderness that the roadless area that may be designated anyway.	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
94	Noise	The fact that non-wilderness activities or uses can occasionally be seen or heard from areas within the Canadian River Potential Wilderness Area should not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses outside the boundary of the covered wilderness area and should not preclude this area from being recommended for Wilderness designation.	<p>While on most days, visitors in the canyon can enjoy the solitude, there are times where activities in and around the canyon can significantly impact visitor experiences. Since wilderness areas may not have buffer zones to protect the solitude of visitor experiences, controlling the intrusion of noise into the potential wilderness area is a management concern and would decrease the quality of the wilderness experience for some visitors. Due to the presence of the cherrystemmed road (K600) and the campground, in the heart of the PWA, visitors would still have to travel up and down in the canyon in order to have a higher quality wilderness experience. □</p> <p>□ While outside sites and sounds does not preclude an area from being managed as wilderness, it is required consideration of the capability in the potential wilderness evaluation process.</p>	p. 6 " Sounds from the developed campground, the excluded roads and adjacent land uses also have the potential to impact the experience of solitude within the PWA."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
95	Noise	Firewood harvesting on the uplands, just outside of the rim, would greatly decrease the wilderness "experience", as the sounds from chain saws will be heard across the canyon.	While on most days, visitors in the canyon can enjoy the solitude, there are times where activities in and around the canyon can significantly impact visitor experiences. Since wilderness areas may not have buffer zones to protect the solitude of visitor experiences, controlling the intrusion of noise into the potential wilderness area is a management concern and would decrease the quality of the wilderness experience for some visitors. While outside sites and sounds does not preclude an area from being managed as wilderness, it is required consideration of the capability in the potential wilderness evaluation process.	See 94
96	Noise	the detraction of CRPWA's wilderness characteristics due to "outside sights and sounds". This argument is used in many parts of the report, from diminishing CRPWA Opportunities for Solitude to explaining why creating barriers to vehicle access would detract from wilderness characteristics. The argument does not hold.	There is no intent from the Forest Service to create a buffer zone. The draft PWA Report disclosed the impacts of the cherrystemmed road on the area's capability. Outside sights and sounds are one of many criteria considered as part of the capability analysis. The road corridor and campground would force wilderness users seeking solitude to move further up and down the canyon in order to find it.	See 31

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
97	Noise	<p>Another example: The current legislation for the creation of a Ute Mountain Wilderness area in Taos County contains this wording (which was taken from pervious wilderness bills): <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> (e) BUFFER ZONES - Congress does not intend that designation of the wilderness areas under this Act lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the covered wilderness area. The fact that non-wilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a covered wilderness area shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the covered wilderness area (emphasis added). <input type="checkbox"/> Given this legislative direction, there would be no need to restrict noise-making activities such as chainsaw or water pumps outside the boundary and no need to consider those noise-making activities on the inside of the boundary.</p>	<p>There is no intent from the Forest Service to create a buffer zone. The draft PWA Report disclosed the impacts of the cherrystemmed road on the area's capability. Outside sights and sounds are one of many criteria considered as part of the capability analysis. The road corridor and campground would force wilderness users seeking solitude to move further up and down the canyon in order to find it.</p>	<p>See 31</p>

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
98	Noise	the FS has greatly overstated the presence of outside sounds.	<p>While on most days, visitors in the canyon can enjoy the solitude, there are times where activities in and around the canyon can significantly impact visitor experiences. Since wilderness areas may not have buffer zones to protect the solitude of visitor experiences, controlling the intrusion of noise into the potential wilderness area is a management concern and would decrease the quality of the wilderness experience for some visitors. Due to the presence of the cherrystemmed road (K600) and the campground, in the heart of the PWA, visitors would still have to travel up and down in the canyon in order to have a higher quality wilderness experience. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>While outside sites and sounds does not preclude an area from being managed as wilderness, it is required consideration of the capability in the potential wilderness evaluation process.</p>	See 94

