

Santa Fe National Forest Travel Management Planning

Disposition of Alternatives Submitted by the Public

March 2, 2010

/s/ Julie Bain, Travel Management Project Leader

Purpose: This document explains how the interdisciplinary team bundled alternatives submitted by the public.

Methodology:

The interdisciplinary team used this criteria to identify alternatives from the public:

- The letter contained at least 3 conceptual suggestions that pertained to the whole forest. For example, “Do not designate any unauthorized routes,” or “Designate all the routes that currently exist.”
- The letter developed an alternative for all (how to implement motorized big game retrieval) or part of the forest (Jemez Mountains).

Some letters claimed to contain alternatives, but did not meet either of the criteria above. Usually these contained statements about effects, such as “Non-motorized activities startle wildlife as much or more than motorized activities,” or “Motor vehicles stir up harmful dust.”

The interdisciplinary team did not consider letters containing requests solely about specific routes as independent alternatives. The public submitted over 1,300 comments concerning specific roads, trails, or areas during the scoping period. Considering each of these as a separate alternative, or combinations therein, is not tenable. Doing so would result in far too many alternatives, and blur the distinction between alternatives. This would not “sharply defin[e] the issues and provid[e] a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public” (40 CFR 1502.14) as required by NEPA. Instead, each individual route was recorded in a database and sent to the ranger districts for analysis and inclusion in one or more alternatives, depending on the focus of the alternative.

When letters contained route-specific suggestions and overall suggestions, these were separated. The route-specific suggestions were considered for one or more alternatives, and the overall suggestions were considered as an alternative.

The interdisciplinary team used some of the public’s suggestions as part of other alternatives. For instance, not having any fixed distance corridors for motorized access to dispersed camping and big game retrieval appears as part of Alternative 3. Where this is the case, the team studied it in detail.

Most letters contained similar, overlapping suggestions. The interdisciplinary team grouped like suggestions into one themed alternative, as shown in Table 1. Some suggestions, like designating every route on the forest, came up numerous times. These are not attributed to one author in the table below.

The interdisciplinary team examined these thematic alternatives to determine whether they should be analyzed in detail in the draft environmental impact statement. If not, a reason is provided in the draft environmental impact statement.

Table 1 shows how the interdisciplinary team categorized the alternatives submitted by the public.

Table 1. How public’s alternatives were bundled.

| <i>Author</i> | <i>Where the Content Appears – Which Alternative Not Studied in Detail Listed in the DEIS</i> |
|---|---|
| S. S. | Administrative |
| J. J. | Motorized Big Game Retrieval |
| D. F. | Glorieta Mesa Minimum Motorized Access and Recreation |
| R. M | Administrative Minimum Motorized Access and Recreation |
| S.P.G. | Glorieta Mesa Monitoring |
| Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance / New Mexico Trials Association | Citizen’s Alternative Monitoring Maximum Motorized Access and Recreation |
| D. B. | Administrative Monitoring Minimum Motorized Access and Recreation Glorieta Mesa |
| Blue Ribbon Coalition | Citizen’s Alternative Maximum Motorized Access and Recreation |
| V. G. | Science-Based Administrative Minimum Motorized Access and Recreation |
| WildEarth Guardians, et al | Landscape-Based Monitoring Minimum Motorized Access and Recreation |