

FOREST PLAN REVISION - COMMENTS - November 2, 2006 to July 9, 2007		
7/19/2007		
<i>This document contains comments received between November 2, 2006 and July 9, 2007.</i>		
Comment	Source	Date
Thank you for the update and for the opportunity to comment. I recently attended a home owners meeting where we had a report on the planned thinning of the forest in the Apache Sitgreaves Forest area. It was very disappointing to see the Vernon district not being reviewed or represented for another several years. Each year it is breath-holding until the Monsoons as the area around Timber Knoll is nothing but a tinder box.	E-Mail - Vernon - 2415-1	11/3/2006
With respect to long term plans I was heartened to hear the pendulum has swung more to the conservative side of how the forest was to be used. I ride my horse and hike in the forest from Greens Peak to Brown's Creek primarily and live adjacent to the forest with a prime view to what's happening on a daily basis. I have joined other neighbors in the area to pick up trash in the forest and dumping of extraordinary amounts of those with no regard for the health or environment. Each ride I take, I come back with bags of trash from beer bottles/cans to just household garbage strewn everywhere. It is disgusting.	E-Mail - Vernon - 2415-1	11/3/2006
One frequent abuser of the forest is the ATV's. They think every elk trail is a forest rode and can go anywhere, anytime they so choose. they scream by my horse with the clear intent to spook it and do "wheelies" spinning in the open meadows. They are destroying the grass and in the summer before the monsoons, they are revving their motors on dry grass representing fire hazards. I have witnessed this on many occasions and even have ridden up to them and told them to stop or I would report them. They just don't care. When the Monsoons occur, they tear up the ground by driving in the pastures and creating deep ruts where previously there were none.	E-Mail - Vernon - 2415-1	11/3/2006
I hope there will be controls put in place to restrict these motorized vehicles to designated "official" roads and penalties for any off road activity. Enforcement must be a part of the change to come. Other states do not have problems like this because of the serious fines imposed for littering the forest or off road activity. (/colorado) While the forest belongs to all taxpayers, I don't think the laws were written with the understanding that these vehicles would become so prolific and so destructive and invasive to the forest lands. We are already behind the curve and action needs to take place soon. I thank you for the opportunity to comment,	E-Mail - Vernon - 2415-1	11/3/2006
Protect watersheds and waterways on USFS land in Towns for animal and vegetative habitat and flood control measures. Protect ground water by prohibiting wells for off USFS land use.	E-Mail - Lakeside - 2376-1	11/7/2006
Prevent Urban Sprawl . concentrate land exchanges in municipalities so that open space is on the exterior of the town boundaries adjacent to USFS open space. Development should be concentrated within interior of towns.	E-Mail - Lakeside - 2376-1	11/7/2006
Protect wildlife corridors. thru developments.	E-Mail - Lakeside - 2376-1	11/7/2006
Restrict roads, close unmapped roads in USFS.	E-Mail - Lakeside - 2376-1	11/7/2006
Continue thinning of small diameter tress to protect water and prevent wild fires.	E-Mail - Lakeside - 2376-1	11/7/2006
I believe that comments to management plans should be weighted. The closer the comments are to the affected community, the higher the weight.	E-Mail - Phoenix - 2451-1	11/9/2006
I support the original mission of the Forest Service - multiple use, maintenance, development of local strong local economies and communities. This vision must be balanced with protection of critical values like threatened and endangered species and appropriate wilderness and roadless area protection. In the past few months, I've been on the Mendocino, where the resource values are all about turning the forest into a National Park. In contrast, the Sequoia is apparently about sustained multiple use, recreation, and appropriate preservation.	E-Mail - Phoenix - 2451-1	11/9/2006
The biggest tragedy I've witnessed the past few years are driving through fire-nuked landscapes, uniformly burned, no break for mile after mile, even-aged, no wildlife edge, no shade for hikers, no vista mosaic for off-roaders, but with exceptional watershed response. I'll only mention the travesty of not being able to salvage log after major events in roaded, managed areas. USFS must be trusted and educate all of us, no matter what our POV may be. Don't reset our ecosystem for another stand-replacing, species shifting event. I'd sure like to be able to look across the landscape when driving in areas of potentially breathtaking vistas instead of endless thickets of tiny trees.	E-Mail - Phoenix - 2451-1	11/9/2006