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
99	Noise	<p>NMWA employees and members have taken numerous trips to Mills Canyon at different times of the year and are yet to encounter noise disturbances such as those listed. Their frequency is clearly quite low and that would not change with Wilderness designation since they are uses independent of such a designation.</p>	<p>While on most days, visitors in the canyon can enjoy the solitude, there are times where activities in and around the canyon can significantly impact visitor experiences. Since wilderness areas may not have buffer zones to protect the solitude of visitor experiences, controlling the intrusion of noise into the potential wilderness area is a management concern and would decrease the quality of the wilderness experience for some visitors. Due to the presence of the cherrystemmed road (K600) and the campground, in the heart of the PWA, visitors would still have to travel up and down in the canyon in order to have a higher quality wilderness experience. □ □ While outside sites and sounds does not preclude an area from being managed as wilderness, it is required consideration of the capability in the potential wilderness evaluation process.</p>	See 94
100	Noise	<p>The FS again uses "outside sights and sounds" as a main argument against solitude in the area (see above) and that argument clearly does not hold.</p>	<p>There is no intent from the Forest Service to create a buffer zone. The draft PWA Report disclosed the impacts of the cherrystemmed road on the area's capability. Outside sights and sounds are one of many criteria considered as part of the capability analysis. The road corridor and campground would force wilderness users seeking solitude to move further up and down the canyon in order to find it.</p>	See 31

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
101	Oil, Gas, Energy	concerns about availability of minerals/gas for exploration in the future	Currently, the Grassland has received interest for mineral leasing. The Grasslands has a decision that stipulates certain surface use restrictions in Mills Canyon area including restrictions for steep slopes, the roadless area, the eligible Wild and Scenic river corridor and the developed recreation site, all of which require no surface occupancy. This will be in place regardless of the outcome of the wilderness evaluation process.	Availability p. 8 " There is little or no potential for extraction of locatable minerals, low potential for oil-gas production, and the area is designated as "No Surface Occupancy" for any future oil-gas drilling. ."
102	Prescribed Burning	Regarding fire, the Kiowa should work toward a "let burn" policy for natural fire to the highest degree possible. Not only is fire a necessary component of ecosystem health, but fighting fires is strangulating an already over-burdened FS budget.	Due to the nature of the mixed ownership pattern around Mills Canyon, the agency will use an appropriate response to wildfire for control and suppression.	See 64
103	Recreation opportunities	Due to its location Mills Canyon is a unique area, worthy of Wilderness designation. Given its distance from large population centers, highways and flyways, as well as its scenery, vegetation, and permanent water source it offers prime wilderness recreation opportunities.	The report acknowledges the many outstanding and distinct features of the canyon. It also discloses that only parts of the canyon can provide the primitive and unconfined recreation or opportunities for solitude that are typical of wilderness recreation.	NA
104	Recreation opportunities	Photography opportunities should be allowed	Personal video and photography equipment is allowed in wilderness. Commercial video and photography permits are generally not.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
105	Recreation opportunities	Given its breathtaking scenery, its diverse vegetation and permanent water source, Mills is prime for the type of primitive recreation that we enjoy. Given its remoteness from large population centers, highways and over flight paths, Mills offers immense opportunities for solitude.	The report acknowledges the many outstanding and distinct features of the canyon. It also discloses that only parts of the canyon can provide the primitive and unconfined recreation or opportunities for solitude that are typical of wilderness recreation.	NA
106	Recreation opportunities	Given its breathtaking scenery, its diverse vegetation and permanent water source, Mills is prime for the type of primitive recreation that New Mexicans enjoy.	The report acknowledges the many outstanding and distinct features of the canyon. It also discloses that only parts of the canyon can provide the primitive and unconfined recreation or opportunities for solitude that are typical of wilderness recreation.	NA
107	Recreation opportunities	given its remoteness from large population centers, highways and over flight paths, Mills Canyon □ offers immense opportunities for solitude.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 5 and 11 Opportunities for Solitude and Visitor Pressure
108	Recreation opportunities	Don't want to see large RVs	This is beyond the scope of the wilderness evaluation process.	NA
109	Recreation opportunities	The Report does not acknowledge the long-held/historical and social values that locals hold regarding Mills Canyon; many locals have been recreating in the canyon for generations.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report.	Current uses and appearance p. 4 " Users find this area a very attractive recreation spot. Local users, in particular, have a strong attachment to the camping and picnicking spots within the PWA."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
110	Recreation opportunities	need for trail improvement (hiking, hunting, horseback riding), unusable trails,	This is beyond the scope of the potential wilderness evaluation process but will be addressed through Grasslands plan revision and the upcoming travel management planning process, which will result in a designated motorized route system for the Grasslands.	NA
111	Recreation opportunities	One of the prime features of Mills Canyon is the quiet and solitude. Even when near K600, there is so little use of machinery and other gas powered implements that this is a great place to collect one's thoughts.	While on most days, visitors in the canyon can enjoy the solitude, there are times where activities in and around the canyon can significantly impact visitor experiences. Since wilderness areas may not have buffer zones to protect the solitude of visitor experiences, controlling the intrusion of noise into the potential wilderness area is a management concern and would decrease the quality of the wilderness experience for some visitors. Due to the presence of the cherrystemmed road (K600) and the campground, in the heart of the PWA, visitors would still have to travel up and down in the canyon in order to have a higher quality wilderness experience. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> While outside sites and sounds does not preclude an area from being managed as wilderness, it is required consideration of the capability in the potential wilderness evaluation process.	See 94

