Comment Tracking Database Report

Letter# 1
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Mailing List removal.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 2
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Add to mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 3
Comment#
1 I tried to download all 11 maps as a WinZip file this afternoon on this page http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/sfe/travelmgt/pa_maps.htm but I wasn't successful.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 4
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 5
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 6
Comment#
1 No understandable reason for ATVs on National Forest Land!
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 7
Comment#
1 Thanks for trying to get the ATV Quads, (with undermuffled/non existant mufflers) ht create noise and dust under control on Federal Land.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Good for you!
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 8
Comment#
1 What is the purpose of "decreasing the miles of roads used by motorized vehicles" while "increasing the miles of trails used by motorized vehicles", unless it is to obfuscate more Bush damage to our public lands.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 9
Comment#
1 My desire is that it all be closed to motorized vehicles and domesticated animals such as horses. If you can't go on foot and bring out everything you took in, you cant go.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 10
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Address change.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 11
Comment#
1 I've been looking at the new proposed management plan, and I have a question regarding Cow Creek Road (formerly Forest Road 86). Particularly the stretch from State Road 223 to Forest Road 92. Based on the new map, it appears that this road is designated for use by ALL vehicles. Has this always been the case, or is this a change that is being proposed in the new management plan? We're concerned that if this changes and a new map is published advertising the change, the road, whick is only minimally maintained by San Miguel County will see more use and abuse than it can safely and practically handle.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 12
Comment#
0 DeliveryFailure

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 13
Comment#
0 Delivery Failure. Mailbox full.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 14
Comment#
0 Delivery failure. Mailbox full.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 15
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Auto Reply.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 16
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Auto message.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 17
Comment#
0 Duplicate.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 18
Comment#
1 I support concentrating motorized vehicles in such a manner that they cause the least disturbance to wildlife and to hikers. I also support full staffing levels which enables enforcement of rules.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I also support full staffing levels which enables enforcement of rules.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 19
Comment#
0 Remove from mailing list.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 20
Comment#
1 Please, NO MOTORIZED TRAVEL IN THE SANTA FE NATIONAL FOREST. NONE.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 21
Comment#
0 Not a comment. FS Res
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 22
Comment#

0 Not a comment FS Res

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 23
Comment#

1 In order to create the EIS, each f your districts will have to provide evidence of environmental impact caused by both opening new forest roads and/or trails and closing existing forest roads and/or trails to motorized vehicle, OHV, and motorcycle traffic.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 24
Comment#

1 In order for me to fully participate in the public forums, I would ask each ranger district to provide me access to all the materials they have collected, including all environmental impact studies from forest road use that have been conducted in the last two years (or prior), that were used to generate this proposal. Please reply with instructions on how I may study your work.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 25
Comment#

1 Your plan is flawed and we are marshalling our forces to fight you tooth and nail against further trail closures

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Please review and implement the Citizen Plan worked on over a year ago…. In part with the BlackFather Motorcycle Group.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Your current proposal will make everyone illegal overnight and cause an enforcement nightmare.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 26
Comment#

1 As stated in many different ways in our Citizens Proposal for the Santa Fe National Forest, submitted in July of 2007, we requested approximately 500 miles of single track trail loops of 50-100 miles each-has anybody in the SFNF even read our Proposal-it was widely and officially distributed? Over the past year we have been trying to emphasize this request in many ways in literally hundreds of meetings and contacts with SFNF personnel-apparently to no avail. When I review the maps in the Proposed Alternative there are almost no single track trail loops that meet those criteria.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 26
Comment#

2 What I do see is miles and miles of boring, (at least to us) roads connected to small segmented single track trails. It sort of reminds me of the definition of flying (I was a pilot0 -hours and hours of boredom interspersed with a few moments of excitement.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I would guess that, one and only one, of the major reasons that our concerns have not come across or been acted upon is that your have nobody on the Travel Management Team that has a real interest, experience or training in motorcycle travel.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 From my point of view, the cards, for whatever reason, have been stacked against us from almost the beginning of the process and the end results should not be very surprising to anybody-unfortunately, they surely were not surprising to us.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 As we also indicated in our Proposal, we too are very concerned about responsible resource management and believe that we have many years of experience doing just that, We are not perfect but we try.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 It would be nice and fruitful if this discussion could be the beginning of a real and sincere dialogue and understanding between our organization.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 27
Comment#

1 Please help our community retain it's rural nature of quiet. I am begging you to act to preserve our Forest Road #79 from off road access by all motorized vehicles.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

2 ATV's are unacceptable disruptive to the easily eroded soils and fragile wildlife. Not to mention quiet contemplation of the beauty of nature.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

3 Well marked trails.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

4 Funding for enforcement to encourage quiet, non-overnitht, non-camping non-destructive or disruptive uses of our forest lands. No campfires, no smoking. Set fines for destruction of forest properties. -Signs describing these fines, for example: Use of all motorized, off road vehicles, littering with broken alcoholic beverage containers, gathering for large parties without a permit, any overnight or camping use, campfires.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 28
Comment#

1 Many of us have ridden dirt bikes on the single track loops in the SFNF for many years - clearing them each spring and working with the Forest Service to mitigate environmental impacts.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The Proposed Action essentially eliminates all single track dirt bikes loops in the forest, leaving only a few single track trails open to dirt bike riders.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 It is very dissappointing that extensive input by many individuals and groups has resulted in Proposed Action that almost completely fails to consider single track dirt bike riders as users of the forest.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Most of the dirt bike loops that we have historically ridden in the Santa Fe National Forest should be kept open, in keeping with the "multiple use" mandate of the U.S. Forest Service. Details the trails we have historically enjoyed riding are contained the the Citizens Proposal, prepared by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 I urge you to reconsider the Blackfeather proposal and modify the Proposed Action according

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 30
Comment#

1 There are and insufficient number of single track loops for trails bikes riders.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 It would be better if you would implement a plan that is essentially in sync with the Citizens Proposal submitted about a year ago from the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 A lot of thought went into that plan (Citizen's Proposal) by a lot of people.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 31
Comment#

1 A lot of thought went into that plan b a lot of people.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I have noticed in your plan that many single track loops have been eliminated and only a few of the single track trails remain open. I urge you to implement a plan that follows the guidelines of the Citizens Proposal submitted by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 32
Comment#

0 I would like to continue to receive information on travel management planning using this e-mail address. Thank you very much.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 33
Comment#

1 this area (Jemez District bordering the Valles Caldera National Preserve close to Bandelier National Monument) receives some OHV trespass on year-round road closures as well as seasonal (winter) road closures. NPS has several law enforcement officers and they patrol this road as part of their regular route. FR 289 is the closest road to the western boundary of the monument. These is one FS LEO for the Cuba Ranger district, the Jemez District and the Valles Caldera National Preserve. Thus FS staff are unable to patrol the area frequently as other areas of the Jemez District have heariver use and demand their time

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 34
Comment#

1 I've been looking at the new proposed management pland, and I have a question regarding Cow Creek Road (formerly FR 86), particularly the tretch from State Road 223 to FR92.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 My family has lived on this road for the past 10 1/2 yrs. And it's always been our understanding that ATVs were prhibited.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 We are concerned that if this changes and a new map is published advertising the change, the road, which is only minimally maintained by San Miguel County will see more use and abuse than it can safely and practically handle.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 35
Comment#

1 I explained out rational for leaving roads that access private property on the map as open to the public.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The question of enforcement of winter and other closures.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

3 FSR 268 that we have shown as open, including an area after it passes through land through which we do not have an easement.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 36
Comment#

Letter# 36
Comment#

1 Mr. Newland called asking whether the changes would affect snowmobiling in the La Cueva area. He had looked at the seasonal closure and apparently its closed 1/9-4/15.

Public Concern # 59 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 37
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 38
Comment#

1 user-created trails that were submitted included within the TAP database (appended matrix)? Statements on page 3 and 13 talk about the trails (as opposed to roads) but it is unclear as to whether the TAP only includes system roads and trails or also includes the user-created segments that were submitted. Second, will there be a detailed map available that shows the location of the corresponding route segments with the attached matrix? It is necessary that the interested public can verify exact segment locations to be able to respond to the criteria applied to those route segments.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 A detailed map showing all the tagged segments is the 'Rosetta Stone' that allows meaningful public participation.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 39
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Add to mailing list request.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 40
Comment#

1 I support the efforts to reduce the impacts of motorized vehicles on the SFNF. I support the reduction of the miles of road from 4,924 to 2,309 miles.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 In fact, I support reducing the open road miles even further.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I support the closure of roads that are now being used for motorized travel. I support the designation of an area of about 50 acres for motorized cross-country vehicle use. I would very much support the enforcement of this rule. I support the designation of access to motorized camping grounds that restrict the overall access of motorized vehicles to camping sites. I support the limitation of the use of motor vehicles to retrieve downed wildlife.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 40
Comment#

4 I realize that you will receive a significant opposition to these proposals from people who would like a forest that is wide open to motorized vehicles.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 But I believe we can see that there are far too many roads in the forest that are already in use. Multiple scientific studies show that the impacts of road in National Forests are degrading to the health of the forests, from fragmentation, erosion, pollution, disruption of wildlife populations, and many other factors. Please do reduce the access of motorized vehicles to the Santa Fe National Forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 41
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Correspondence.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 42
Comment#

1 Your motorized travel plan has already hurt our area!!! I hear more dirt bikes on La Cueva Road. I actually saw a flat bed truck driving down our road with six ATVs on it.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 The road is no impossible to ride (my horse) or walk on. The noise, that I can hear from my once quiet house, tells me there are dirt bikes on the road.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 I want to know where is the enforcement. The plan is not into effect and I can already see the trashing of the forest. ENFORCEMENT… Without it we can kiss the forest goodbye!