<p>I'd also love to walk through the forest and find a diversity of plant, animal insect and spider species instead of walking on wonderfully soft pine needles punctuated with really sick-looking grama grass.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Phoenix - 2451-1</p>	<p>11/9/2006</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on forest use. My husband and I have been enjoying horseback riding, hiking, picnicking, camping, hunting, "wooding" (for firewood) and mushrooming in the Sitgreaves and Apache Sitgreaves National Forest since we first moved into the area in 1985. Of course we have seen many changes during the past 20 years, several of which are not good. These undesirable changes include trash everywhere and destruction of habitat due to motorized vehicles driving offroad and/or in a non-responsible way (i.e., making circles around stock tanks at speed, ruining any vegetation surrounding it, trying to drive through muddy, boggy places I guess just to see if they can do it, making "donuts" in the open meadows, creating ruts on hills, ignoring trail signs that are designated for only non-motorized travel, etc., etc.). Over the years, it appears that hikers are the best at "leaving no trace, horseback riders are next and then it goes downhill from here.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Vernon - 2452-1</p>	<p>11/12/2006</p>
<p>Also in the past 20 years, we note more roads in the forest, both those improved (widened and/or cindered by the FS) and those created by OHV's, ATV's or whatever you want to call them. More roads has led to more abuse of our forest. And yes, it is everybody's forest, but I feel that those who show no respect and/or appreciation of it should be prohibited from using it. It will no longer be a special place if we continue to allow this pollution (both noise and physical) to continue. Let those who must drive their noisy machines go to a special place set aside for them and make all the noise they want and sacrifice an area to be used specifically for them. Make jumps, mounds, muddy areas, all that "fun" stuff for them to "enjoy" in their own way, but keep them out of the forest.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Vernon - 2452-1</p>	<p>11/12/2006</p>
<p>Our forest has been thousands of years in the making and we cannot allow it to be treated with the lack of respect shown by too many of these vehicular drivers. To me, the forest is a special, almost sacred, place, to be enjoyed in quiet, humble peace.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Vernon - 2452-1</p>	<p>11/12/2006</p>
<p>Each summer my grandson, 15 this year, comes for a one to two-week visit from Los Angeles. One day this summer we went to a favorite area for mushrooming. Not finding many edible mushrooms, we filled up our bags with trash, wandering slowly. Then my grandson started pointing out the interesting pieces of wood lying around - some with holes, moss, twisted shapes, "this look like -", etc. Then of course there were the unusual mushrooms and toadstools we were unfamiliar with to appreciate up close, noting color and shapes. And the different sounds in the forest, whether birds or squirrels scolding us from above. Until a couple of ATV's screamed into our hearing. Just ruined the peaceful scene. But can you imagine a 15-year old boy, who lives in the big city, who was totally immersed in appreciation of all the forest had to offer with his grandmother and a hiking friend, two "old ladies"? Those kids and young adults who only ride through the forest are not developing the appreciation and awe that we should be encouraging and therefore should not be allowed to desecrate what we want to enjoy.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Vernon - 2452-1</p>	<p>11/12/2006</p>
<p>If we allow this to continue, there won't be a forest left as we know it today or as it was 10 years ago. And what about the wildlife? Surely they do not benefit from this type of activity. We must sustain our habitat for them also.</p>	<p>E-Mail - Vernon - 2452-1</p>	<p>11/12/2006</p>
<p>The following comments on the Forest Plan Revision are submitted by a coalition of conservation groups and on behalf of our members, many of whom are Arizona residents and enjoy the natural and scenic beauty of our public lands, as well as several individuals with strong interests in forest planning. This Arizona Forest Plan Revision Coalition is an informal coalition which consists of Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter, Center for Biological Diversity, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Arizona Wilderness Coalition, Arizona Zoological Society, The Wildlands Project, Forest Guardians, Maricopa Audubon Society, Sky Island Alliance, Grand Canyon Trust, Sonoran Audubon Society, Arizona Council of Trout Unlimited, Friends of Anderson Mesa, and the Arizona Wildlife Federation. Thank you for inviting the public to participate in the planning process. We would like to meet with you and the forest supervisors in Arizona to discuss the planning process and the principles we have developed at your earliest convenience. We have penciled in December 13, 2006 as a tentative date.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Arizona's forests are biologically diverse and culturally important. We recognize and we hope the agency recognizes the need to conserve these values now and for future generations. As such, we offer the following framework for management decisions regarding collaboration, fire protection, fuels management, cultural resources, economics, recreation, forest restoration, livestock grazing, invasive species, mining, off-road vehicles, roads, and transportation among others. These are all issues that we have identified as being important to us and our members, and which must be addressed in the plan revision process.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>Attached are the basic principles that we believe should guide forest plan revisions in Arizona. These principles were developed collaboratively over many months and vetted with a variety of individuals and interests. They do not specify certain actions; rather, they will help to guide the agency in crafting forest plans that reflect sustainability, multiple uses, and the long-term health of this collectively-owned asset. The forest plans, in turn, should guide site-specific actions that will align with the ideal vision that we collaboratively develop for the desired future conditions of our forests.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Thank you for considering our comments and we will continue to work with you as the revision process proceeds.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE FOREST PLAN REVISIONS 10/30/06</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>ARIZONA FOREST PLAN REVISION COALITION The Arizona Forest Plan Revision Coalition is organized to bring together the Arizona conservation community to share ideas, resources, and planning towards achieving the best possible Plan Revisions for Arizona's forests. Participants include a broad spectrum of conservation interests and individuals who enjoy the forests recreationally. The Coalition developed a set of principles through a collaborative process. These principles should guide the Forest Plan Revision Process for all of Arizona's National Forests.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>COLLABORATION • Include Diverse and Balanced Stakeholders. Potential stakeholders include local property owners, local governments, tribal representatives, industry groups, conservation groups, academics, scientists, and the interested public. All stakeholders must be invited to participate, both those interested as well as those directly affected, and there must be a way to involve non-local stakeholders (for instance, those from urban centers when rural issues of concern to them are at stake). Collaborative organizers should include balanced representation from relevant interests in the collaborative process and should avoid dominant representation by commercial interests, regardless of the decision-making rule used in the process.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Establish Clear Expectations and Goals. The collaborative process should be open, accessible and tailored, as much as possible, to participants' needs. Meetings should be civil and respect the ideas of all participants. Participants should agree on how they are going to collaborate and develop clearly articulated and achievable goals for action. All parties should agree at the outset, in writing, on a clear set of rules to govern the workings of the group that cover: who can participate, withdrawal, facilitation, minutes, meeting procedures, what constitutes a decision, and the form that any final agreement will take. Commitments made during collaboration should be honored.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Collaborate Early and Often. Collaboration is enhanced when participants are involved at all stages of project planning, including the identification of issues and concerns, potential project areas, the development of alternatives, project design and, where applicable, implementation and post-treatment monitoring. All members' key concerns should be articulated at the outset and addressed early.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Strive for Maximum Transparency in the Decision-Making Process. The criteria that will be used by decision-makers to select a final project or alternative should be made clear to the participants and the decision making process that will be used to apply the criteria should also be transparent and understood by all. There should be flexibility in the decision-making process to allow for multiple options to be considered. Financial resources should be made available to overcome lack of parity among participants in terms of expertise, skill, and experience. All participants should have access to expert advisors on relevant technical questions. Meetings must be held in various places to facilitate participation by all interested parties (urban as well as other stakeholders, those who work during the day or those for whom the process would not be part of their jobs, those without cars, etc.).</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Encourage Stakeholders to Function as Representatives. Participants in collaboration should serve as a liaison between the collaborative group and the interests they represent and, when appropriate, advocate within their constituency for the agreed to plan, project or activity. Communication between the entities should be enhanced as a result of the collaborative effort.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>• Foster Long-Term Participation. Collaboration will yield longer-term benefits if participants maintain regular communication and active participation in the collaborative process and are committed to staying engaged through completion of the plan, project or activity. New stakeholders should be added when appropriate.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Recognize Time Frames and Resources. Participants in collaboration should mutually agree on ways to accomplish their objectives within reasonable time frames and in consideration of resource limitations. Collaborative processes must recognize and honor participants' time and resource limitations as well as those that exist for implementing agencies.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Enhance Decision-Making. Collaboration should be conducted in a way that complements and informs formal decision-making. A collaborative process for forest planning should not be used by government agencies as an alternative to enforcing existing laws, such as NEPA, nor should it be used to supplant the authority of a land management agency by counter-imposing the weight of local opinion.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Consensus Decision-Making. A consensus decision-making rule adds value to collaborative processes. Legitimate consensus processes tend to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reassure opponents that they can work together, with the knowledge that they have effective veto power; o Require meeting the needs of each member of the group, forcing groups to seek creative solutions that might not occur otherwise; o Allow real consideration to be given to minority views that might otherwise be summarily dismissed; o Enhance a norm of responsibility for the group; and o Increase broad-based support and likelihood of implementation for decisions made by the group. 	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>COMMUNITY AND WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE FIRE PROTECTION Community fire protection is a high priority for forest planning. Fuels reduction and structure protection within the wildland urban interface should be completed as quickly as possible. Planning comprehensive community protection should be done in the context of both protection of life and property and restoration of fire adapted ecosystems and natural fire regimes. Aggressive community protection will enable effective restoration of forest ecosystems and natural fire regimes.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Current efforts to protect communities from the threat of forest fire are often planned without consideration for what is actually effective at protecting houses and communities from forest fires. Considering the current risks and the limited resources available for the implementation of fuels reduction projects, individual projects and strategic plans, including Forest Plans, need to utilize the best available science to develop the most effective and efficient methods for protecting houses and communities. At the same time, the focused treatment of the WUI is necessary in order to avoid inadvertently damaging adjacent forest ecosystems and wildlife habitat with poorly planned and ineffective projects.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>CULTURAL RESOURCES The desired future condition is the adoption of a comprehensive approach to ensure the continued protection of identified cultural heritage resources and enable the timely assimilation of any new information/discoveries to protect resources identified in the future. A flexible approach is urged in which the agency will utilize the full range of management mechanisms such as "special area" designations to preserve both landscapes and the cultural resources they harbor while ensuring that additional land uses remain compatible with cultural resources conservation objectives. In situations in which there are competing use demands, plans should be devised such that landscape and cultural resources preservation receive a high priority.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Prehistoric sites should be allowed to age naturally and remain undisturbed whenever possible. Active stabilization efforts should be kept to a minimum and site reconstruction projects are generally discouraged. A strategy of road closure/re-routing and provision of minimum signage is recommended to help prevent vandalism.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Active efforts to involve tribes and citizen groups such as the Arizona Archaeological Society in the process of forests resources identification and establishment and/or expansion of volunteer site steward programs are urged. In addition, because so much of the forest land cultural resources are un-surveyed, it would be desirable to consider developing mechanisms to gather and rapidly confirm new information obtained from the public that may reveal new resources deserving protection.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>Plans should include as integral elements mechanisms that will enable managers to receive, store and analyze data and meta-data relevant to on-the-ground conditions. A flexible approach that recognizes useful information may come from many sources – the public, commercial users, ranchers, etc. – and offers several channels for citizens to provide such input conveniently such as web sites, written response forms, or well-publicized phone numbers, will provide the structure and wherewithal essential for true adaptive management.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>ECONOMIC The natural heritage provided by our National Forests, i.e., productivity of native plants, wildlife, and fully-functioning natural ecosystems, improves the social, economic, and cultural condition of local communities, the nation, and future generations. The national forests provide important habitat for plants and wildlife, clean water, clean air, opportunities for hunting fishing, recreation, natural quiet, and visually pleasing natural landscapes, among many other critical ecological services. Any uses of the forests for social and economic benefit should be compatible with the national forests' long-term ecological sustainability and integrity. Any economic uses of national forests should be compatible with restoring and maintaining ecological integrity and should only be accommodated if they do not degrade the forests' natural heritage.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT Restoration of natural fire regimes and fire adapted ecosystems should be a high priority for the forest planning process. Restoration of natural fire regimes outside the WUI should be a primary goal of fire and fuels management. Recognition of the variability of forest and woodland ecosystems and associated fire regimes is critical to successful restoration of fire adapted ecosystems.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Wildland fire use and prescribed burning, both as fuels reduction and forest and grassland restoration tools, should be used wherever possible. Restrict mechanical thinning for fuels management and forest restoration to areas with system roads and where wildland fire use or prescribed burning is not possible. Wildland fire use and prescribed burning should be the preferred tool in areas without existing system roads.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Fire management planning consistent with the 2001 Wildland Fire Management Policy should be completed as soon as possible. Public involvement, including collaboration and NEPA, will ensure that fire management planning is effective and addresses the most critical areas and issues. Existing fire management plans that have not involved the public should be updated as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Fire suppression, where necessary, should include protection of habitat, fish and wildlife, watershed integrity, and other critical ecosystem elements as a high priority when conducting suppression activities. Emphasize the fire prevention responsibility of private landowners within and adjacent to the forests.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>GRAZING Manage the extent and intensity of livestock grazing on National Forest Service lands so that this practice is compatible with sustainable long-term ecological health and ecosystem integrity. If compatibility cannot be obtained, ecological values shall be given the highest priority. Ensure that permitted use does not exceed the lands' capacity and suitability for livestock grazing, and does not harm the sustained productivity of the forest. In cases where the threshold has been exceeded, rapidly implement all strategies for recovery, including rest, and then adjust livestock management to meet objectives. Base management decisions on quantifiable monitoring conducted at regular intervals, with an emphasis on methods specifically designed to meet all resource objectives. Restrict livestock use in riparian areas and the habitats of endemic and imperiled species where such use conflicts with watershed health and recovery goals. Allow for voluntary permanent retirement of grazing allotments and extended nonuse for resource protection.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>HUMAN TRENDS Work with universities and governments to collect and analyze human growth and use trends that may impact forest use within the region. Look at trends in urban, suburban, and ex-urban growth. Understand the projected expansion of the transportation systems and how people are using or interacting with public open spaces. Be informed about socio graphic trends including how people are using discretionary time to include how they are recreating. Work to project human use and development trends for at least 20 years and incorporate that trend analysis into forest health plans so the health of the forest is assured even as human use changes and expands.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>INVASIVE SPECIES</p> <p>Invasive species can rapidly alter the ecology of a region. They reduce biodiversity, change ecological composition and reduce the quality and volumes of environmental services. Consistent monitoring for and identification of invaders is imperative. Effective evaluation of methods of both precluding invaders and responding to them in ways that do not degrade the environment is important. Mitigations that are founded in good science, work against the invaders while not harming the surrounding ecology must be the policy of the land agency and their partners. As climate change becomes better understood and documented the effects of warming on species migration into previously unoccupied habitat should be monitored, understood, and responded to.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>MINING</p> <p>Identify areas in the national forests that, because of their outstanding biological, cultural, scenic or other resource values, are incompatible with any form of mining. In addition, permanently withdraw these areas from mineral entry. No mining should occur that degrades water quality for unique waters/outstanding waters, Wild and Scenic Rivers, critical habitat or any other special designation areas. Identify abandoned mines that present a risk to water quality and seek reclamation and restoration of those areas. Abandoned mine closures should take into consideration wildlife and include bat-friendly grates.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>RECREATION</p> <p>• Motorized Recreation & Off-Road Vehicles</p> <p>Allow motorized access only to areas where damage to natural and cultural resources will not occur. Protect sensitive areas, such as washes, land with archeological sites, and habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive species. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. Increase enforcement of laws governing</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Nonmotorized Recreation</p> <p>Adopt a road/trail ratio that reflects the needs of wild species and communities, as well as the needs of muscle-powered human users.</p> <p>Convert system and non-system roads to hiking/equestrian trails where appropriate. Prohibit the creation of wildcat trails. Reverse the trend toward increasing damage to the forest's trails from overuse or inappropriate use; take into account slope, soils, and other limitations. Steer trails away from sensitive habitat and cultural sites.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>• Commercial Recreation</p> <p>Allocations, opportunities, standards, rules, and guidelines must be applied equally to commercial and non-commercial public lands recreational users. While there is a legitimate need for professional outfitting and guiding in forests and wilderness areas, land managers should allocate use fairly and equally and avoid fixed allocations that favor commercial outfitters/guides over the general public that does not use outfitters/guides services.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>OLD GROWTH - PRESERVE ALL OLD GROWTH AND LARGE TREES</p> <p>Old growth and large trees that represent the next generation of old growth are important and rare ecosystem components at all scales, from individual to landscape level.. Old growth forests provide habitat for numerous birds and mammals including the northern goshawk, the Mexican spotted owl, the Kaibab squirrel in northern Arizona and the Mt. Graham Red Squirrel in southeast Arizona. Old Growth is critical to so many species because it provides key habitat attributes not found in less mature forests. These include large, old trees, large standing dead trees, vertical and horizontal structural diversity, nesting cavities, broken tops, and unique "plated" bark structure. In addition to these important habitat characteristics, Old Growth provides irreplaceable aesthetic values, recreational opportunities such as hiking and wildlife viewing, and provides a host of ecological services including overall watershed function, clean water, soil retention, and storage of greenhouse gasses.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH TO ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION</p> <p>Proposed land management actions should be based on a precautionary approach to land management, that is, decisions that adequately account for scientific uncertainty. These decisions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be made in an open and accountable process that includes sharing with all participants • be based on disclosed standards for justifying conclusions, and • include full disclosure of value judgments, and assumptions that underlie the interpretation of data and information. 	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>To implement the precautionary approach, decision makers must select alternatives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid harm and the potential for harm resulting in serious or irreversible damage to ecosystems • err on the side of conservation • expand and not foreclose future conservation and actions and options • avoid irreversible consequences • consider "no action" • provide high-quality scientific research for timely detection of actual or potential adverse impacts • recognize that action to protect ecosystems is necessary, even in the presence of uncertainty, and • shift the burden of proof to those who advocate potentially harmful action. 	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH, MONITORING, MITIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT</p> <p>Use best science and practice in monitoring the ecologies in the forest. Where downward trends occur, adaptively manage to mitigate and recover. Monitoring, mitigation, education and enforcement will be integrated into all forest plans and be supported and funded in ways that conserve the ecological and environmental values of the forest.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>RESTORATION OF ECOSYSTEMS</p> <p>The primary goal of restoration is to enhance ecological integrity by restoring natural processes and resiliency. Effective restoration should reestablish fully functioning ecosystems. Ecological integrity can be thought of as the "ability of an ecosystem to support and maintain a balanced, adaptive community of organisms having a species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to that of natural habitats within a region (Karr and Dudley 1981)." A restoration approach based on ecological integrity incorporates the advantages of historical models while recognizing that ecosystems are dynamic and change over time.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Sound restoration requires an integrated, multi-disciplinary approach rooted in conservation biology and ecosystem restoration principles that include protecting intact landscapes (particularly those that serve as reference or baseline conditions); allowing the land to heal itself; and, where necessary, helping it to do so through active restoration. A key priority is to move the lands to a more natural condition. Missing or diminished compositional elements, such as herbaceous understories, mycorrhizal fungi, or extirpated species also require restoration attention.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Restoration planning should include the conservation of habitats for diminished or extirpated wildlife species, with special emphasis placed on protecting and restoring ecologically effective populations of "strongly interactive" species to a significant portion of their historic range. Recovery plans and conservation plans for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species should be incorporated to the fullest extent possible in planning for comprehensive ecosystem restoration.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Comprehensive forest ecosystem restoration requires balancing fire risk reduction with retention of forest structures necessary for canopy dependent species, which is the group of species most in decline in the SW. It is also critical to retain some dead, deformed, and diseased trees, and some clumps of large trees with interlocking crowns, to maintain structural complexity and important food and nesting habitat. Such trees are important elements of genetic diversity in their own right as well. Trees larger than 16" dbh and old-growth trees, regardless of size, should be retained in restoration treatments because of the scarcity of these trees in Southwestern forests.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>ROADLESS AREAS</p> <p>Expand the forests' network of Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA) established by RARE II and subsequent planning processes, including the 2001 Roadless Rule. Refine boundaries of current roadless areas to reflect comprehensive conservation planning needs such as wildlife corridors and wildland fire management areas. Identify roadless areas that have not been inventoried, assess roadless characteristics, and provide official IRA status where applicable.</p>	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>