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
112	Recreation opportunities	It is far enough away from major population centers that it should not be overused but having that scenic campground -- almost like an inholding in the area -- should provide access for a reasonable number of people	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 5 and 11 Opportunities for Solitude and Visitor Pressure
113	Special Uses	Woodcutting important to local residents.	If the PWA were designated as wilderness, mechanized wood cutting activities would not be allowed within the boundary.	p. 9 "The area has a low potential for commercial timber harvest. Wood gathering in the canyon for recreational use within the campground and at dispersed camping sites is allowed."
114	Species	I think it is a prime area for wilderness-related recreational opportunities, in addition to providing significant habitat for many species of plants and animals, including peregrine falcons.	While Mills Canyon has enormous biodiversity, it is not frequented by threatened species. There has been one sighting of a peregrine falcon in migration through the canyon, but no known nesting sites. There are no sightings of Southwest Willow Flycatcher or the threatened subspecies of Yellow-billed Cuckoo to the agency's knowledge. □ □ A designation of wilderness is not required to provide for the protection of wildlife resources in Mills Canyon.	p. 12 "On the other hand, representatives from wilderness advocacy groups and some members of the public expressed the view that attracting more people to the area through wilderness designation could contribute to the local tourism economy while protecting the special natural features in the canyon."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
115	Species	I am afraid that if it is declared a wilderness area that it will open up the chance for the future introduction of the mexican wolf or other endangered species	The Mexican grey wold recovery program is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. While reintroduction activities have occurred in some wilderness areas, the program is not dependent on wildernes for it to be carried out. The current reintroduction plan does not include this part of New Mexico.	NA
116	Species	Do not want a wilderness designation bcause would open up the chance for the mexican wolf or other species that we would not want in this area to be allowed to be moved in here	The Mexican grey wold recovery program is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. While reintroduction activities have occurred in some wilderness areas, the program is not dependent on wildernes for it to be carried out. The current reintroduction plan does not include this part of New Mexico.	See 115
117	Species	Please conduct baseline data on wildlife in Mills Canyon	Wildlife data is considered as part of the special features criteria under the capability portion of the analysis.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
118	Species	The Canadian River is a key wildlife corridor. Threatened species such as Peregrine Falcons regularly use the area. Wintering Bald Eagles are frequently seen and it is the only site in northeastern NM for Zone-tailed Hawks. A Wilderness designation for Mills would provide additional protection for grassland species and this important riparian habitat. It would protect a host of riparian-depenant species including Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and the Yellow-billed Cuckoo.	While Mills Canyon has enormous biodiversity, it is not frequented by threatened species. There has been one sighting of a peregrine falcon in migration through the canyon, but no known nesting sites. There are no sightings of Southwest Willow Flycatcher or the threatened subspecies of Yellow-billed Cuckoo to the agency's knowledge. □ □ A designation of wilderness is not required to provide for the protection of wildlife resources in Mills Canyon.	See 114
119	Species	Would wolf reintroductions be an issue if this is designated?	The Mexican grey wold recovery program is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. While reintroduction activities have occurred in some wilderness areas, the program is not dependent on wildernes for it to be carried out. The current reintroduction plan does not include this part of New Mexico.	See 115