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 I am sorry, but the road is impossible to ride (my horse) or walk on. The noise, that I can hear from my once quiet house, tells me there are dirt bikes on the road.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 43
Comment#

1 We have been camping and witnessed ATV groups, speeding, doing donuts tearing up trails roads and grass lands, playing loud music, and drinking heavily long into the night, keeping us up late and ruining our expected peaceful camping experience. We chose not to confront them, (many people carry guns in NM), but it is these people who ruin things for all of us.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 44
Comment#

Letter# 44
Comment#

1 I supported the proposal for the road management that was recently described in the newspaper--particularly the limitations on access for motorized vehicles, etc. Kudos, and thank you!

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 45
Comment#

1 I am disappointed with the Proposed Action in the North, South and West Jemez area as it virtually ignores the Citizen's Proposal created by Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance back in July 2007.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 There are too many trails to list that are lost. The paltry 28% portion that is proposed to remain 'open' by the SFNF is disjointed and seperated by long distances thus effectively ruling out any satisfying offroad riding experience for the average enthusiast.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 46
Comment#

1 There are essentially no meaningful single track loops left and only a few of our trails are proposed to remain open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I feel that you should implement a plan that is essentially in sync with the Citizens Proposal submitted about a year ago from Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 47
Comment#

1 The availability of single track loops for off-road motorcycles seems drastically limited.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 A proposal more in line with the Citizen's Proposal submitted last year by Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance would be more appropriate.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 48
Comment#

1 The road shown as CR A042 on the attached map-- the A042 is partially obscured by the road. It travels up the Rito Garcia and shows on the map entering Sections 21 and 22 on NFS land, which is part of the Sawyer (Gascon Point) land acquisition. When that acquisition was being completed, it was clear that we did not have access via that route. Fore some reason, it does not go all the way to the boundary of what is now NFS land so out purchase included an easement for access into the NE corner of the acquired parcel. MR Lorie says that road may show as a country road on the map, but it has not been driven since the 70's/

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 49
Comment#
0 Not a comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 50
Comment#
1 Consider this a vote for the proposed action for managing motorized travel.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 51
Comment#
1 I am very shocked at the reduction of access by the 53%. National Forest land is supposed to be accessible to the public for public use, but this proposal will drastically limit the ability for the public to utilize this space.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 San Juan is not accessible due to road closure.I understand that the road is not safe for tavel in a vehicle, but ATV's, motorcycles, or horseback riders should have access.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 I noticed that the proposal would allow motorized behicles only on a few main roads and not any of the side roads. This will limit the overal hunting area.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Allowing an off - road vehicle to go and retrieve the game would be beneficial. Additionally, maybe more forads could be open to motorized vehicles in hunting areas.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 52
Comment#
2 This is the only access to my property, 8.37 ac located in section 22 block 2 tract B-1.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 53
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Add to mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 54
Comment#
1 Though a county road is indicated, it has not been use by the public since I first purchased the property in 1983
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 55
Comment#
2 Educating public about FR 289 winter road closure applying to ATVs
Public Concern # 53 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 56
Comment#
4 Paul Lewis stopped by the office and talked with me about the proposed action showing the roads through the private land as open to motorized use.He wants to see it closed and wants the fs to relinguish the easement
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 58
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Reqeust to be added to mailing list.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 60
Comment#
1 there are essentially no meaningful single track dirt bike loops.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 61
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Request for meeting.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 62
Comment#
1 Track 77MM is pitiful: it should be signifcantly improved.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 do not close or decease maintaining 77, the good existing gravel road. In addition, please do not do anything to make Track 77MM less useful as egress to our 20 acres.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 63
Comment#
0 Cover Page for Comment #64.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

0 Not a Comment. Email cover page for comment form letter #64
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 64
Comment#
1 there are no single track loops and only a few of our trails are proposed to remain open
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 You need to implement a plan that is in sync with the citizens proposal submitted about a year ago from the Blackfeather Trail preservation Aliance
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 65
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Remove from Mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 66
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Remove from Mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 67
Comment#
0 Not a Comment. Auto Mail Response
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 68
Comment#
0 Not a Comment. Auto Mail Response
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 69
Comment#
0 Delivery failure. Mailbox full.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 71
Comment#
0 Please remove my name from your email list
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 72
Comment#
0 Not a comment phone discussion.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 73
Comment#
0 Not a comment, clarification of specific issue.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 74
Comment#
1 Ron called to ask what happened to the dispersed camping buffers on FR 144, FR 270,and FR 10
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 75
Comment#
1 The reality is that OHVs cause fires. The more motorized vehicles in the national forest the greater the risk of fire. It is totally inexcusable to allow these vehicles on any paved road. Sparks from their exhaust can easily ignite fires.
Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

2 The encourage the spread of invasive species with their tire tracks, as well as the seed materials sticking to parts of the vehicle, the tires and rider, who typically loves to get muddy and dirty.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 There sould be a fee for any limited OHV use in the National Forest and it should be used to repair the damage they have caused in the past and police their activities to prevent future damage.
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 77
Comment#
0 Not a comment, info. Request
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 78
Comment#

Letter# 78
Comment#

0 Duplicate + correspondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 79
Comment#

1 the single track motorcycle trails there seems to be no reasonable way to relate the TAP rationale for closure and segments of the single track motorcycle trails on the map

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 80
Comment#

1 I strongly support any plan that reduces and restricts the access of all off-highway vehicles to the Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 The more roads that are close, the better

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 81
Comment#

1 Please allow NO motorized vehicles or mountain bikes off the paved roads.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals an plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and (worst of all) teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (its not!).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 82
Comment#

1 I am deeply concerned by the recent turn of events closing down 50% of existing designated, GPS'd trails. These have been utilized by hikers, horseback riders, motorcycle riders and all terrain vehicles for many years. To close these down purely out of pressure and money from green groups is a slap in the face to those who actually enjoy these trails.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 83
Comment#

Letter# 83
Comment#

1 we are not happy with the proposed action that just came out.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 My thoughts are to consider and subsequently implement the plan that is in sync with the Citizens Proposal submitted approximately 1 year ago by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 84
Comment#

1 Concerned about an old logging road being closed
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 hunt area, wants to get to the top of mt. on roads & trails that exist.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Where we hunt they don't cause damage with ATV's
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Utimately like to see this left open
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 85
Comment#

0 Add to mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 86
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Follow up by FS. See Letter number 48 for comments.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 87
Comment#

0 Duplicate of #43
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 88
Comment#

Letter# 88
Comment#

1 I see the biggest issue in all areas is the enforcement of the current rules and laws.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 89
Comment#

1 We consider the present proposal a very positive step in the right direction and wish to express support for the overall direction taken.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 90
Comment#

1 to install barriers limiting certain types of vehicles on sensitive trails

Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 the result is dramatic and tragic trail wear and destruction since all ATVs have live axles - both or all drive wheels tires move at the same rate, bringing much accelerated soil disturbance. Let's keep them out of narrow, sloped trails with barries, and give them the jeep roads.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 91
Comment#

1 ORV vehicles in our parks need to be managed at an acceptable level creates an environment free of damage to the landscape,noise,dust and other non necessary airborne pollutants that ORV's emit.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 if off road vehicle users need a to "recreate" our Gov. should find other dedicated areas/land for them to do just that. ORV's don't belong in our parks.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 92
Comment#

1 Now we hear there is a propposal for chupadero…. No,No,No,!!!

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We can not see from what has been published so far that the Forest Service has any way or plan to control or MANAGE the rampant misuse of public land when ORV's get there and go running amok.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 You have neither the money nor the personnel!!!