<p>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS Work with stakeholders to identify and create additional Special Management Areas and ensure that they are of an ecologically effective number and size, e.g., subwatershed. Act on the Forest Service mandate to designate at least one Research Natural Area for each habitat type on the forest. Designate new Zoological and Botanical Areas in sectors with unusual or significant biological diversity value. Recognize the Important Bird Area designation of Bird Life International and the National Audubon Society as a Zoological Area designation. Insure that management plans for such areas, including National Game Preserves and National Natural Landmarks, have explicit, effective management prescriptions necessary to achieve stated conservation goals.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM Designate the minimum transportation network that is consistent with the Travel Management Rule.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Lower existing road density by closing (1) redundant or unnecessary system roads, (2) system roads that are causing significant damage to natural and cultural values, and (3) all non-system roads, unless a non-system road can be substituted for a system road to the benefit of habitat conservation. Retain or lower the current road-density standard of no more than one mile of road per square mile of forest; ensure that Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Area acreage are excluded from this calculation for each Ecosystem Management Area, as well as across the forest.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Ensure that the route network that is adopted through the designation process is economically viable in terms of maintenance requirements, law enforcement and safety precautions.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Ensure that any design for roadbuilding is fish and wildlife friendly. Reduce sedimentation effects from road and trail construction. Minimize the impact of road paving and maintenance on fish and wildlife and fish and wildlife habitat.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Implement an enforcement and education plan to ease compliance and inform the public about new transportation system regulations.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>VISUAL RESOURCES Maintain and protect the viewsheds for which the forest is famous. Prevent any activity that would compromise the visual or habitat quality of these viewsheds. Work with adjacent private landowners to protect areas off the forest, via conservation easements. Protect views of and from wilderness areas. Protect all views of rivers and lakes. Protect all views from recreation sites, population centers, vista points, and transportation corridors. Prevent degradation by activities such as logging, mining and mineral exploration, road construction, power transmission lines and cell phone towers, energy, and inholding developments.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>WATERSHED PRINCIPLE Consider historic, current and future climate predictions for the climatic range of variation and the projected population growth of Arizona and potential impacts to current and estimated future human populations associated with the down stream flows of these watersheds.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Manage watersheds with a holistic approach, reestablish stream connectivity and sinuosity, and utilize the most current scientific information readily available and accepted by the scientific community.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
<p>Manage with consideration of ongoing drought conditions and the resulting stress on aquatic life, fishes, wildlife and vegetation.</p>	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006