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
120	Species	Threatened species regularly use this area.	<p>While Mills Canyon has enormous biodiversity, it is not frequented by threatened species. There has been one sighting of a peregrine falcon in migration through the canyon, but no known nesting sites. There are no sightings of Southwest Willow Flycatcher or the threatened subspecies of Yellow-billed Cuckoo to the agency's knowledge. □</p> <p>□ A designation of wilderness is not required to provide for the protection of wildlife resources in Mills Canyon.</p>	See 114
121	Tourism/Economic Development	Tourist from all over the world has come to spend time in the canyons. It would hurt what little County touring economics we have for getting tourists to come here.	It is difficult to determine what the visitation or economic outcome from a change in the management of Mills Canyon would be in the local economy. The Final Report will discuss economic scenarios but may not be able to determine which of these scenarios is the likely outcome of changes in management.	p. 17 "The economic effects of wilderness designation are difficult to predict. The substitution of one type of recreation user group for another has unclear impacts on local tourism. The effects of marketing and gas prices are more likely to result in changes to the local economy than wilderness designation."
122	Tourism/Economic Development	changing this canyon to a Wilderness would create hardships in this County	It is difficult to determine what the visitation or economic outcome from a change in the management of Mills Canyon would be in the local economy. The Final Report will discuss economic scenarios but may not be able to determine which of these scenarios is the likely outcome of changes in management.	See 121

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
123	Tourism/Economic Development	Most tourists want the area as it is and not changed	Approximately 70% of the comments received from the comment box indicate that visitors would like the canyon left the way it is now. Consideration of these public comments has been incorporated into the report.	NA
124	Tourism/Economic Development	I feel like this is an effort to create hardship for the local people so that a few people that live in the city can run up here and walk around a little bit, and I feel like our economy in this area is in bad enough shape as it is.	Completion of a potential wilderness inventory and evaluation is an essential step in the plan revision process. The Forest Service must evaluate all lands possessing wilderness characteristics for potential wilderness during plan revision (39 CFR 219.17). □ It is difficult to determine what the visitation or economic outcome from a change in the management of Mills Canyon would be in the local economy. The Final Report will discuss economic scenarios but may not be able to determine which of these scenarios is the likely outcome of changes in management.	See 121
125	Tourism/Economic Development	Maintaining private property taxes is important. [PILT]	Current uses that generate fees are expected to continue regardless of the outcome of this analysis.	NA
126	Tourism/Economic Development	loss of use would hurt local economy (rock crawlers bring a lot of dollars into community),	Rock crawling takes place outside the boundaries in Mills Canyon.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
127	Tourism/Economic Development	how much money comes into an area as a result of wilderness designations, how much money is lost as a result of a wilderness designation	It is difficult to determine what the visitation or economic outcome from a change in the management of Mills Canyon would be in the local economy. The Final Report will discuss economic scenarios but may not be able to determine which of these scenarios is the likely outcome of changes in management.	See 121
128	Tourism/Economic Development	Consider the whole package being offered here: an easy-to-travel road leading to a very scenic canyon with historical sites and suitable interpretation where one can then take a hike of almost seven miles, round trip, along a river in a protected Wilderness corridor. This would fit in very well with the Harding County economic development strategy, which includes this area as a recreation opportunity along the Frontera del Llano Scenic Byway.	This economic development opportunity exists regardless of whether or not it is recommended for wilderness designation.	p. 16 "The economic effects of wilderness designation are difficult to predict. The substitution of one type of recreation user for another has unclear impacts on local tourism. The effects of marketing and gas prices are more likely to result in changes to the local economy than wilderness designation."
129	Water	the Harding County Commission has talked about building a dam on the Canadian River to prevent all of our water going downstream. This is a priority for Harding Co. It's in our water plan (it's online under the Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan. How would this affect or be affected by wilderness designation?	A major water impoundment to the north of the canyon could affect the amount of natural flow in the area but the dam being proposed is many miles away near the Colfax County line.	p. 21 "Major water impoundment to the north of the canyon could affect the amount of natural flow in the area but the dam being proposed is many miles away near the Colfax County line to the north of the PWA."