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 93
Comment#

1 Please restrict motorized vehicles throughout the Santa Fe National Forest
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Off-Road vehicles not only ruin the experience for the rest of us, but destroy the beauty and wildlife inherent in our forests
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 94
Comment#

0 not a comment/ Cover letter for 94
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 95
Comment#

1 WE understand from your proposal that those who need Forest Roads to their private property will continue to have access. Is there something that we need to do to ensure FR521 (FR74B) remains accessible to us
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 96
Comment#

1 we must reduce all vehicular traffic everywhere-including National Forests
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Fossibl fuel-based vehicles contribute to air pollution, climate change, noise pollution, habitat destructin-all conditions that threaten human health.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Please create plan that eliminates all fossil fuel-based vehicle travel in the National Forests whithin the next 10 years.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Elliminate any expansion of roads in the National Forest
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Reduce the number of roads in existance.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 97
Comment#

0 Not a comment/ Cover page for 95
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 98
Comment#

1 My comment concerns all the planned raods and travel--Way too Much!
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Who will police them?
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 You don't have enough manpower or funds to do it properly
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 99
Comment#

1 Please register my opposition to the proposed opening of SFNF in the Chupardero/Rio En Medio area to off-road vehicle use.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 100
Comment#

1 I am very shock at the reduction of access by 53%. National Forest Land is supposed to be accessible to the public for public use, but this proposal will dreastically limit the ability for the public to utilize this space.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 by teaching respect to citizens and puttng up signs and making pamphlets available the citizens could help preserve the forest and meet your goals without limiting access to the forest.
Public Concern # 53 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

3 Currently, San Juan is not accessible due to road closure. Residents of Ponderose,San Ysidero,Jemez Pueblo,canon, and the surrounding area who have used this road and this part of the forest for many generation are not able to access it due to the road being completely blocked from any traffic
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I understand that the road is not safe for travel in a vehicle, but ATV,motorcycles,or horseback should be accessible.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 the proposal would allow motorized vehicles on only a few main roads and not any of the side roads.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 the same number of hunters in a smaller space could be very unsafe
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 100
Comment#

8 There is also the issue of wood hauling here in the jemez Mt. as well as all forests. It is necessary to haul away the down and dead trees in order to help control the additional fuel in the forest fires. Wood is also a necessity for the heating of homes and cooking of many residence

Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 "No maintenance" done on any the roads by the forest service.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

10 that I can get documented proof that there is a serious risk to the Santa Fe National Forest if this proposed 53% reduction in motorized access is not passed.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 101
Comment#

1 We are requesting that the Forest Service omits the lower fork of Road A042, at least from the point where it enters our property (the line between sections 26 and 27), from their public records; and are further hoping the Forest Service chooses either road A005 or A007 as public access roads. Of the three proposed roads, we suggest that either A007, reportedly running through the Forest Services recently purchased Sawyer Ranch, or A005, which I believe is currently utilized by the public, would be the best choices for access to the National Forest. The lower fork of A042 runs through a narrow canyon, the exact center of our property, and through the site we have surveyed for our future home. The road, from the section line has been completely closed to the public since at least 1971; with only two families having had access to it.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 102
Comment#

1 I am Creating a sacrifice zone for ATV without a fence will cause habitat loss, noise and air pollution, and environmental impact

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 there will not be any enforcement and the ATV's will destory the environment in the area.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 103
Comment#

1 Unfortunately, and for reasons that are totally unclear, you are proposing a system of trails in which ther are no meaningful loops (our primary request) and where there are very few trails proposed to remain open. I believe you are proposing a completelyu unsustainable system that will eventually result in a complete closure of the forest to OHV use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 104
Comment#

1 The present Santa Fe National Forest (SFNF) Proposed Action is toally unacceptable

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Many of the trails and roads submitted to the SFNF by the Blackfeather Trails preservation Alliiance (BTPA), for inclusion into the Travel Management Rule (TMR) are not even listed on your latest "Proposed open/closed" maps on your website.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Requiring Quads and Motorcyles to travel FR- 266 for approximately eight miles in order to connect with the trails in the lower part of Paliza Canyon, is a major safety concern.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

4 The lower partr of palliza Canyon should remain open to motorcycles, as your area of concern in the creek bed is hard rock bottom, with no erosion problems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The way the map now reads, there is no legal way for mototcycles to get from the end of Horror Show, to the beginning of the Electric Fence trail, as FR-281 is gated and locked all year long. We need to have Paloza/Peralta and Deagons Trails designated for mototcycle travel.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

6 Your current map has omitted the Lost Jug trail entirely. This will require motorcycles coming off the bottom of Bear Butt Trail to travel all the way back out on FR-280 and back around the entire length of FR-282 in oder to connect with the Dead Horse trail,

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 It will also result in a lot of two-way traffic on these roads, increasing the chance of head-on collisions.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 there is no need to close the North Pass Extension trail,

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 Bear Butt Relief Route Do to the degree of difficulty riding the Bear Butt trail, we need this logging road designated for the less skilled riders.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 For those motorcycle riders exiting the bottom of the Electric Fence trail, and not wanting to ride the Cerro Pelado trail, we need Shorty"s trail (AKA Easy Out) included on the map for motorcycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 104
Comment#

11 the forty-eight mile Ponderosa Loop should flow and be designated as follows: Paliza Canyon (all of it),old Jeep Road,Tepee Two-Track,Bonding Rock,Flat Box,Salt Lick,Tower Trail,Toe Breaker,Bear Butt Relief Route,Bear Butt,Lost Jug, Shady Lane, Salt and Pepper,Dead horse,Over 40,Lower Grassy Roads,Upper Grassy Roads Procupine, North Pass Extension, Horror Show, Paliza/Peratla Dragons Tail, Electric Fence, Cerro Pelado, Shorty's Trail(AKA Easy Out)

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 The more trails and logging roads that you close to motorcycles, the more you can expect to have major compliants from hikers, equestrians, bicyclists and hunters about the trails being impassable do to fallen trees across the the trails.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 105
Comment#

1 What provisions have you planned for handicapped visitors

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 106
Comment#

1 Its there a contact in the Espanola District they can contact to see this info [Proposed Action Maps]? The last time they tried to see some of the TMP documents in Espanola, they had a hard time locating someone who knew where the documents were.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 107
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Forest service response to letter # 97.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 108
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Forest service response to letter # 49.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 109
Comment#

1 People hike in the forest to find quiet, peace, serenity and solitude.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 There is no possible compatibility between motorized vehicles and hiking in the wilderness- not for people nor for wildlife and flora.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 110
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 111
Comment#
0 Information request
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 112
Comment#
1 I am writing to voice my extreme opposition to the proposed off road vehicles range in Chupadero/Rio En medio area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 Such [ohv use] a use would be extremely disruptive to the goals of our programming, one of which is “unregulated” status would result in misuse of surrounding areas as well.
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Such [ohv use] a use would be extremely disruptive to the goals of our programming, one of which is “unregulated” status would result in misuse of surrounding areas as well.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I also wish to voice opposition to allowing access to this wilderness area with activities that are potentially very damaging to the and noise polluting.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 113
Comment#
13 FR's417,417B and 417BA north of Pacheco Canyon in the Pecos Ranger District is proposed to be open to vehicles<50" (ATV's) from April 15 to May 15 only, to allow spring turkey hunters motorized access for this period. In the Department's 12 January 2007 comments tothe SFNF, the Department requested that the SFNF consider hunting-related OHV activities similar to any other recreational OHV activity that occurs on USFS lands and apply appropriate restrictions equally. Because of the dense road/trail network that would be opened for this activity in Section 11 between Pacheco Canyon and Rio del Medio, and the intent of the Travel Management Rule to limit motorized road and trail densities, the Department recommends that this dense trail network not be opened to motorized use for thes pring turkey hunt. Opening one main stem road should be considered, bu twe again reiterate our recommendation that no special motorized concessions be made for non-disabled hunters. Opening this dense road/trail network to motorized vehicle would likely decrease opportunities for a high quality hunting experience inthis area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 114
Comment#

Letter# 114
Comment#

1 Under the Endangered Species Act, as amended (Act), it is the responsibility of he Federal action agency or its designated representative to determine if a proposed action "may affect" endangered, threatened or proposed species, or designated critical habitat, and if so, to consult with us further. Similarly, it is thrie responsibility to determine if a proposed action has no effect to endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated critical habitat. If your action area has suitable habitat for any of these species, we recommend that species-specific surveys be conducted during the flowering season for plants and at the appropriate time for wildlife to evaluate any possible project-related impacts. Please keep in mind that the scope of federally listed species compliance also includes any interrelated or interdependent project activities (e.g., equipment staging areas, offsite borrow material areas, or utility relocations) and any indirect or cumulative effects.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Under Executibe Orders 11988 and 11990, Federal Agencies are required to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands and floodplains, and preserve and enhance their natural and beneficial values. We recommend you contact the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for permitting requirements under section 404 of the Clean Water Act if your proposed action could impact floodplains or wetlands. These habitats should be conserved through avoidance, or mitigated to ensure no net loss of wetlands function and value.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 To minimize the likelihood of adverse impacts to all birds under the MBTA, we recommend construction activities occur outside the general migratory bird nesting season of March through August, or that areas proposed for construction dufring the nesting season be surveyed, and when occupied, avoided until nesting is complete.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 115
Comment#