Consider the impacts of every project to: the entire watershed, in-stream flows, and to groundwater and the aquifer.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
For any activity with the potential to impact the stability, sustainability and productivity of any watershed, the managing agency must identify these factors with the accompanying detail through the NEPA process and alternatives. The consideration and disclosure of impacts must account for all the watershed components including: soil, plants, aquatic life, fishes, and wildlife, as well as the surface and sub-surface hydrological systems.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
Acquire surface and subsurface water rights for all waters on the forest and work with partners to assure and maintain instream flows. Document historical and existing waters and water uses on the forest, and determine the ecologic and economic value of these resources.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
Conserve, protect and restore water quality and quantity, protect free-flowing surface waters, ephemeral, seasonal and perennial wetlands, lakes and riparian areas.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
Acknowledge that waters, both surface and subsurface, are linked hydrologic systems that are integral to the health of ecological communities and downstream users.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS Ensure that management direction in Forest Plans regarding the Verde Wild and Scenic River and the proposed Fossil Creek Wild and Scenic River (legislation introduced July 2006) adequately protects the values of those river segments.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
Ensure that management direction of the Forest Plans does not affect the eligibility of the river segments that were identified in the Resource Information Report (September 1993) as "potential wild and scenic rivers on the six National Forests of Arizona."	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
While there may be instances where the suitability of Wild and Scenic designation of specific river segments may be analyzed during the revision of Forest Plans, we recommend that suitability analysis not be evaluated during the Forest Plan Revision process, and that such evaluations would be more effectively analyzed in separate planning processes focused on specific rivers or watersheds. This would preserve current administrative protection for recognized eligible segments as well encourage maximum community involvement and citizen participation during subsequent suitability studies.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
WILDERNESS All Forest Plans should protect the wilderness character of Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and the Blue Range Primitive Area. The Forest Service is required to evaluate wilderness quality lands during the Forest Plan revision process due to the clear direction specified in the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984 [Public Law 98-406 Section 103(b)(2)].	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006
WILDLIFE SPECIES AND HABITATS Focus plans on the critical relationships that exist between wildlife and between wildlife and habitat. Focus on the health of the biotic system and all of its parts. Emphasize protection and restoration of ecologically effective populations of "strongly interactive" species to a significant portion of their historic range. Understand that all wildlife depends upon healthy habitat and all efforts will be made to ensure human use of the forest does not compromise habitat capacity to sustain an appropriately diverse biotic community that is self-sustaining over generations. Through monitoring and assessment, when and if the Forest Service finds species in decline in ways that may compromise system functioning, employ the best science available to design and implement mitigations that will recover the wildlife in question and restore the system.	Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447	11/22/2006

<p>We support a forest-wide wildlife population status and trend process consistent with the 2000 Conservation and Recovery Act (CARA) that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the distribution and abundance of species of wildlife, including low and declining populations that are indicative of the diversity and health of the forest's wildlife; and, • Descriptions of locations and relative condition of key habitats and community types essential to conservation of species identified in (1); and, • Descriptions of problems which may adversely affect species identified in (1) or their habitats, and priority research and survey efforts needed to identify factors which may assist in restoration and improved condition of these species and habitats; and, • Descriptions of conservation actions proposed to conserve the identified species and habitats and priorities for implementing such actions. 	<p>Letter-Phoenix-55-1/Phoenix-2539-1/Tucson-707-1/Tucson-1431-1/Flagstaff-2540-1/Portal-2545-1/Mesa-2546-1/Santa Fe-2251-1/Phoenix-2457-1/Tucson-2103-1/Flagstaff-2548-1/Glendale-2549-1/Mesa-479-1/Phoenix-447</p>	<p>11/22/2006</p>
<p>Forests in Arizona are biologically diverse and culturally important. I recognize and hope that the USFS recognizes the need to conserve these values now and for future generations. Please use the framework that was presented to you by the Arizona Forest Plan Revision Coalition in 2006 for planning decisions regarding collaboration, fire protection, fuels management, cultural resources, economics, recreation, forest restoration, livestock grazing, invasive species, mining, off-road vehicles, roads, and transportation among others. These are all issues that I believe are important and which must be addressed in the plan revision process.</p> <p>I also believe that the Forest Plan revision requires an Environmental Impact Statement rather than a Categorical Exclusion because there will be decisions made in the document that directly affect the forest and its resources. Without an EIS, the Forest Service cannot seek to understand the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the Forest Plan, nor can it adequately examine a range of alternatives.</p> <p>Please place me on your mailing list to remain involved in the Forest Plan revision process.</p>	<p>E-Mails-Green Valley-2507-1/ Paradise Valley - 2508-1/ Tempe-2509-1/ Springerville-249-1/ Tucson-2510-1/ Tucson-2511-1/ Tempe-2512-1/2513-1/Safford-2514-1/2515-1/ Bosque Farms, NM-2516-1/ Stephens City, VA-2517-1/ Marcellus, MI-2518-1/ Santa Fe, NM-2519-1/ Milwaukee, WI-2520-1/ St. George, UT 2521-1/ Maple Falls, WA-2522-1/ Rancho Rio, NM-2523-1/2524-1/ Silver City, NM-2525-1/ Glendale, CA-2528-1/2529-1/2530-1/ Mesa-2531-1/2532-1/ Santa Fe-2533-1/ Santa Fe-2534-1/ Placitas, NM-2535-1/ Santa Fe-2536-1/2607-1/2608-1/2616-1/2617-1/ Corrales, NM-2618-1/ Santa Fe-2619-1/2620-1/Santa Fe-2621-1/2622-1/</p>	<p>12/21/2006 07/09/2007</p>
<p>Letter is in previous cell. This space is provided to allow inclusion of all numeric identifiers that sent in the letter,</p>	<p>(Continued from previous cell) Albuquerque-2623-1/2625-1/ Albuquerque-2627-1/ Springfield, IL-2628-1/2661-1/2661-2,/2697-1/ Pell City, AL 2698-1/ Davie, FL 2699-1/2700-1/ Corrales, NM-2701-1/2702-1/ Taos, NM-2703-1/ Albuquerque, NM-2704-1/ 2708-1/ Cedar Falls, IA 2710-1/ Davenport, IA 2711-1/2712-1/ Scottsdale-2716-1/ unknown location-2717-1/ Sheffield Lake, OH-2725-1/ Phila, PA-2726-1/ Albuquerque, NM-2727-1/ Emporia, KS-2728-1/ unknown location-2729-1/ Surprise, AZ-2730-1/ Franklin, KY-2731-1/ Denton, TX-2732-1/ New Brunswick, NJ-2733-1/ unknown-2739-1/ unknown location-2742-1/</p>	<p>12/21/2006 07/09/2007</p>
<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I was unable to log on to the comment word document due to your web page being unavailable. Please accept this email as comment to your request for more precise usage routes and recommendations for OHV.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1</p>	<p>1/8/2007</p>
<p>First, I again thank you for the opportunity to comment. My belief is there should be no additional roads created for these vehicles. Only existing Forest designated and clearly marked FS roads should be accessible to Motorized vehicles. There along with the proliferation and vast sales of ATV's have come a significant proportion of "ad hoc" create as you go trails....mostly previously animal created and then adopted by the ATV's. Here in lies the problem. The noise and disruptive nature of the careless activity is destroying grasslands, watersheds and is polluting the environment with noise and trash. I am constantly picking up trash where over the past 15 -20 years I have never seen such disrespect for the forest. Therefore, my recommendation to limit on existing Forest major roads such as the McNary Road, 4,5, 69, etc. the sub roads would be questionable, i.e., 4a, b, & c....due to the traversing of elk and animal trails in areas.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1</p>	<p>1/8/2007</p>

The newly created roads where animal trails were once the only tracks should be reinstated and marked for foot, bicycle and horse only traffic and returned to their natural state.	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
I cannot help but notice the vast numbers of ATV's in the forest and yet your comments were from those who were 16 and older. Here in lies another problem. More often than not, these vehicles ARE NOT licensed and are NOT driven by someone 16 or older. Frankly, I would doubt if many are even ten years of age (it would be good to include driver's license with comments) and many I have seen driving are perhaps 6-7 years old without a parent, helmet or any regard for "rules of the road". This is a serious problem in the summer when camping families turn their children loose on these machines. They should only be driven by "licensed drivers" on fully licensed vehicles and in order to "enforce" Which is the key to any of your changes being successful, tax the sellers and distributors such that these funds go to the ability to enforce what ever rules are promulgated. I am sure this is a manpower constraint but along with the "fun" goes the responsibility for proper stewardship of public lands which has not been the	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
I believe a few well published photos and examples & fines would curtail the misuse and abuse of this forest but there must be teeth in order to ensure everyone plays by the same rules. The manufacturers, distributors and sales channels for these (ATV's) are only interested in selling without regard for use. The education process begins here and the taxation either for the end user or the seller must be reflective of the infractions. Over time tax can be lessened if improvement is seen or conversely, increased.	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
These are motorized vehicles and end users should be of a legal age and fall under the same laws as defined by the department of motor vehicles and should pass a test before being able to drive. If fines were issued by the forest service officers for willful and negligent behavior it would not take long for the word to spread.	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
I hike, ride my horse on the tracks system, picnic, camp and have thoroughly enjoyed the Apache Sitgreaves Forest for the past 25 years. I leave it as I found it and many times better than found. I am thoroughly disgusted at the sight of trash and destruction of our forest. While I am only one, I pick up trash every time I ride or hike...only to find it again the next time, same place. If I am physically affected by the noise of these vehicles, I can only imagine what it is doing to the animal's wellbeing.	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
My apologies for the lengthy response but I am fearful for the magnitude of the infestation of the forest by these motorized vehicles and want to see the forest protected for all to enjoy, not destroy to the point the damage is irreparable which is where it is heading from my viewpoint. It is not just for these special interest groups but for our children and their children to enjoy and therefore I appreciate this initiative and again for my opportunity to comment.	E-Mail-Vernon-2415-1	1/8/2007
Sitgreaves East - Support and maintain designated hiking and recreation trails by: 1) Avoiding land swaps in proximity to designated trails	Comment Form - Show Low - 2537-1	1/18/2007
2) Recognizing the importance of designated trail system areas to local economies, 3) Working in conjunction with local groups for trail system maintenance	Comment Form - Show Low - 2537-1	1/18/2007
4) Maintaining a diversity of trail types (hiking, biking, horse, ATV, Jeep) with some areas reserved for non-motorized uses 5) Ensuring access to designated trail areas is not limited by development along forest boundaries (work in conjunction with local land use planning), 6) Including designated trail system areas in the "Special Areas" category.	Comment Form - Show Low - 2537-1	1/18/2007
The members of the Upper Little Colorado River Watershed Partnership (ULCR) are representatives from the towns of Eagar, Springerville, Pioneer Irrigation Company, Springerville Ditch Company, citizens from the area and technical advisors from many government agencies including ADEQ, ADWR, Bureau of Reclamation, AZ Game and Fish to name a few. The ULCR is a sub-watershed group of the larger Little Colorado River Watershed Coordinating Council. As a watershed group, we would like to make these comments for the proposed "Forest Plan Revision" on the Apache Sitgreaves National Forests:	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
1 - Maintain respect for existing water rights.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
2 - Maintain existing roadways with proper surfacing and maintenance schedules in order to create quality and quantity of water in the watershed.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
3 - Vegetation management should include thinning of the forest to allow for more recharge into the watershed. Support of the current and future stewardship plan is essential to a healthy watershed.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007