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
130	Water	It then notes that this segment of the Canadian River is free-flowing and unimpaired but that there are problems upstream and downstream. The FS uses that to imply that problems outside the evaluation area are lowering its rating. This must be clarified.	For water pollution, Mills Canyon was rated as highly as the available data allowed. The segments up and downstream are impaired based on parameters for which there is no data available for the Mills Canyon segment of the Canadian River. The report will be edited to clarify the rating.	p. 22 "The segment within the potential wilderness boundary is not listed but the segments up and downstream from the area are listed as impaired for nutrients, air to water deposition of mercury, and eutrophication possibly caused by phosphorous levels. The segment of the Canadian River within the PWA has not been tested for the pollutants for which the adjacent segments are impaired, which makes Medium the highest possible rating of the PWA."
131	Water	The FS fails to note the most special feature of the area -- the free flowing Canadian River.	The area was rated High for this criteria under capability.	NA
132	Wilderness Need	Las Vegas lacks any easily accessible wilderness.	The Pecos Wilderness (220,088 acres) is accessible from Las Vegas, NM.	p. 11 "The Pecos Wilderness (220,088 acres) is the most easily accessible wilderness area from Las Vegas, NM. "
133	Wilderness Need	Bandelier is distant and topographically different	The southern canyon of the Bandalier Wilderness is dominated by the free-flowing Rio Grande River. The cliffs are formed from tuft which is a volcanic material similar in appearance to sandstone and the vegetation is similar to that of Mills Canyon with the exception that there are fewer cottonwood galleries.	p. 15 Photo Comparison of Canadian River and Bandelier Wilderness
134	Wilderness Need	I do not feel there is enough public demand to even consider the Canadian River as a need for Nation Wilderness Preservation.	Completing the potential wilderness evaluation is a required part of the plan revision process. Need is determined by several factors, including public demand, population pressure, and land form and ecosystem types represented regionally in the National Wilderness Preservation System.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
135	Wilderness Need	there are no Great plains of grasslands Wildernesses in the country, no Wilderness areas on the transition zone from mountain to plains and few that encompass such a diverse array of wildlife and ecotones. Further, there are no Wilderness areas along the Canadian River and that river corridor is a key wildlife corridor that shifts from the plains to the mountains.	Completing the potential wilderness evaluation is a required part of the plan revision process. Need is determined by several factors, including public demand, population pressure, and land form and ecosystem types represented regionally in the National Wilderness Preservation System.	NA
136	Wilderness Need	We "NEED" preservation of potential wilderness areas and National Grasslands. Protection from invasive species such as flora, cattle, motor vehicles, etc.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	NA
137	Wilderness Need	The 20,000 acre Sabinoso Wilderness Study Area, which is only 20 miles downstream is almost identical in most aspects except size.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 14 "This proposed wilderness is a better representation of the landform and vegetation type common to the subregion. "

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
138	Wilderness Need	I can't see any need at all in going through this process, because according to your report, there are 21 million acres in eleven states of the western US of Wilderness Areas - now how many people do you have? This is the most ridiculous proposal I've ever heard in my life.	Completion of a potential wilderness inventory and evaluation is an essential step in the plan revision process. The Forest Service must evaluate all lands possessing wilderness characteristics for potential wilderness during plan revision (39 CFR 219.17).	
139	Wilderness Need	The next smallest wilderness in acreage is 4,000 acres so the Canadian River Wilderness Area is really small compared to all the others so isn't this a stretch to include this one as a wilderness area?	The boundaries of the proposed area meet the requirements for inventory of potential wilderness areas under FSH 1909.12 Chapter 70.	
140	Wilderness Need	It seems as though there is no need for this Wilderness. Sabinoso's already approved. Would we really need this wilderness?	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
141	Wilderness Need	There is no need for Wilderness in this area as it would impose additional regulations.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	NA
142	Wilderness Need	The area of Mills Canyon is the only place where there is ample public access to this great river. The Canadian River makes this area distinctly different from the Sabinoso WSA 25 miles to the south, which contains similar canyons and cliffs, but lacks a year-round flowing river and has no direct public access to the Canadian.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 14 "The Canadian River PWA is not representative either of these descriptions and therefore its addition to the NWPS would not add to the representation of the vegetation types and landforms associated with this subsection...This proposed wilderness is a better representation of the landform and vegetation type common to the subregion. "
143	Wilderness Need	It would seem the only area that could meet the need criteria is a landscape so unique that it couldn't exist; occupying part of a 200,000 square mile region (250 mile radius) that has no current designated Wilderness; and it is adjacent to a population center of 500,000 Anglos.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
144	Wilderness Need	The assumption that "minority populations" do not favor Wilderness is strongly countered by our own experience with the Sabinoso WSA. San Miguel County has a majority Hispanic population and expressed overwhelming support for this area becoming designated Wilderness.	The report will update to expand its description of the similarities and differences between Sabinoso and Mills Canyon.	pp. 13-15
145	Wilderness Need	Sabinoso, at first glance, would seem similar to the CRPWA in terms of landform. However, the CRPWA excludes the upper mesa while a significant portion of Sabinoso is a high mesa with grassland meadows.	The report will update to expand its description of the similarities and differences between Sabinoso and Mills Canyon.	See 144
146	Wilderness Need	Furthermore, the canyons of Sabinoso are different because it is located adjacent to the Canadian River as it joins the Mora River and Cañon Largo. This creates an area of very intense erosion that is in many ways unique to upstream areas. We have already noted of Sabinoso's lack of a year-round, flowing river.	The report will update to expand its description of the similarities and differences between Sabinoso and Mills Canyon.	See 144