1 In the Santa Fe National Forest Proposed Action there are essentially no meaningful single track loops and only a few of trails are proposed to remain open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 It is my opinion that the Santa Fe National Forest should implement a plan that is in sync with the Citizens Proposal submitted a year ago from the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 116
Comment#

1 The website listed in your letter of July 10,2008 is not functional and for that reason I can not comment beyond objecting to any reduction in roads open to motorized travel which link to private lands in the area of Bland.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 117
Comment#

1 I have no comments other than to commend your efforts but would like to be kept in the information loop
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 118
Comment#

1 the Santa Fe National Forest already has too much off road traffic- including illegal 4-wheelers I regularly encounter.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Allowing more areas to deteriorate with more off-road use will also lead to an increase in illegal entry into more protected areas.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 destroying plants, animals , watersheds, and quiet over a larger area of the forest makes no sense.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 119
Comment#

1 In the Santa Fe National Forest Proposed Action there are essentially no meanigful single track loops and only a few of trails are propsed to remain open.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 it is my opinion tha the Santa Fe National Forest should implement a plan that is in sync with the Citizens Proposal submitted about a year ago by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I also encourage you to keep existing fire roads open to use by legally licensed vehicles.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 120
Comment#

1 I request that the Santa Fe National Forest use the guidelines and recommendations for OHV recreation management from the National Off Highway Vehicle Conservation Council (NOHVCC)
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Alternatives should include the goal of creating a system that provides user satisfaction.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 But the practice of allowing excessive cross-country travel to dispersed camping sites is harmful, and the extent of sites you're considering alarms me.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 120
Comment#

6 Please, restrict the designation of dispersed camping areas to protect remaining wild lands in the forest. Instead, designate terminal rutes or spurs that provide access to camping or allow camping adjacent to designated routes.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 I appreciate the proposal to reduce the current road system to one that is more manageable, but I urge you to continue to work to designate a motorized system that 1) does not include additions to the system, 2) closes routes that are degrading the land and travel through endangered species habitat.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 121
Comment#

1 It is called "pre-analysis decision making" and it is not legal

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

1 The following ID'd roads are listed; 1. ID: 24M Under the Existing Roads shapefile this is a closed road that leads to the City of Santa Fe's Buckam Well #8. It is not sown under the Proposed Designated Routes shapefile. Does this mean the road will no longer be utilized or maintained by the USFS? 2 ID: 26W Under the Existing System Roads shapefile this is an open system road that leads to the City of Santa Fe;s Buckam Well #7. It is not shown under the Proposed Designated Routes shapefile. Does this mean the road will no longer be utilized and maintained by the USFS? 3 ID: 476B,C,F Under the Existing System Roads shapefile is listed as both an open and closed road in different sections. This road is withing the Santa Fe Municipal Watershed, which is closed under the 1932 Dept. of Agriculture Closure Order and the subsequent USFS Special use Permit. Also, the pdf file of Map #6, Mao #6 Travel Management Proposal Action-Eastside, shows this area as Non-National Forest System Lands within the Santa Fe National Forest contrary to the Existing System Roads shapefile. Non of the 476 roads are listed under the Proposed Designated Routes shapefile. Does this mean the road will no longer be maintaied by the USFS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 All routes that have been submitted, and everything else all the motorized users have been using or ARE using must be considered in the DEIS analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The Forest Service must carefully analyze alternate funding sources (like grants) and the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 122
Comment#

1 In light of the need to designate a minimum system to protect resourctes and decrease budget demands, I was surprised to see the Forest Service is considering additions to the system- including large areas open to cross-country motorized travel. This is especially shocking given the Santa Fe National Forest Transportation Analysis reveals that the forest can afford to maintain just 8 percent of the current gravel road syste, has millions of dollars in backlogged maintenance projects, and is unable to identify how many of the current system roads can be maintained.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 122
Comment#

2 The areas in Jemez Ranger District will suffer from damage to wildlife habitat, damaged archeological sites, destroyed vegetation and increased soil erosion. These areas should not be subject to off-road use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Closure of routes that are degrading the land and travel through endangered species habitat such as Mexican spotted owl, goshawk, Jemez mountain Salamander, and Rio Grand Cutthrout Trout.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The forest should prioritize protection over the call of ORV access and develop a plan for enfocing the ban on cross-country motorized travel

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 123
Comment#

0 Form letter

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 124
Comment#

0 Not a comment/ Correspondence. Reply to previous entry.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 125
Comment#

1 We need FR 521 (sign says Fr 74B) open to us so we can access our property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 126
Comment#

1 Thank you for the impressive Proposed Action for the Santa Fe National Forest. I have talked to many residents of La Cueva and nearby communities and they appreciate the reduction in routes and the positive response to our petitions, letters and phone calls.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 127
Comment#

1 thanks for the reply, but one of the main issues I found with our GIS specialist is that the GIS shape files do not show the same descriptions as the pdf files.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 128
Comment#

1 Carlos came in and wanted to know why we were showing a road off of Forest Road 391 as open to the public all year long for all types of vehicles. This road heads NW from road 391 near the intersection of Sparks Creek and Manuelitas Creek. He wanted to see the Forest Service easements. He does have an easement through NF to get to his private land in Section 16, T19N, R14 East to access portions of Section 16 and 17. His request was that the road to his private land not be shown on the map as open to the public. Roger, Norton, Lands Specialist did double check and confirmed his easement on National Foares. Roger also confirmed that the Forest does not have an easement through Mr. Ramirez's property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 129
Comment#

1 I know the whole National Forest would not be appropriate for off road vehicles but on the other hand no or very limited off road use on the whole forest is not appropriate either.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 130
Comment#

1 I spoke with Sharon Colby on Brother Cristians behalf yeasterday. They were concerned that it would affect access to the Monastery. I was able to assure he that access to private land including the Monastery would be maintained.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 131
Comment#

1 I am opposed to opening more of the Santa Fe National Forest to off-road access, and support the closure of routes that cause ecological damage and user conflicts.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I am opposed to any additions to the off-road access system.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Motorized-access camping areas need to be consolidated, not dispersed to minimize overall impact on the wildlands of the forest.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 132
Comment#

1 My neighbors and I reached full agreement with Joe and Rob about the issue of a closed road (83C) East of Pecos, which all parties agreed should not be reopened to motorized use. The reasons are numerous, discussed at length in several comments submitted last year. The last time I spoke with Joe Reddan, just a few months ago, he assured me that 83C "will not be designated for motorized use." So, you can imagine that I am dismayed to see the road designated on the new Proposed Action Map as "year round motorized use by vehicles <50"." This is not only inconsistent with a year of specific agreement, it is also incorrect.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 133
Comment#

5 however, to reduce the motorized access now available when demand and growth for motorized access is on the rise is imcomprehensible management planning and will only create bigger problems for the SFNF.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 134
Comment#

1 I have seen the forest envirnment change from a pristine place for wildlife and responsible users of the land and its resources to setting overun with roads and ATV's that willl not even stay on the roads. I am a hunter and I have observed ATV's in every canyon and even crawling up mountains and across high meadows wheno roads exist. Their tracks are everywhere. Many present day "sportsman?" just ride all over the forests hunting off of these vehilcles.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I think travel in the national forests should be severly restricted to motor vehicles of all kinds. As a hunter I must say that I think some provision for off-road retrieval of game should be in place, but anyone caught off road and not able to substantiate a retrival of game should be subjected to a substantial penallty and fine.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 All roads not marked open should be considered closed and no travel off any road except to retrieve heavy game animals such as deer or elk.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I think travel in the national forests should be severly restricted to motor vehicles of all kinds. As a hunter I must say that I think some provision for off-road retrieval of game animals should be in place, but anyone caught off road and not ablt to substantiate a retrieval of game should be subject to a substantial penalty and fine. All roads not marked open should be considered closed and no travel off any road except to retreive heavy game animals such as deer or elk.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 135
Comment#

1 Please desisgnate as "open" the "non-system road" that is the only access to my property located north on FR 103-west on Fr 93 100'-200' on the left.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 136
Comment#

1 I have been informed that Canada de Los Alamos, my dear home, has been taken out of the Travel Management Plan for allowing OHV uise in our area. Specifically Route 79 and all the logging roads that feed off it.i can't thank you enough for this consieration on your part.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 137
Comment#

Letter# 137
Comment#

1 The Grazing permit does not protect rancher's off-road vehicle travel. It has to be mentioned in the rule as well.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Dirt bikes travel to fast on the trails? Need to control.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 138
Comment#

0 Not a Comment but a response

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 139
Comment#

1 HPD-TCP is concerned with Navajo tribal members having access to Cultural Sacred sites and plant gathering areas. A field visit by an HPD-TCP representative may be appropriate for additional comments, recommendations, and/or concerns regarding the proposed project location.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 140
Comment#

1 I was very disappointed when I read that off road OHV access to retrieve downed game was not included.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Suggested Method to provide and manage off road ATV access to retrieve downed game (See hard or electronic copy of leter).