4 - Catastrophic fire is a danger to the watershed and destroys it. Use of best management practices including grazing and thinning of the forest should be included in this plan.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
5 - Adopt proper travel management rules that allow access to the forest for recreation and fire fighting but limit the degradation of wetland areas.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
Develop and maintain high quality riparian areas, which will enhance the quality and quantity of water in the watershed.	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
A health watershed is the responsibility of all of us who are caretakers of the land that surrounds us. It is imperative that the U.S. Forest Service, in partnership with all those who use public lands, protects the resources that will keep our watershed healthy. Thank you for your efforts in "caring for the land and serving people".	Letter - Springerville-2538-1	1/18/2007
Range Land Management - no more double fences. These are a death trap for wildlife. If there is no money for removing old fences, do not build new fence. If it means no cattle grazing so be it or let ranger build it and remove old fence within 2 weeks!	Comment Form - Lakeside - 861-1	1/23/2007
Wildlife and Fisheries. Keep some streams for Broke trout and Brown Trout, Rainbow Trout not all Apache Trout and Gila Broke Trout.	Comment Form - Lakeside - 861-1	1/23/2007
I would like to see a loop route starting at Old Landfill Rd #229 (by Paper Mill area) and going west with connectors on North end of sitgraves to Heber and return on connectors by Clay Springs East to Show Low land fill area by Lone Pine Dam Rd.	Comment Form - Show Low - 2709-1	1/30/2007
Apache-Highlands, Blue, Eagle, Sunset - Have to have multiple use to work hand in hand to have a healthy forest.	Comment Form - Duncan-202-1	2/1/2007
Health of are forest is way out of balance. Thick and over grown needs logging and timber sales. Cows to help with under growth and brush. Need firewood gathering. Need to salvage dead, burned, dying trees. Take a look at forest on Indian land from Eagar to Honda.	Comment Form - Duncan-202-1	2/1/2007
National Forest System Lands - DO NOT exchange land in Greenlee Co. for land out of Greenlee Co. We have already lost to much of our land to land exchanges by the us forest.	Comment Form - Duncan-202-1	2/1/2007
Rangeland Management - Ranches help keep our Forest clean form other folks trash. Pot grower grow pot where there is no rancher riding checking cattle. Ranches are eyes for protecting are forest. Ranches are like free employees of the Forest yet they pay to use the land.	Comment Form - Duncan-202-1	2/1/2007
The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) appreciates the coordination efforts of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (ASNF) on the Forest Plan Revision process. The purpose of this comment letter is to address surface water quality protection in the ASNF.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Surface water quality protection requires a multifaceted approach in any national forest due to the various recreational, livestock, and wildlife uses. ADEQ recognizes the challenges that ASNF faces when it comes to maintaining surface water quality as it is impacted by the various uses the forest maintains. By maintaining surface water quality, ASNF can further enhance the experience of those who utilize the forest for its aesthetic and resource value.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Upon reviewing the 1987 Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Plan, ADEQ noticed that there were no identified measures in place to address the restoration of degraded surface waters. In order to manage present and future surface water quality impairments, ADEQ suggests adding a section to address degradation in a general sense, e.g. if a water body is impaired by suspended sediment ASNF will reduce loadings by restoring riparian vegetation, reducing the level of recreational use, etc.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Currently, there are several streams and lakes within the ASNF listed as "impaired" in the most recent assessment cycle. A list of these water bodies and their impairment causes and several copies of a map illustrating their location are enclosed with this letter. ADEQ would also like to note that this list of impaired surface waters can be variable from cycle to cycle.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
ADEQ suggests that these specific surface water bodies, as well as future listings, be given special consideration within the Forest Plan Revision to help protect them from further water quality degradation, and to help them recover from various impairments.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Additional information regarding water quality assessment in Arizona is available on ADEQ's Web site: http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/water/assessment/assess.html	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Thank you for your consideration of this comment. I will also forward additional ADEQ comments to you (if any) as they are produced. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at (928) 337-3565.	Letter-Phoenix-2400-1	2/9/2007
Sitgreaves East - I am a competitive shooter. There is no safe place for us to shoot whereby offroad vehicles and hikers do not interfere with my practice, or the practice of anyone else.	Comment Form - Concho-2610-1	2/12/2007

<p>The forest is suppose to be multi-use. So why not set aside an area whereby shooters can enjoy their sport without interference by anyone or to anyone. The forest is large enough for all sports. A shooting range accessible to all communities in the white mountains would be an asset. It would localize all shooting in a safe and controlled environment. Thank you.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Concho-2610-1</p>	<p>2/12/2007</p>
<p>There is a given - - People will engage in activities they desire to do whether there is a designated place or not. The advantages to a designated location are many - to cite several - supervision - safety - cleanliness & control - the disadvantages are many - to cite several - property destruction - litter - trespass - criminal activity - & environmental damage.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Snowflake-2611-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Navajo county is engaged in a huge population explosion & many are coming from metropolitan areas & feel that the open areas here are free for all to use, any way desired. A designated activity area allows for public awareness & governmental control. If there is no place to engage in their activity they will do so at any location they encounter, feeling free to do so. As there is no designated local ranges I suggest a site be selected in mid county (Snowflake areas) to be developed into a firearms range to accommodate - pistol - rifle & shotgun. An agreement between government & local shooting enthusiasts to volunteer development - maintenance & cleanup could be done to the betterment of all parties concerned.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Snowflake-2611-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>I am writing to tell you my concerns regarding management on your forest. These are things I ask you to address during your planning. While I do not currently live in Arizona, I have lived there for many years and have spent lots of time on your forest and I continue to make trips to eastern Arizona. I also have some background in forestry.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Economics/Forest Products. What the forest provides to the local economy through recreation, scenery, and wildlife far out outweighs what is provided to the local economy through extractive uses such as logging and grazing. Your plan and what it directs should reflect this fact. The West is changing and local economies are not dependent on logging and grazing; for example the small towns of Forest Lakes, Alpine, and Nutrioso aren't dependent on cutting trees or grazing cows. The perception to some of those responding is likely that they are dependent on extractive uses but you have the responsibility to demonstrate and educate -- otherwise you will get poor input and only emotional appeal which probably won't help. Also, I have heard a number of local folks say the cutting of firewood seems to have little oversight.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Fire/Thinning. Fire is part of the ecosystem and it should be returned. However, after a century of intervening in the natural process, the use of fire must be conducted carefully. Far too much effort and money is going to protect homes where people have chosen to live in a forested area and do not build with fire proof materials.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>More money and effort should go into other areas to restore ecosystems with fire and thinning such as the PJ areas from Lakeside west. I am also uncomfortable with the way forest thinning is happening and have previously commented on this, e.g., there is no ecological justification for thinning out large trees because there are now so few; harvest activities should be adjusted or precluded from sensitive areas; and thinning should reflect a more natural spacing of trees (using base area means nothing to the public and some of the areas thinned now look like tree farms). Regarding big wildfires, there is nothing to support cutting the burned trees that are big and I support limits to sizes of trees cuts both for fires and thinning. If seeding is done after fires, it should be with a mix of species that naturally occur on the forest.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Access/Law Enforcement/Social. Arizona is now the fastest growing state in the country. You need to be doing a better job of regulating all the uses and impacts to the land from so many people. The type of recreation and forest use seems to be dominated by people who are looking to do mechanized (vehicle) use in an outdoor setting (they are certainly louder!). This is different than coming to the forest to enjoy it as a "place" and I would argue that people in the latter category are being ignored these days. For instance, how can 4-wheeler groups go into areas others cannot access? Roads and vehicles shrink the forest, reduce the quality of wildlife habitat, damage plants and soils, and reduce the quality of the forest experience for everyone who is there to enjoy the forest as a place to be, not just as an outdoor setting for driving 4-wheelers, sand rails, and mega trucks. Hence, please limit motorized use to specific areas. It is also unclear (few signs) what roads or areas are legal for what type of vehicle to use.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>