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
147	Wilderness Need	The FS similarity of CRPWA to Bandelier Wilderness is also minimal. The FS does not adequately compare landforms as highlighted in the Sabinoso example above. Bandelier is a series of canyons carved in to black basalt leading out of an extinct volcano in a mountainous ecosystem. This is a clear contrast to the CRPWA, which is out on the Plains and is mostly one main canyon carved into red, orange, and yellow sandstone.	The southern canyon of the Bandelier Wilderness is dominated by the free-flowing Rio Grande River. The cliffs are formed from tuft which is a volcanic material similar in appearance to sandstone and the vegetation is similar to that of Mills Canyon with the exception that there are fewer cottonwood galleries.	See 133
148	Wilderness Need	The FS process does not take in to account the factors that make the CRPWA unique. Though it is a river canyon, it is part of the Great Plains, which, as an ecological region, has very few designated Wilderness areas. Additionally, there is the fact that there are so few designated Wilderness areas in our National Grasslands system.	The evaluation report will be updated to include ecoregions in the "Need" section of the report.	p. 13-15 Ecoregions and Subregions

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
149	Wilderness Need	The list of comparative Wilderness areas has some basic flaws. Comparing a landscape of 800,000 or 400,000 or even 200,000 acres to one that is 6,000 acres makes little sense. The title states "...Areas with Similar Topography.." but it is hard to imagine how the Wheeler Peak Wilderness compares topographically to the CRPWA.	<p>Within larger wilderness areas there may exist areas of 5,000 to 10,000 acres of similar landform and vegetation type. Size is not a criteria used under the FSH 1909.12 Chapter 73 for the "Need" evaluation. □</p> <p>□</p> <p>The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.</p>	NA
150	Wilderness Need	We need as much designated Wilderness as we can get considering our growing population.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 11-12 Visitor Pressure

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
151	Wilderness Need	There is already enough Wilderness Area in NM and in the US.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 10 Wilderness and Non-wilderness Lands in the Vicinity
152	Wilderness Need	We "NEED" preservation of potential wilderness areas and National Grasslands.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 12 "On the other hand, representatives from wilderness advocacy groups and some members of the public expressed the view that attracting more people to the area through wilderness designation could contribute to the local tourism economy while protecting the special natural features in the canyon."
153	Wilderness Need	It is not true that a Mills Canyon experience competes with opportunities in the Forest Service's many mountain wildernesses of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado: terrain, vegetation, and location make the Canadian River canyon very different.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 13-15 Ecoregions and Subregions

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
154	Wilderness Need	Las Vegas lacks any easily accessible wilderness.	The Pecos Wilderness (220,088 acres) is accessible from Las Vegas, NM.	p. 11 "The Pecos Wilderness (220,088 acres) is the most easily accessible wilderness area from Las Vegas, NM. "
155	Wilderness Need	And consider that existing Forest Service wildernesses are accessible by skis or snowshoes in winter whereas Mills Canyon is open to hiking nearly throughout most years.	Thank you for your comment. The Report will be updated to incorporate public input into the evaluation report. Need is also determined by through an analysis of the degree to which it contributes to the overall National Wilderness Preservation System and on a regional basis by evaluating such factors as the geographic distribution of areas and population centers, and representations of landforms and ecosystems.	p. 4 "It is open year round, when there is not enough snow to close the road."
156	Wilderness Need	Your statement on p. 11 that BLM's Sabinoso WSA is "very similar to the landform and vegetation types of Canadian River Potential Wilderess Area" is false: Sabinoso is a mesa on which the Las Vegas Plains extend eastward in a "peninsula" high above the Canadian River.	The report will update to expand its description of the similarities and differences between Sabinoso and Mills Canyon.	See 144
157	Wilderness Need	That Bandelier Wilderness shares pinyons and junipers with Mills Canyon (p. 11) is irrelevant; Bandelier is distant and topographically completely different.	The southern canyon of the Bandelier Wilderness is dominated by the free-flowing Rio Grande River. The cliffs are formed from tuft which is a volcanic material similar in appearance to sandstone and the vegetation is similar to that of Mills Canyon with the exception that there are fewer cottonwood galleries.	See 133