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 141
Comment#

0 duplicate of 175.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 142
Comment#

0 not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 143
Comment#

Letter# 143
Comment#

1 ORV traveling up Old Colonias Road (CR 60), from the Y junction with CRB51 (prior Camino Rael), travel over a county maintained dirt road that has been assessed as an environmental hazard from the spreading of mine tailings years ago. The EID decision after testing was to "cap" the hazard as opposed to carting it away. An order has been issue with a deadline and fine in the wings, but no action has been taken by San Miguel County. ORV'S traveling up this road will spew this hazardous waste from the road into the air. NO THANK YOU! The noise intrusion can be heard even now from those few locals who speed up the road to enter the forest through the forest service gate. The tire treads of the ORV'S compact the soils, devastate wildflowers, crush, frighten and kill reptilian and small mammals and their habitat; Invasive plants are subsequently introduced to the area via the mud and seeds on the ORV tires. There also are many beneficial insects and birds in the area. Opening this area to ORV will not only result in noise and air pollution along the lower Old Colonias Dirt road area, it will also result in habitat fragmentation and environmental degradation throughout the upper forest region of Old Colonias Road 83, and 86. These old routes to Colonias Village were replaced many years ago by a new road and this road and its intersecting road were CLOSED to vehicular traffic.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 ORV use is LOUD, INTRUSIVE, ENVIRONMENTALLY DAMAGING, AND RECKLESS.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Opening this area to ORV use as a nationally advertised area will create devastation, destroy our quiet rural subdivision and create unsolvable parking problems due to the adjacent private land abutting this gated area. With parking of pick-ups and trailers hauling ORV's there will be an exponential increase of TRASH.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 There is no acceptable and respectable use of ORV in NATIONAL FOREST AREAS.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 144
Comment#

1 (83c+83CB) Private land owners, neighbors and users recommend that this section of road remain closed to motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 145
Comment#

1 Below 635. Mruphy Canyon road has not been maintained for 35+ years and its on private property. The Serna family dow not want it open up for public access as it is privately maintained.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 146
Comment#

1 Please keep the road to the water falls open. The road all the way to the falls is too far to walk. (walker flats area).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 146
Comment#

2 Keep open all roads corrently open to all ATVs.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 147
Comment#

1 Off road vehicles damage soil and vegetation, degrade water quality, disturb wildlife, fragment and destroy habitat that is critical for wildlife survival and are noisy.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I am opposed to opening more o fthe SantaFeNational Forest to off-roada ccess.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 ORV access should be disallowed where damage to natural and cultural resources might occuror where wildlife habitat, ecology, and behavior will be disrupted.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The forest service should continue to disallow any form of motor vehicle use in wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 It should also keep ORVs out of arroyos seco, riparian areas,land near archeological sites,and habitat for threatened, endangered or sensitive species (i.e. Mexican spotted owl, goshawk, Jemez mountain salamander, and the Rio Grande cutthroat trout).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 All cross country use of orvs should be disallowed, including game retrieval, dispersed camping, and permitted gathering of forest products with large fines for those caught doing so.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Designate route networks that can be monitored and enforced.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Road density (all roads including renegade) should uniformly be held to less than one linear mile per square mile of Forest.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 147
Comment#

9 Obliterate any roads, whether inventoried or not that have appeared in roadless areas

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 Obliterate route that have already been closed or decommissioned (physically erased) from maps presented to the public.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

11 Close roads, routes, and trails to motorized use where user conflicts between motorized users and non-motirized users exist.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

12 Finally the forest service should sponsor in some fashion public education in the responsible use of ORVs in National Forests.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 148
Comment#

0 not a comment/duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 149
Comment#

0 duplicate/nota comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 150
Comment#

1 Education and enforcement is paramont importance.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Education and enforcement is paramont importance.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 151
Comment#

1 Firewood is my sole source of heat during the winter.

Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 151
Comment#

4 Access for woodcutting is vital to my survival.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 152
Comment#

1 I am in apposition to the road closures for ATV

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Senior citizens or people with handicaps to walking miles + miles will no longer access.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Residents in the area also will not be able to use ATVs on their own property because of noise restriction of right to personal property.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 154
Comment#

1 I am opposed to any and all restrictions on ATV use in the SFNF for the following reasons:

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 For people living in the forest who currently own ATV's it violate the "Takings Principle" of the Bill of Rights

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 It is prejudice against older people and people in poor health who need vehicular assistant to access inner areas of the Forest. This will not be a law passed by legislators but rather an ordinance passed by bureaucratic fiat.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I do not want Forest resources to be wasted on enforcing this garbage.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 This will adversely affect property values in the area.

Public Concern # 63 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 155
Comment#

Letter# 155
Comment#

1 Roads inbetween the Chama River Canyon Wilderness and the San Pedro Parks Wilderness should be kept to a minimum, to improve wildlife connectivity between wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 Roads leading to the Chama Wildernes should be closed to OHVs, as they would illegally encroach into the wilderness.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 156
Comment#

1 Motorized routes are very close to wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Since many of these vehicles are extremely loud, allowing vehicles this close to wilderness areas will have a harassing effect on wildlife and quiet users in these wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 157
Comment#

1 Thank you for the progress you've made in limiting motorized use ac ross the SFNF.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Do not include any user-created (illegal) motorized roads or trails in the final map

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Limit motorized access to 1/4 mile to 1/2 mile of any designated wilderness, or inventoried roadless areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 158
Comment#

1 Please consider keeping the gates at SR4 /289 & SR4/268 closed during the winter closure months. This is the way the FS operates now.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 159
Comment#

1 50 acres of proposed cross country travel seems to small for such a large forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 159
Comment#

2 Holiday Mesa Rd 607, 656, propose for Atv use. Rd 76R, 111, 608, 656, 106, 615D and83-200: designate for ATV use to creat loops.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Why not have maps on CD for Public at meetings, no table maps, color on ledger different, no pen or markers on map, hard to see/read.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 160
Comment#

1 Management through closure should not be an option.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 FR 106 to RD 144 should be on the map as open OHV trail.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 161
Comment#

1 41V open 8/16-2/28. Santa Fe National Forest Site Stewards need access to sites from spring through fall. All year designation would be ideal
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 442/442s. There roads are one we use to reach our sites (never seen any road numbers so not sure if these are them) Need to get to sites once / month all year.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 162
Comment#

1 So the Ohv users want the entire west side open for their use and only wilderness area for quiet recreationists and wildlife.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Wildlife is what makes the forest different from the cities.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 163
Comment#

1 I am insisting that all the supporting documentation used in the SFNF analysis and decision making for the DEIS be posted on the SFNF website as a PDF file as soon as the DEIS is published. In previous dealings with the FS I have had to wait until the comment period was nearly over, before having access to much needed information which I might use for thoughtful and substantive comment.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 163
Comment#

2 The public must have this information ASAP. All the underlying documentation for the DEIS helps to suppor and foster the public's good will, which is coveted by all participants.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 164
Comment#

1 I would appreciate very much if the F.S. would define exactly what standard they are applying in identifying and analyzing trails. I insist you identify how you are going to decide which routes will remain open and which will be closed.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 165
Comment#

1 I am insisting that you include all motorized routes on the forest to be included in the full analysis. That would include all system and nonsytem routes as well.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 By excluding more than half of all roads and trails from consideration before doing an EIS Analysis is illegal. By filtering the criteria in the TAP eliminated many, if not most, of the perfectly legal "user created" routes from the last thirty yrs. Or so.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 166
Comment#

1 I wish upper Fr106 be considered as well as the other existing z-track roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 167
Comment#

1 This mile of unimproved road was closed by SFNF in 1980 when it was improved to access Upper and Lower Colonias. Designation could result in a significant increase in motorized traffic through an established residential neighborhood, without outlet or clear connection to a road network. Substantial improvements would be required to remove obstacles and create an effective trailhead at Rd 83. Private land owners, neighbors and users recomment that this section of road remain closed to mororized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 168
Comment#

Letter# 168
Comment#

1 How long do we have to wail until you start busting ATV's and dirt bikes trashing the Jemez Mountains?
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 We'll wait two years for them to push back through the NEPA process and the place will suffer major damage in the meantime! This is going too slowly. We need protection of our valuable natural resources now!
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 169
Comment#

1 right of passage as defined in common law allows for continued use of these trails. Would be lide denying an easement to their property through yours.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 We request that all single track trails defined in the Blackfeather proposal be included for analysis in the scoping study.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We have noted that if motorcyclists do not maintain the trails, virtually nobody else does and the trails become impassable, e.g.Media Dia.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 170
Comment#