<p>Not everyone needs to driver everywhere - instead provide on access or loop into each large defined geographic area. Also, there are some many neat areas that would provide great opportunities for access by trail but the forest does not seem to maintain most existing trails very well and it certainly seems no new trails are being built. Why do you allow driving off road totally willy-nilly? It seems to be a free-for-all out there. So please stop the yearly proliferation of new road tracks everywhere and especially during hunting season. In years past, when camping on your forest, Forest personnel would be around, stop to talk or help; today you don't hardly see anyone and if you do they often don't stop. And, good luck finding someone to deal with problems in the woods such as disruptive or destructive activities by others.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Lands/Acquisition. People with property next to the forest seem to have their own private forest out the back door and you may not know it (no law enforcement around) but there are a lot of illegal activities coming from these properties (garbage, cutting fences, new roads, etc.). Years ago when I first started going to your forest there seemed to be little private land. Now I see houses popping up all over; please acquire these parcels before anymore houses go in that ruin meadows, disrupt wildlife and chop up the landscape.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Grazing/ranching/riparian areas. How many of your ranchers live entirely off the public lands? Again, I have written to you on some grazing evaluation processes so I have seen the information you have on the miniscule amount that grazing on the forest brings to the local economy and to the American public for use of our lands. What is the cost to the taxpayer for fences, pipelines, etc, not to mention ecosystem damage and competition with native wildlife? Most of the forest appears to not be suited for grazing - there is little grass, little water, and the ground is trampled or washing away in so many areas. Grazing can be ok as long as it does not damage areas that can support it and it provides for wildlife and other things like the plants and water are protected at the same time. In areas with degraded conditions (I have seen a lot of poor range country on the forest) and in creek areas, livestock should be removed. Your analysis should fully and first provide for the forest ecosystem needs instead of just putting the desires of really just a few ranchers in the changing West.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>I have been reading about "wild horses" on the forest; everyone knows these are not really wild but if people want them then they must be managed to not harm the natural resources just like cows and elk and tourists and loggers.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Recreation/Education/Information. Except for the few big developed recreation areas, most of the recreation facilities are in poor condition (rotting picnic tables, peeling paint, incredibly old porta potties). I do not mind taking my trash home but restrooms need to be clean for health reasons. I am glad to pay fees to the forest service for use of campgrounds, boat ramps, etc.--fees could even be higher based on today's value of the dollar and, after the initial complaints, folks will be glad to pay. However, I find paying fees to a business running forest facilities antithesis to the concept of public lands (the same for businesses running internal government functions)!</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Also contract business people are often not enforcing safety or rules for storing food which will only hurt us and wildlife. Signing is bad for the most part on your forest because signs are, in general, unclear, missing, vandalized or not maintained as to be unreadable. Many places that don't have signs would be so much nicer if the public knew the name of the place or something interesting about the forest at that spot such as the sign at Three Forks.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>As far as other areas, again not everyone needs to camp everywhere because so many sites become degraded, rutted, trashy, and generally beat up, so if there is a way to manage that please do so. As noted above, there are hardly any forest personnel in the woods any more or programs for education so the public may come to appreciate the National Treasure that is the forest service land.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Vegetation and Water. I am also concerned with the loss of oaks, large junipers, shrubs, willows and cottonwood trees. The open grasslands on your forest are very unique in the Southwest but they seem to be getting run over by vehicles and grazed heavily no matter how droughty it gets. Along highway 261 and other meadow areas you see big groups of bunched up cows and it appears to me that those areas along Highway 261 have become considerably degraded since 10-15 years ago when I first saw them, as I now see bare dirt and raw banks.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>

<p>Special Areas. Is there a management plan for the Blue Range, if not there needs to be. What about the other roadless areas, how are they being managed. I have heard of (I think they are called) Natural Areas but what are these and how are they being managed? Your forest has more water than any other in the state, so why aren't some of them designated as special rivers? I have hiked some of the wildlife areas where vehicles are not allowed and seen so much wildlife, especially as compared to roaded areas. I would ask if you have enough of them across the landscape with adequate connecting corridors to meet the needs of the wildlife? They don't seem to be signed well and it looks like vehicles do get into some portions of them, especially during hunting.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Wildlife. Again your forest is tops in having some of the most diverse and unique wildlife and wildlife areas in the state. It doesn't seem the forest gives any emphasis to what could be a great opportunity to feature them to the public through education, viewing areas, interpretive signs, and talks. What are you doing to protect these unique animals, including the butterflies, frogs, and other species often more sensitive than the big game animals? All I ever see any more are elk, elk, elk. Elk are ok but what are you doing to coordinate with the game department for deer bighorn sheep, prairie dogs and other species key to the ecosystem? What is the forest doing to maintain, protect, and restore places for these species? Certainly the grazing damage I see is not good for the mice that live in those meadows and grasslands, that feed the hawks and foxes, and on up the chain.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Not everyone agrees or likes all wildlife but the Mexican wolf represents a huge move to functioning ecosystems. The forest needs to do more to protect them (reduce roads, law enforcement) and needs to feature the important role of wolves through education and information, which is happening in Yellowstone. I understand the forest has many endangered species, why? What are you allowing or doing o the forest that this is the case? What are you doing to turn this around? What about the unique fish in the Southwest of which so many have been lost even on public lands? The forest needs to develop programs and change management to provide for their needs; otherwise they will be lost from our American public heritage. Again I hear that the forest seems to be primarily responding to consumptive users and not those who value the forest of the forest and its wildlife.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Summary. The forest service is a <i>land</i> managing agency. In so doing there is opportunity to provide for some, but not all, of people's consumptive and non consumptive desires. Any provision for people must be within the ability of the forest ecosystems to sustain themselves, or restore themselves where they have been degraded. I urge you to have a forest plan that does not just offer guidance, but requires the agency to address the needs of natural resources and where that is possible, serve the public. The West is no longer a "back woods" place, it's being over run--please manage with strong direction, not suggestions.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>Than you for this opportunity to provide you with my thoughts. I hope they will receive serious consideration and not be dismissed or ignored because I am not currently a local. I hope that just because I do not live there, that my views are just as valued as those who do because, after all, these are public lands for all American people.</p>	<p>Letter - Longmont, CO - 2612-1</p>	<p>2/13/2007</p>
<p>As our White Mtn. towns grow in population, the preservation of our forests and primitive areas seems even more important. While we all love our trees, recent fires and bark beetle infestations have shown us that we must thin the forest wisely - leaving trees as homes and protection for wildlife and to stop erosion but cutting out trees that cannot survive due to over crowding. Noxious weeds are growing without restraint in Pinedale burn areas. These may wipe out native plants if not controlled.</p>	<p>Comment Form-Pinedale-2124-1</p>	<p>2/15/2007</p>
<p>Outdoor recreation is important to the economy of this area. Let's unify in protecting our air, water, wildlife, and trees so that visitors and residents can enjoy the beauty we have here. Please make regulations to keep ORVs in areas where they will not disturb hikers, wildlife, and those seeking serenity in the mountains. Enforce ORV regulations.</p>	<p>Comment Form-Pinedale-2124-1</p>	<p>2/15/2007</p>
<p>The history of the area is another important feature that attracts visitors to the area. We should respect all artifacts left here by previous cultures and return them to their owners (descendants of those cultures). We should respect areas designated as sacred to those cultures.</p>	<p>Comment Form-Pinedale-2124-1</p>	<p>2/15/2007</p>

<p>I live thirty two miles into New Mexico so regularly go to Show Low area for shooting. Mostly at the Lonepine Dam borrow pit with the "White Mountain Practice Shooters" but occasionally elsewhere. I'm also an off road motorcyclist so the forest trails are important. In the last year have been there three times motorcycling but between twenty and thirty times shooting. I am definitely in favor of a real shooting area within one hundred miles.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Quemado, NM - 2631-1</p>	<p>2/17/2007</p>
<p>I moved to the White Mts. 7 years ago, before that I was an active member of South Bay Rod & Gun Club in San Diego CA., where I could go to site in my hunting firearms, work up loads, and participate in recreational and competitive shooting. I now compete in 2-3 matches per month and would participate more if there was a range including a caretaker. I would be happy to pay a small use fee for this privilege.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Vernon- 2632-1</p>	<p>2/20/2007</p>
<p>I understand you are accepting public comments on uses for the public Forest Service. I am a hand gun shooter with no place to safely practice my shooting skills. There are many individuals in the same situation as myself. I request that you add an area for a shooting range in your revised plan for the forest.</p>	<p>Comment Form - 2630-1</p>	<p>2/24/2007</p>
<p>I have lived in north central Arizona for 5 years and am originally from Montana. My family and I enjoy outdoor activities and I miss not having a site dedicated to bench rest, pistol, Archery and trap type shooting. I support the development of a local shooting club for the Sitgreaves, East area that is multifunctional. I also heavily support a shooting club and paid membership to help support and care for the facility. I have found the areas around Taylor and White Mountain Lakes South West and am ashamed to use these facilities even after picking up a lot of trash left by others (Target boxes, old refrigerators, washer and dryers and other things used for target supports. Not to mention the cans, bottles, plastic containers etc. these things left in the environment are a real shame and eye sore.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Taylor-2624-1</p>	<p>2/24/2007</p>
<p>I have built two quality wooden bench rests that I positioned to shoot into soil banks south of Taylor only to have both shot full of holes by other disrespectful people and have them ruined over a 4 month period and I'm all done unless I can find private land owner or a facility such as this to support. I think that pistol and Rifle ranges should have lead capture tarps and backstops that will support lead capture and re-use by bullet molders also instead of just leaving this material back in natural soil. My whole family would use such a facility and I believe most shooters will pay reasonable fee's and support such a facility that had weather shielded bench rests, target supports, garbage cans available and even a planned archery target and walking / shooting course for kids to learn and practice on. I will support your efforts in what ever manner I can and look forward to forming a support club or organization.</p>	<p>E-Mail-Taylor-2624-1</p>	<p>2/24/2007</p>
<p>Thanks for your thoughts and opportunity to comment on multiple forest use in the White mountain area.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Lakeside - 2633-1</p>	<p>3/3/2007</p>
<p>I am an "outdoor" oriented person and have enjoyed our National Forests all of my adult life. I hike, backpack, camp, and cross-country ski. As a 57-year resident of this state most of these activities have been accomplished in the Arizona Forests. I may be a little biased but I think the White Mountains of Arizona is one of the most beautiful and accessible areas in this country. I appreciate the care your agency has provided for this area.</p>	<p>Letter - Show Low - 2634-1</p>	<p>3/5/2007</p>