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
158	WSR/IRA Management	It is prime for primitive recreational opportunities and solitude. It should be very manageable because of its constricted access points, which would make it easier to construct new barriers to deal with ATV use.	Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other points of access. There are two roads going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability on pages 5 and 6.	NA
159	WSR/IRA Management	with a little effort on your part, we cannot think of a more manageable area	The boundary of the rim was selected because it is the most manageable boundary for the potential wilderness area. The rim is a natural barrier to prevent intrusion of motorized vehicles from the east and west of the canyon. Extending the boundary above the rim would conflict the ability to effectively manage the area as wilderness. Acreage adjustments along the rim do little to increase the wilderness attributes. □ □ Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other point of access. There is the road going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
160	WSR/IRA Management	simple management changes such as proper signage and the construction of ORV barriers could greatly increase your ability to manage the area.	While ORV barriers would increase manageability for motorized access to the campground, constructed features are projected to detract from the wilderness character of the area. Due to the nature of the area, barriers would be visible for long distances rather than a few yards as is the case in most wilderness experiences.	p. 6 "Constructing fences and vehicle barriers to prevent motor vehicle access within the area would detract from wilderness characteristics but would improve manageability."
161	WSR/IRA Management	The Mills Canyon area is difficult to manage as it is now	This area holds several challenges in managing it for wilderness characteristics. They are addressed on page 5 and 6 of the evaluation report.	NA
162	WSR/IRA Management	Encouraging more tourists to an area this small with inadequate management would create additional problems.	This area holds several challenges in managing it for wilderness characteristics. They are addressed on page 5 and 6 of the evaluation report.	NA
163	WSR/IRA Management	a resources manager has at their disposal a multitude of tools. Some of these can be fire, grazing, rest, seeding, fencing, mechanical, chemical, etc. Wilderness designation effectively removes many of these options from being considered by a land manager.	Many management tools can continue to be used in the area, if it is designated a wilderness. Grazing, where established, can continue subject to Forest Service regulation, Fences, fire, chemicals, and water developments are allowed when minimum tool requirements are met and the project meets wilderness management objectives. Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 outlines these uses and prohibitions, such as no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motor boats, etc. within a wilderness area.	p.16-18 Effects of Recommendation

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
164	WSR/IRA Management	I do not believe this area possesses the characteristics desired in an area that is to be given a wilderness designation. I believe a policy of multiple use has been and should continue to be the highest and best use of this area.	Thank you for your comment.	NA
165	WSR/IRA Management	it is worth noting that the CRPWA is an extant Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) and must be managed as such.	Regardless of the outcome of the wilderness evaluation process, Mills Canyon is a special area in the plan and will have management direction specific to its unique characteristics.	See 35
166	WSR/IRA Management	Mills Canyon is a very manageable area given its remoteness and constricted access points.	Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other points of access. There are two roads going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability on pages 5 and 6.	See 14
167	WSR/IRA Management	The newly renovated Mills Canyon campground will most certainly attract more people to the core of the potential Canadian River Wilderness area. Currently this amount of use is not within wilderness guidelines and unregulated use at the boundary of the proposed area will be a management challenge.	Thank you for your comment.	NA

	Subcategory	Comment Text	Response	How was this addressed in the Report
168	WSR/IRA Management	The irregular shape, open terrain, and non-federal land along the boundary pose many challenges to maintaining this area as wilderness.	Even though K600 is the main access route, there are several other points of access. There are two roads going into the canyon from the west side, the road accessing the State trust land, and traffic entering the canyon from the north and south along the canyon bottom. This off-route travel reinforces the reports discussion of manageability on pages 5 and 6.	See 14
169	WSR/IRA Management	Recognizing these difficulties, we still think that wilderness designation is best for Mills Canyon.	Thank you for your comment.	NA