1 I am writing to express my concerns about the inclusion of Trail # 375 in the current plan, the old mining road, Across La Cueva Creek
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 It will pollute that area and the watershed
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 It is virtually impossible to enforce people on motorcycles staying on the assigned trail.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Potentially camping in that area represents a fire hazard to the whole area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Access to property reach a private arrangement with the parties involved
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 I hope you will give carefrul consideration to the difficulties involved in having public access to this trail.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 171
Comment#

Letter# 171
Comment#
1 Please limit ORV's as much as possib ble. They do not belong on the mesa at all.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 172
Comment#
1 The trail system in the north Jemez is going to be efffectively useless because all the entry routes have been closed.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 173
Comment#
0 not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 174
Comment#
0 not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 175
Comment#
1 The potential closure of FR268 would result in a dangerous lack of Southern access - egress for the community of Cochiti Mesa in the event of an evacuation emergency as a result of fire.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Designated areas for the sport of trials within multible locations throughout, the forest.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 176
Comment#
1 Worried that if lower FR268 is closed, there will be no egress by local homeowners in the case of a fire
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

1 Worried that if lower FR 768 is closed, will have no egress in case of wildfire
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 If road is not designated, it won't be a viable emergency egress because it will become un-passable without regular use
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 176
Comment#

3 Understands emergenc;y vehicles can use it but is afraid it will degrade and become unusable without regular use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 177
Comment#

1 Wants ATV access for firewood collection and recreation near FR10
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 wood permittees should be allowed to go on non-designated roads and trails a well as off-trail
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Including areas for off-road travel for firewood in permits won't work because there won't be any good fuelwood left
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Uses roads not only for recreation, but also for wood
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 178
Comment#

1 One of the single track routes was omitted due to Rio Grande Cut Throat Trout habitat.There was no effort made by the staff to see if mitigation efforts could protect the habitat and still allow motorized use of the trail.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

2 A simple bridge will mitigate motorcycle impact on the creek and the rest of the route should pass the NEPA.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 This trail(Lost Jug Trail) is required to keep a sage loop open for us to ride
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Please put this trail back on the map so that it can proceed through the NEPA process as it should.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 179
Comment#

1 The owners beyond us which include Tessie Marquez, Ramirez, and Zumax do not want an open road on their property and neither do we.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 180
Comment#
0 no comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 181
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Cover email for Comment form letter number 1067
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 182
Comment#
1 I feel strongly that 83 - c should NOT be opened to motorized use for the following reason: Closed by Santa Fe national Forest
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 The one mile approach to the barriers traverses a residential area, with approx. 50 homes. Noise and dust pollution would be greatly intensified.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 I understand that the road just outside the west forest boundary is on private property. It is very steep and difficult to maintain.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 183
Comment#
1 I hate to see the way 4 wheelers are tearing things up.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 184
Comment#
1 I am strongly opposed to opening 375G / 53 to any motorized vehicle. This road goes through LA Cueva Creek.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 185
Comment#
1 Opening up the trail system to ATVs will lead to much noise and more traffic in my immediate area, not to mention safety issues with children along the road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Opening the trail system to Atvs will also disrupt the integrity of the trail and disturb the peacefulness of hiking.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 185
Comment#

3 I am opposed to the idea of opening the trail system. This may also adversely affect the property value of my area.

Public Concern # 63 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Also, EPA standards have not been met on the road by our property. More traffic wll kick up more dust which is polluted.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 186
Comment#

1 CRB60 is surfaced with tailings from the old mine at Terrero and the dust is dangerous for humans and animals.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 CRB60 is a difficult road to navigate… Any more traffic on this road poses risks from many sources.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 I think it is a serious mistake to re-open it as it is surrounded by private land and would create any number of problems for local residents.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 187
Comment#

1 83C, 83CB, 615D, 615A. Atv trails bring in noise and will be nationally advertized. These trails are currently used by people walking.

Public Concern # 6 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 [People] are quiet and allow for wildlife. ATVs bring in seeds from other locales, noise, air pollution, and disect the environment for wildlife and people. It increases risks to walkers. It drives some animals away and will cause loss of life for wildlife. It decreases enjoyment of my property, and negatively impacts property values.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 188
Comment#

1 Road 50A. I am most vehemently opposed to such designation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 It will leave my property open to abuse and damage by trespassers. It will increase the risk of forest fire in this fragile environment. It will increase the risk of illegal timber cutting in the area and on my property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 188
Comment#

3 Private ownership of this land predates the Santa Fe National Forest and I have the right to access my land ia the Forest Service Road. This road has always been closed to the public.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 The raod is difficult and expensive to maintain. The reality is that my fellow landowners and I share the primary burden of maintaining this road and protecting our property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 189
Comment#

1 County Road B60 (Old Colonias Rd._ is in violation of EPA regulations, and below State standards for public roads.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 The Forest Service "Proposed Action" to reopen this mile of #83-C to motorized use would substantially impact our property and the East Pecos Neighborhood. Substantial improvments would be required to remove obstacles and make the road safely accessible and usable. We accept some of the unauthorized uses of 83C by our neighbors and community but we do not extend invitation to the general public for motorized use. I urge you to correct your maps to reflect actual conditions, and that roads 83C and 83CB remian in their current condition, closed to motorized use.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 190
Comment#

1 Cow Creek, notnot supervized on control… filled with cars, trucks trailver and people.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I would recommend that your planning restrict the number, size and traffic on this road, as well as parkup on the sides of the stream.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 OHV in this area are several… youngsters who have no concept of speed or danger.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 191
Comment#

1 I object to modifying the Forest Plan during the TMR process to "remove quantitative goals for road construction, reconstruction and decommisioning".

Public Concern # 34 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

2 Modifications to the forest plan during the TMR process should be restricted to issues germane to the Travel Management Rule.

Public Concern # 34 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 191
Comment#

3 Including the issue of "quantitative goals for road construction, reconstruction and decommissioning" in the TMR almost guarantees that the matter will not receive adequate public review and discussion.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

4 Modifying the plan to "remove quantitative goals for road construction, reconstruction and decommissioning" simpl removes the Forest Service's obligation.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 192
Comment#

1 There is a trail on the proposed action maps located in between 270D and 271. These trails are labeled as 270DA an 271L. This has been proposed for single track use only. This trail has very strong bed, will require little to maintain and easily wide enough to handle full size vehicles. We Sierra Riders would like to have it included in for ATV use.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The Sierra Riders ATV group has been doing trail maintenance along now what is called 270D and would be easy for us to include it in our work. The Sierra Riders would like to adopt this section and will purchase and erect a fence and/or trail cattle guards for controlled access and cattle

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 This also would complete a ATV trail loop from 270 through 270D, 270D, 271L, 270DE, and 270B

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 193
Comment#

1 FR326 can be used for access to the public but not used for OHVs to go across where they want.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 194
Comment#

1 I feel that there should not be any ATV;s or OHV's on the Glorieta or Rowe Mesa because of not only the noise but damage that they have already done to our earth tanks and grass.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I feel that there should not be any ATV;s or OHV's on the Glorieta or Rowe Mesa because of not only the noise but damage that they have already done to our earth tanks and grass.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 195
Comment#
0 not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 196
Comment#
0 not a comment. Information Request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 197
Comment#
1 Undesignated FS roads west and south of Gascon to Sparks Area - (1) They do not provide access to any private residences; (2) The proposed roads predominantly provide access ti private property which is not the intent of the plan; (3) The proposed roads do not provide access to any natural feature, trail, special use area, etc within the National Forest; (4) the roads depicted as the Proposed Action do not exist on the ground, i.e. they do not continue to Sparks Canyon; (5) prudent use of limited federal personnel and fiscal resources suggest use in areas with natural attractions and resources as evidenced by high visitor use, not these roads. In summary, the proposed Forest Service roads in the Gascon area should be withdrawn from the Proposed Action because they serve little to no public purpose.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 198
Comment#
1 The area noth of Thompson Ridge in the Mushroom Basin area has not been proposed for an;y ;motorized trails because of sensitive wildlife habitat in that area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Had concerns about sensitive species habitt and elk-calving in that area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 199
Comment#
0 not a comment. Add to mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 200
Comment#
1 The area T15N, R11E, Sec30, marked route 50A
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Trespass through these easements leads to forest habitat of endangered species i.e. the Mexican spotted owl.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 200
Comment#

3 The erosion they(OHV"s) cause, and possible introduction of invasive species compromises what is an already environmentally fragile reclamation area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 They (OHV riders) trespass on those private easements, taking down gates, cutting gences and creating erosion and noise and hazard for the resident easement holders.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 I urge you to remove this lovely canyon road from the final map
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 201
Comment#

1 If you are cutting forest roads by 75%. Than more people will be driving on fewer roads to locate fallen trees. What are your plans to provide more trees for fuel.
Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 202
Comment#

1 Frijoles trail is proposed to be open from Sept to December. Realisticially dome road is pretty close by the end of October due to snow motocycles are out!
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 203
Comment#