<p>I have seen many changes over the years and have some concerns about the future of Arizona and all other national forests. One concern is for the loss of forest land itself for development. This has been a substantial loss already and continues at an alarming rate. Yes, I know about the "exchange" of land and feel that much of the land we are gaining is less desirable for recreational purposes than conifer forested land I feel very strongly that we should keep the forests that we have.</p>	<p>Letter - Show Low - 2634-1</p>	<p>3/5/2007</p>
<p>The federal, state, county and city governments in this country contribute vast sums of money to provide other forms of recreation for citizens (golf courses, ball stadiums, etc). While these endeavors are supposed to benefit the taxpayer in the long run, I fail to see a decrease in my taxes. Those of use who treasure the wildness, solitude and renewed spirit of the outdoor experience would like at least as much consideration for our choice or recreation. This is a special experience that, if taken away, would be a devastating and irreplaceable. I do not play golf and am not a sports fan but do not advocate denying persons recreational opportunities of their choice. I hear congressmen stating that we no longer need land for recreational purposes and fear that this attitude will result in more loss of forest land.</p>	<p>Letter - Show Low - 2634-1</p>	<p>3/5/2007</p>
<p>Another concern is loss of access, forest uses, and the need for more employees to "police" and protect the forest. I see more and more areas previously used for camping now closed down. While I realize that Arizona's forest fire potential is great, some of these areas have been closed and left that way unnecessarily. This leaves less and less area for a fast growing population to enjoy. Again, some clearing of land and increased policing would allow more persons to enjoy undeveloped camping areas. The developed campsites are full in the summer are difficult financially even with elderly discounts for persons who camp frequently.</p>	<p>Letter - Show Low - 2634-1</p>	<p>3/5/2007</p>
<p>ATV's have invaded the forest and even those who are on roads and marked trails (and there are still many who are not) do much to disturb the peace and outdoor experience for campers. I have a two wheel drive pickup with a camper and cannot camp too far off any roads. While camping, I have had groups of teenagers on ATV's drive within inches of my camper, laughing, yelling, splashing mud on my vehicle and making my camping experience a very negative one. Their parents were close by. Teenagers with ATV's should be required to be accompanied by a responsible adult. Camping areas and stays are limited. Maybe we need limits on the number of ATV's. The number of persons using these is growing at an alarming rate. Again, more policing is needed in undeveloped campsite areas and throughout the forest. Thank you for allowing me to voice my concerns.</p>	<p>Letter - Show Low - 2634-1</p>	<p>3/5/2007</p>
<p>I think it is vital that we take care of the forest as it is home to all kinds of life, even if it means limiting it's access and use by humans. Humans are far too destructive and have largely become greedy in wanting things their way and being blind to how destructive this is. "A few will always spoil it for the many" is a common enough saying, but when it is applied to a forest the damage those few can make, (for example with unconfined use of ATV's lasts for generations. There are a few responsible riders, but do not be fooled.) Too many people are out for themselves and their pleasures. People are not responsible enough to drive the legal speed. People are not responsible enough to return a shopping cart to its bin. How can anyone imagine people will adhere to any regulations or laws imposed upon them when they are out in a forest? We have to protect our national forests from ourselves! I look to you to put the Forest's best interests first and not peoples!</p>	<p>E-Mail-Show Low-2121-1</p>	<p>3/6/2007</p>
<p>SITGREAVES_EAST - As a trail maintenance worker with TRACKS my main concern is to maintain those trails away from roads (forest) and especially away and out of HEARING OHV's crashing through the forest. We hikers are out in the forest for a unique experience away from the high tech world of today.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Pinetop - 2659-1</p>	<p>3/8/2007</p>
<p>Maintain the Blue Primitive area <u>Primitive</u></p>	<p>Comment Form - Pinetop - 2659-1</p>	<p>3/8/2007</p>
<p>As our population grows more demands are put on our National Forest's resources. This is a matter of fact. What isn't a matter of fact is that we have to continue robbing these resources to feed the avarice of popular sports (id, ATV's), businessmen and regional developers. It is inherent upon us as stewards of God's great blessings to attempt to preserve resources by using monies set aside for development and growth to providing education to the public on preserving and managing healthy forests for today and future generations.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Show Low - 2660-1</p>	<p>3/8/2007</p>

<p>We are a nation of disposable affluence that says yesterday's is outdated so we need something new. We race through our "disposables" so that we can get something "better". Enough is enough, we've mortgaged our children's financial futures in this country. Must we also give them a legacy of irresponsible waste? We must continue to preserve nature for the sake of our combined psyches. No more encroachment should be allowed. We are killing everything because we are bored with yesterday's stuff. Extinction of species is increasing because we can't walk to the store or work or school.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Show Low - 2660-1</p>	<p>3/8/2007</p>
<p>As the world's population increases, there is a growing threat to our wilderness areas and open spaces. Especially in Arizona we feel the impact of growth. Developers are building houses ever closer to wilderness areas. An increasing number of people are wanting to access the forests (and deserts) using ORV. I believe that it is crucial to create and protect quiet areas for people and wildlife. We have to accept that there will be an increase in ORV users and their powerful lobbies. Our only hope to preserve areas for wildlife, healthy forests, and the enjoyment and even sanity of people is to regulate ORVs. We need to designate ORV routes and enforce the regulations imposed. This will cost money but it's well worth it. Once these areas are destroyed by misuse they will be almost impossible to bring back.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Lakeside - 2148 - 1</p>	<p>3/12/2007</p>
<p>Have areas set aside for target shooting which would be open to responsible hunters and target shooters. A place or places where you would be able to target shoot without being run off or fined or arrested. Also - have camping areas which are free with water and toilets as our taxpayer dollars are part of the Forest Service budget. Yes fees are now charged yet campgrounds should not be run by private corporations who make a profit off of the taxpayer.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Pinetop -2694 - 1</p>	<p>3/13/2007</p>
<p>Limit vehicle and OHV use to forest roads only (existing). Do not allow OHV to continue to use hiking trails (blue diamond) or animal trails. Increase enforcement and fines for offenders. Increase distance of hunters/shooting from campsites and homes. Limit noise and require licenses for OHV. Forest Service to close areas any time there is a threat to wildlife, habitat, fire, overuse, damage etc. Allow public groups to work with Forest Service to assist with projects, ie. monitoring areas, education, forest thinning. Increase effort to thin forest near homes. 24-hour hotline to report offenders in forest. Limit cattle grazing - more monitoring of impact of wildlife, habitat. Increase fines and require licenses of OHV's to help fund Forest Service activities. Better and updated maps.</p>	<p>Comment Form - Paradise Valley - 2689 - 1</p>	<p>3/13/2007</p>
<p>Better protect wilderness areas, roadless areas and areas with wilderness characteristics. Limit livestock grazing, especially in riparian areas and in wolf recovery areas. Protect remaining old growth, continue to restore fire to the landscape. Restore native wildlife (Apache Trout). Better limit spread of invasive plant species. Close additional roads and better manage off-road vehicles. Areas should be closed unless designated open. Allow natural recovery of forests instead of salvage logging. This area includes some of the most beautiful parts of the state. We encourage more protective and conservation-minded management. Do more monitoring of resources and rapid response to problems (for example ORV damage).</p>	<p>Comment Form - Phoenix - 55 - 1</p>	<p>3/13/2007</p>
<p>Try and put a shooting facility near the Heber - Overgaard area. It would be well used because of the increasing population moving into the area. (I bought a home in Overgaard in 2001) It is also a safety issue. A shooting range would stop some of the random shooting in the forest. Make the facility for the rifle, pistol and clay targets.</p>	<p>Comment Form - 2696 - 1</p>	<p>3/21/2007</p>
<p>We are in desperate need of a shooting range in the White Mountains. Right now we have no place to sight in rifles. Most people go out in the forest to sight in and shoot. This creates a safety problem and people trashing the forest. Your help in this matter would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Comment Form - 2695 - 1</p>	<p>3/27/2007</p>

<p>Keep our Trails. Show Low has a distinctive character as a mountain forest community. This character should be retained. Note the following excerpt from the Show Low city's webpage.</p> <p>"The White Mountains area is home to the White Mountain Trail System, which was conceived and designed as a way to increase recreational opportunities for everyone who enjoys the forest through hiking, biking and horseback riding. A series of loop trails and connectors, such as the 12-mile Buena Vista Trail located on the southwest border of Show Low, have been constructed through a partnership with the U.S. Forest Service, Pinetop-Lakeside TRACKS and the Arizona State Parks Heritage Trails Fund." If development were allowed in Forest Service land along the southern border of the city, then development would run up the the reservation border. The forest character and existing recreational opportunities in this area would be permanently lost.</p> <p>No land swaps should be allowed on or near existing trail systems.</p>	E-Mail-Show Low2537-2	3/31/2007
Shooting range in White Mountains (preferably Lakeside or Show Low in Navajo County).	Comment Form - Pinetop - 1230-1	4/6/2007
<p>Preserve riparian areas near towns for waterfowl and public viewing (i.e. birdwatching) including Brown Creek near Vernon; Billy Creek near Lakeside; Show Low Creek between Lakeside and Show Low; Walnut Creek near Pinetop; Woodland Lake near Pinetop; Scotts Reservoir near Lakeside.</p>	Comment Form - Pinetop - 1230-1	4/6/2007
<p>Preserve Woodland Lake Park and Big Springs Nature Area and 600+ acres surrounding the two locations.</p>	Comment Form - Pinetop - 1230-1	4/6/2007
<p>OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE (OHV) RECREATION IN THE NATIONAL FOREST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •THERE HAS BEEN AN ENORMOUS INCREASE IN THE OWNERSHIP AND USAGE OF OHVs, ESPECIALLY ATVs, FOR RECREATION IN THE PUBLIC NATIONAL FOREST LANDS IN RECENT YEARS. •THEREFORE IT IS CRITICALLY IMPORTANT THAT RESPONSIBLE AND COURTEOUS USE OF OHVs BE OBSERVED AND THE RIGHTS AND DESIRES OF EVERYONE BE GIVEN DUE AND PROPER CONSIDERATION. •THE RIGHTS OF OHV ENTHUSIASTS TO PURSUE THEIR SPORT IN THE NATIONAL FOREST MUST BE RECOGNIZED. IN ADDITION, THE POTENTIAL DELETERIOUS IMPACT OF OHV USAGE ON INDIVIDUALS WHOSE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY LIES DIRECTLY CONTIGOUS TO THE APACHE-SITGREAVES NATIONAL FOREST MUST ALSO BE GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION. •FOR EXAMPLE, THE PROPERTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF TORREON WHO RESIDE ALONG BOTH THE WEST AND SOUTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE COMMUNITY ABUTS DIRECTLY UP TO THE NATIONAL FOREST. •THE USAGE OF OHVs ALONG THESE TORREON BOUNDARIES IS NOT ONLY IRRESPONSIBLE AND DISCOURTEOUS BUT HAS A STRONG POTENTIAL FOR CAUSING A SERIOUS DETERIATION IN PROPERTY VALUES. 	E-Mail - Show Low - 2705-1	4/13/2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •WE NEED TO SEEK A COMPROMISE THAT RESULTS IN A WIN-WIN SITUATION FOR OHV ENTHUSIASTS AS WELL AS PROPERTY OWNERS WHO DO NOT WANT OHV USAGE IN THE BACK YARDS OF THEIR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. •WITH THE VAST AREA IN THE NATIONAL FOREST THAT IS OPEN TO RESPONSIBLE OHV RECREATIONAL USAGE, IT SEEMS REASONABLE TO CLOSE CERTAIN SENSITIVE AREAS DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES SUCH AS THE WEST AND SOUTHERN BOUNDARIES OF THE TORREON COMMUNITY. <p>* It is simply naive to believe that those who abuse their privileged right to practice their OHV sport in the forest can be made more thoughtful and respectful through education! Society expends enormous efforts and funds in attempts to educate people to not use drugs, the dangers of smoking, to practice safe sex, etc. all to no avail.</p>	E-Mail - Show Low - 2705-1	4/13/2007

<p>My residence is in the Torreon Golf Community and is directly contiguous to the national forest on the west boundary of the community. I selected this site to design and construct my dream retirement home and paid a premium price for the lot due to the fact that it abuts the national forest. It would be both a personal tragedy and a financial disaster to me if the USFS was to trade the portion of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest that borders my property for use by a private real estate developer. Thus, I respectfully request in the context of the current USFS multi-year planning process for the responsible management of the forest that sensitive consideration be given to the impact on existing personal property of potential forest land swaps with real estate developers. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to your planning process.</p>	E-Mail - Show Low - 2705-2	4/13/2007
<p>Shooting Range In Heber-Overgaard. I understand that the above cited item is under consideration in upcoming planning for forest use in the area. I think that a shooting range facility would be an excellent idea. Besides a resource for the local community, I believe that ancillary benefits would be to the tourist and hunter trade in the area. Additionally, the opportunity to provide safety and marksmanship classes to youth and adults would be a wonderful by-product of any such facility.</p> <p>Please include this facility in the planning process.</p>	E-Mail - 2706-1	4/15/2007
<p>I was at Lone Eagle Outdoors (an outfitter in Heber/Overgaard) this weekend and found out that there might be a shooting range included in the planning for forest use in this area of Arizona. As an avid outdoorsman I think this is a wonderful suggestion. This facility would give an outlet for weekend sportsman to hone their skills prior to hunting season(s)... a great safety addition for those of us that use the forest during hunting season! I think the facility would also be a community asset in terms of the local economy (hunters, tourists, seasonal residents) as well as an outlet for safety training for youth.</p> <p>As they say in the old Nike ads..."Just Do It"!</p>	E-Mail-2707-1	4/16/2007
<p>I would like to recommend this route Remain Closed to motorized use: Beron Pt, Hall Cr, Lee Valley Rec Area, Greer Area, and Hidden Lake Special Designations. This is an outstanding example of identifying a large connected area that is important to wildlife and human recreation and managing to protect those values. Open road network is well thought out and provides access to key destination. Other closed roads should remain so to protect: A) Native fisheries; B) Spotted owl PAC's; C) Goshawk PFA D) Wilderness value of Mt. Baldy WA; E) Very high quality developed and non motorized recreation opportunities; F) Community values associated with Greer and private land; G) Provide corridor connectivity from core wild area (Mt. Baldy) through essential riparian corridors. Will suggest in forest plan revision to increase size to include all of Little Colorado River to private land and to go to HWY 260. Also will recommend increasing size on south end to connect to E&W Fork Area & big Lake Recreation Area. There is great potential.</p>	Comment Form - Tucson-2146-6	4/24/2007
<p>People first wolves last. I notice we have a large trail selection in OUR forest. I do not believe denying access to families that camp and enjoy driving in OUR forest is right. More road closures is just a ploy to keep an eye on everyone. I am from a small community and appreciate being able to camp away from your crowded campgrounds. West fork campground needs repairs. Do not close it but fix it. I have camped there for 50 years. Logging needs to be resumed to keep the wildfire danger to a minimum(sic). Public lands are what it says not to be taken away by the Forest Service or the federal government. More campground (sic) are needed for recreation if you want more control of campers. Reservations (sic) should not be allowed. First come first serve. The more accommodating (sic) for campers the easier it is to get them to go where you want. Environmentalists (sic) are more damaging than campers by not letting the forest service do its job. KEEP OUR FOREST OPEN FOR ALL.</p>	Comment form - mailed in - Clifton, AZ-2740-1	6/20/2007

<p>Arizona Public Service (APS) is aware that several of the federally-managed forests within the State of Arizona are in the initial stages of revising their specific Forest Plans. As the largest electric utility in Arizona and a participant in several regional transmission planning organizations, APS seeks to provide our input regarding specific considerations that we believe should be part of the Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Plan Revision process and wish to be recognized as a party to the ongoing planning efforts.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>
<p>APS operates and maintains hundreds of miles of electric transmission lines on national forests in Arizona. Additionally, we frequently work with USFS representatives throughout the state to permit new facilities to meet increasing electrical demand. Many of the existing generating resources that provide energy to the Phoenix Metropolitan area and other outlying areas are located in northeastern Arizona and northwestern New Mexico. These same geographic regions are regarded to have favorable resource conditions for renewable energy generation projects, including solar, wind, and biomass facilities.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>
<p>The State of Arizona has recently mandated that utilities use renewable energy resources for 15% of their base energy load by 2025. It is likely, if not inevitable, that additional electrical transmission lines will be needed by APS and other utilities across forests in Arizona to meet growing demand and to integrate renewable resources into the regional electric supply.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>
<p>The need for existing and future transmission lines across Arizona's federal forests is complicated by the existing condition and volatility of these areas. It is well known that forests in Arizona are hampered by the compounding effects of bark beetle damage and an ongoing regional drought. This has significantly increased the potential for prolonged and devastating forest fires, evidenced by several large-scale fires in recent years. These fires put at risk all built elements within their path; however, an outage of transmission lines and associated infrastructure from fire damage can have wide-ranging implications on APS' and other utilities ability to provide electric service.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>
<p>The typical fire season occurs during the same timeframe as peak electric usage and an outage of lines caused by forest fire could have a potentially devastating effect on regional electric supply. The concept of locating new transmission lines immediately adjacent to existing like facilities, as has been the guideline in the current plans for many of the forests in Arizona, does not mitigate the potential effects of forest fires on transmission lines. The identification of new utility corridors that are separate from existing corridors will be a key concept in maintaining the reliability of the regional electric network.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>
<p>APS recognizes the need to sensibly balance resource protection with the accommodation of utility infrastructure necessary to support the demands of a growing region. We believe that the Apache-Sitgreaves Plan Revision should include consideration, analysis, and provisions for existing and future utility corridors, including the analysis of potential utility corridors that are separated from existing facilities for reliability purposes. We furthermore respectfully request to be included in future correspondence regarding your efforts and to have the opportunity to review and comment on all public documents. Please contact me with any questions you may have regarding this letter. We look forward to working with the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest throughout the plan revision process.</p>	<p>Mailed Letter - Phoenix, AZ,-2741-1</p>	<p>6/29/2007</p>