1 Some 500+ miles of trail have been submitted for consideration by the Black Feather group. Most of these trails, probably 75%, are not included in the current proposal. For those not included, I would like to see an explanation and reason why they were not included.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 204
Comment#

0 Previously addressed. Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 205
Comment#

0 Already Included. Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 206
Comment#

Letter# 206
Comment#

1 animals became spooked by some idiot on and atv/mc
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Horse people need safe and enjoyable areas to enjoy our hobbies too.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 207
Comment#

1 All the loops in this area were made illegally in areas that only allow "motorized travel on open roads only.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 Loops off FR280 - All the loops in this area were made illegally in areas that only allow "motorized travel on open roads only"
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 The illegal trails are in an area where there are threatened and endangered species.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 208
Comment#

1 TR19N R3E Area / NF 106 North of Thompson Ridge.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I request the inclusion of routes and loops in the area north of Thompson Ridge to be included in the motorizerd routes of the new driving direction for the Jemez district of the Santa Fe National Forest travel management plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 These requested routes can and should be dedicated to off road (motorcycles and ATV) activity as the main route in the area identified (NF 106) is in serious disrepair past Thompson Ridge and it would be expensive for no apparent benefit to make routes accessible again for cars and trucks.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Use of this area as requested is a traditional use area mainly and especially for the home and cabin users at Thompson Ridge.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The new plan potentially has impact (reduction of value) on the property and investments of the residents of Thompson Ridge.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 This area is used very limitedly and probably exclusively by Thompson Ridge residents due to its lack of easy access from main roads through the forest and lack of extended trail paths from the ridge.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 208
Comment#

7 This speaks to the added safety factor in including trails in the commented area of this submittal.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Review of the planning activity maps available on line show that the area of this request is significantly below the targeted road density of the guidelines being targeted.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 The area mentioned is currenly and also traditionally used for open grazing.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 Access to the proposed plans continued use of NF144 at the north end of the commented area would be beneficial to the Thompson Ridge residents and propbable off load (lessten) the violation of the proposed plans continued use of N144 through the "N" areas.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 These comments have no basis by any rational analysis as presented above, formal scientific environmental impact studies, and are not supported by the "N" areas identified on the planning maps. They clearly reflect the opinion of the commenter to rationalize the proposed plan. These biased and somewhat arrogantly delivered comments by the representative of the Forest Service are not an acceptable or valid reason for the exclusion of the requested roads of this comment.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 209
Comment#

1 375 is not passable, borders private property. Motorcyclists use it for access to private property.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 La Cueva Creek is our water supply. There are several, 50 or less wells along the creek. Oil, gas soil erosion all affect water qualityof these wells. Close this road(375G and 53) for all of these reasons.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 210
Comment#

1 The biggest flaw with the travel management plan is that it does not provide routes for hikers and horseback riders.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

2 Trail 113 keep for non-motorized travel
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 211
Comment#

Letter# 211
Comment#

1 I am extremely unhappy on the selection process and the closing of the majority of PUBLIC LAND in our state and our country.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 This riding area for Observed Trials continues to improve and mature while being protected by our club members; similar as if it were personal property that we consider an investment to our future of observed trials and a place where our children can ride and learn stewardship, safety and protection of natural resources. We now only have one very small area near Lake Fork in the Jemez Mountains left to ride observed trials.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Does the Forest Service only try to appease radical and extreme liberal environmental groups?
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Our PUBLIC LANDS should meet the needs of all of the PUBLIC which include motorcycles, bicycles, snow mobiles, 4-wheel drives, horses, naturalist, bird watchers, hang gliders, tree huggers, back packers, fire wood cutters, rock hounds; everyone.
Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Responsible use and management by clubs and organizations will insure the maintenance and stewardship of these select areas and also allow fire and emergency equipment access to remote regions by continued use of motorized access.
Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Motorcycles require vast areas and many miles of loop type trail systems.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 We consider an investment to our future of observed trails and a place where our children can ride and learn stewardship, safety and protection of natural resources. We now only have one very small area near Lake Fork in the Memez Mountains life to ride observed trails.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 212
Comment#

1 to express my deep concern increasing the number of trails available to motorized travel withinthe Santa Fe National Forest.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

1 I am strongly opposed to the allocation of an old mining road approzimately 3.5 miles from the entrance to Sfe 63A as open to ATV and other motorized traffic.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Motorized ATV's and similar vehicles contribute to noise, pollution, and dangerous situations within our forests.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 212
Comment#

2 The road(Sfe 63A) is steep and fragile
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 They (ATV's)disturb both wildlife and people.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Trails for ATV's kept to an absolute minimum.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 FR 375, 375M, 375LB and 375 should also be closed to ATV's.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 213
Comment#

0 Form Letter. Already adressed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 214
Comment#

1 I support the Forest Service action in closing some 50% of unofficial/official trails opento ORV's.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 Our community was heavily impactee by uncontrolled ATV use of our roads and arroyos.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 215
Comment#

1 As a motorcyclist, I object to road closures. If effectively prevents citizens from accessing their own forest.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 216
Comment#

1 Noise that carries, noise factor from using motorized vehicles impacts more than the designated trail.
Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 216
Comment#

2 Increased Erosion
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Impact on wildlife, noise from motorized vehicles negatively impact some wildlife?
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Poor trail Manners, pose a real danger to those walking or riding horses
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 Every Motorized vehicle area I've ever seen had bolts and ruber, broken glass, and plastic pieces strewn over the packed-dirt landscspe.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Limit the use of motorized vehcles to only one area in the forest, not several areas throughout the forest.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 217
Comment#

1 I am strongly opposed to the allocation of an old mining road approximately 3.5 miles from the entrance to SF 63A as open to ATV and other motorized traffic.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 218
Comment#

1 I hear you are proposing to completely ruinme and my family's ability to oure OUR national forest in the Jemez area
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 219
Comment#

1 One of the single track routes that the Black Feather club submitted was omitted due to the Rio Grande cut Throat Trout habitat. There was no efffort made by the staff to see if mitigation efforts could protect the habitat and still allow motorized use of the trail. The specific issue is that the trail crossed Peralta creek in one spot.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The trail is called Lost Jug trail in the Black Feather submission and the Jezez district knows where it is.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 219
Comment#

3 A simple bridge will mitigate motorcycle impact on the creek and the rest of the route should pass the NEPA. Any parts of Lost Jug trail that cinsist of user created single track can be routed onto one of the existing logging roads that parallell Lost Jug trail. This trail is required to keep a sage loop open for us to ride.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 220
Comment#

1 All public lands will become their private museum. The Forest Service does not have , or has ever requested sufficient budget from Congress to adequtely build and manage trails or riding areas and that is one driver for closures - to make your job easier.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 221
Comment#

1 The proposed action does put forth a plan that protects heritage resources in Bland Canyon, and if implemented, will reduce conflicts between off roaders and residents of the Bland historic community.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The proposed action authorizes motorized routes in areas currently designated as prohibiting cross country travel, and prohibiting motorized use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The seasonal opening of the section of Forest Trail 113 between FR89 and Fr 289, the Dome Road is gauranteed to prevent any genuine progress in safety, trail manintenance, or wildlife protection efforts.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Road disignations create new issues in Bland.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The general public will not have access on sections of roads crossing public land between private property, thus mapping these sections of road is misleading.

Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 222
Comment#

Letter# 222
Comment#

1 I suggest that the policy consider alternatives like"seasons" for individuals types of activities so there are no conflicting overlaps.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 223
Comment#

0 duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 224
Comment#

1 The road you propose to open has never been opened to the public. It is a privately owned road use for access to our home ONLY!
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Opening the private road will bring in trash, and potential for fires with careless people.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 A good example is Walkers Flat. Growing up we spent time camping and fishing, and now there are diapers and beer bottles everywhere. The original beauty is gone.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 225
Comment#

1 Why not require all off-road vehcles to obtain a permit for road and Trail use
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 You would have a record of who is using the various areas.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 226
Comment#

1 We have listened to special interest groups for too long they have an agenda to close all public lands to all but a few users.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Many people have been maintaining the trails for over 30 years this at no charge to the federal government they have cleared out dead wood and underbrush to make the trail cleaner and safer.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 The government has stopped the harvesting in the forest areas and they now are seeing more underbrush and dead wood starting to be a hazard.
Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 226
Comment#

4 The closing of the trail systems will restrict access to most areas and the resulting growth will increase the dangers associated with excess foilage. We have seen in New Mexico and across the western United States how this will affect wildfires. Leave our trails alone and you will at least have a better access point to help manage the forest with hundreds of extra pairs of eyes.

Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 227
Comment#

1 We have concerns about Forest Roads 635,635A, and 635B being open to off-road vehicles in Sect 15&22, as these roads are currently closed via gates. Santiago Creek has a population of Rio Grande cutthroats that is 98% genetically pure.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 We believe that the existing road system that leads up to the Gascon Trail A007, connecting to FR 636 would be a better alternative for off-highway vehicle use. Rito Mrghy whih has genetically pure cutthroat trout

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 228
Comment#

1 Is there something that we need to do to ensure that FR 748 remains accessible to us?

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 229
Comment#

1 There is a need for a well thought out series of loops and trails for off highway vehicle use on public lands.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Limiting the areas and trails utilized by these vehicles is not only counter to the proposed action it will more than likely increase the damage on the allowed trails due to overuse.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Please consider the Blackfeather Tail Preservation Alliance citizens Proposal

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Each member (Blackfeather Tail Preservation Alliance)is dedicated to preserving a manageable and sustainable system of trails and I have witnessed firsthand the efforts to maintain trails in the SFNF riding areas.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 230
Comment#

1 The SFNF bears a burden to present a clear, concise statement of environmental impact for established and existing OHV trails. Clearly, any trail used for any recreational purpose(such as hiking, horse riding, and bicycling) is a man-made impact to the forest. Motorized use by responsible OHV enthusiasts cannot be in and of itself a reason to close a trail. Established trails in sensitive areas can be re-routed or re-established.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The SFNF should learn from the action of the Cibola NF(where the needs and desires of all parties were considered) and re-introduce OHV routes with modification if necessary.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Formal and informal OHV rider groups have a tradition of forest stewardship as evinced by the hundreds of man-hours volunteered to clear and maintain established OHV trails.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 These groups have volunteered to educate their membership and others encountered on the trail about specific topics of concern to the SFNF to maximize compliance with environmental needs.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 The vast majority of OHV users enjoy established single-track trails narrowly winding throughout the forest in places most people do not access by foot, bicycle, or horse.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

6 OHV's use soft rubber tire at low air pressure that cause minimal soil disturbance under nearly all desirable riding conditions. Trails in existance for over thirty years have, in general, miminal rutting and erosion. Most riders avoid traversing or exacerbating poor soil conditions in order to maintain good riding conditions for themselves and other riders.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Cattle graze freely in commonly- used areas of the forest including in and around traditional and existing OHV routes and camping sites. Cattle consume native grassses and plants down to the ground level leaving exposed soil and roots. This exposure causes extreme susceptibbility to erosion and infestation by non-native (invasive) species. Cattle inhabit meadows and other grasslands where grazing and defecation are in perpetuity. These areas can be found to be muddied and trampled after even small amounts of moisture. Cattle feces are pounded into the soil and leach into streams and other watershed. By contrast, cattle ranching has introduced hundreds if not thousands of objects into the forest. These include fences (both standing and abandoned raw materials), rusted and dilapidated water troughs, storage tanks, and artificial ponds dug into the ground. The rusting metal is an eyesore as well as potentially toxic, and the non-draining ponds invite mosquitos and other sources of disease.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

8 In contrast to OHV users, cattle inhabitat the forest during very dry, very wet, and all conditions between, thus exposing wide swaths of soil to constant damage. OHV enthusiasts leave no artifacts behind.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 230
Comment#
9 I request that all established OHV trails be placed backonto the map as open OHV routes. Thank You
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 231
Comment#
0 question, not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 232
Comment#
0 not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 233
Comment#
0 request not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 234
Comment#
0 question, not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 235
Comment#
1 Please keep all the trails in the Black feathr Trails Preservation open.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The proposed closures in the Jemez will result in less families enjoying the outdoors. Enjoying the outdoors sends a positive signal to our youth which will be passed on..
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Not to mention it is bad for the ecomomy, lots of businesses depend on our forests the way they are in their current condition. Who is going to utilize the forest if they are closed? Everybody loses.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 236
Comment#

1 Would like to express my appreciation to the forest service for responding to the residents of Canada de los alamos almost unanimous desire to have OHV's excluded from the Canada de los Alamos forest under the Travel Management Rule.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 forest as open to highway worthy vehicles only for the following reasons--1) User conflict--There is an extremely high level of user conflict. Local residents have been very angry and upset that the recently developing usage of OHV's in the Canada forest has created much resource damage and it has become increasingly uncomfortable and dangerous to use the forest for quiet recreation. This forest is too small to have both OHV traffic and quiet recreation co-exist. 2) Danger--Almost every resident has at least one story of being nearly hit by an OHV, usually more. We have believed for quite awhile that a serious or even fatal OHV/quiet recreationist or OHV/car accident is almost inevitable. 3) Resource damage--Much of the Canada Forest is designated as having highly erodible soils in the TES soils map and survey and is designated as inappropriate for OHV use. The rest is designated as having moderately erodible soil. The local residents have identified large amounts of erosion caused by OHV's both on and off road and trail. There is also a great deal of damage to forest vegetation. 4) Impact on wildlife--There is very little wildlife remaining in the Canada forest and we believe that it is largely due to the sound of the OHV"s stressing the wildlife.5) Community--This community is very environmentally aware and wants to work with the forest service in developing new techniques for forest restoration and reclamation. We are working on developing proposals and obtaining funding for such projects. This would be an ideal environment for finding new ways for the forest service and local residents to work together for the benefit of the national forest.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 Do everything in you power to obtain reasonable levels of law enforcement to enforce the Travel Management Rule. I understand funding for law enforcement is limited, so I would encourage the forest service to be bold and creative in finding new sources of funding and to work together with the public in finding new ways to provide law enforcement

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I am asking the forest service to close any areas of national forest to Ohv's that can not be adequately patrolled for compliance to the Travel Management Rule.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 I am also asking that no roads be open to OHV's that are within 1/4 mile of a wilderness area because OHV riders will be tempted to go into the wilderness areas and may not even realize they are doing so.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

6 I am requesting that signage be placed in all areas and on all roads and trails where OHV's are not permitted because it is extremely unlikely that most OHV riders will obtain and follow maps. Even if an OHV rider had the desire to do so, I do not belive most are capable of following maps of trails in the forest.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 236
Comment#

7 Please make it known to the national levels of the forest service and to congress that you want to be given the means to truly protect the forest from what is certain to be an unprecedented forest natural disaster. Please do everything in your power to reduce the forest areas where OHV's are permitted under the Travel Management Rule and then help bring about legislation to eliminate OHV's from the national forest system completely.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 237
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Corespondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 238
Comment#

1 Trail closures are too severe and are so limited in remaining miles. This will only encourage violations and cause additional problems.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Overcrowding will occur causing acute damage to approved trails due to the same number of forest users being forced onto the same trails or roads.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Dangerous for family recreation where different skill levels are present while forcing all levels of riders onto the same trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Loops so that family recreation can see more of the forest, and would also result in adding additional miles on the same trail system. Many additional trails do not necessarily need to be opened if there is an trail system that links together.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Approved trails that have a rating system similar to ski areas. This keeps riding safe for family recreation and also for the more skilled riders.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 A plan for a shift in trails for certain periods of time. This would allow existing trails a period of rest where maintenance could occur or volunteer planting of native species to close the trail.

Public Concern # 17 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 239
Comment#

0 not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 240
Comment#

Letter# 240
Comment#

0 not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 241
Comment#

1 In examining human impacts on erosion, the analysis must take a longer view of the land, longer than just a few decades of motorized recreation. Current conditions did not happen 'overnight'. The Forest Service itself recognizes the current conditions are the results of centuries of human use, and even pre-human changes in the landscape.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The Forest should be extremely cautious about the claims it makes concerning erosion and what causes it. The land itself, the soil types,slopes and historical uses are by far the largest factor in erosion. Even more so, if the Forest does claim any measurable erosion due to roads, it must acknowledge that the Travel Management decision does not eliminate roads, it only eliminates one of the road user types.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The analysis must not invite either the agency or the public to believe that the current conditions were caused by a few decades of motorized recreation. The Forest must not mislead the public into believing that closing routes to motorized use will have any substantial positive impact on erosion.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 I refer you to USDA Forest Service Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-5. 2000, Would Ecological Landscape Restoration Make the Bandelier Wilderness More or Less of a Wilderness? This paper must be included in the analysis of the erosion and watershed issues.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Burned areas are beneficial to foraging wildlife, and very hot fires may help prevent the regeneration on Juniper. We know mule deer are seriously declining in New Mexico, and pinon juniper does not provide the habitat they need.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

7 It would be very interesting to see the reaction of the public, if the Forest Service and BLM proposed to do something that would really reduce erosion, that would be to remove the invasive pinon juniper forest so the native grasses could thrive.

Public Concern # 27 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 242
Comment#

Letter# 242
Comment#

1 You are suppose to represent all of us, not just a few special groups. All the tax paying public that own the land you manage for US. Yet you only leave us 1 riding area in the SFNF. Is this fair usage of MY forest? From my perspective you seem to have disregarded some of the smaller groups that need you to look out for them. It saddens me to see how America is not "by the people for the people" anymore.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 243
Comment#

1 Lack of funding should not be used as an excuse to close roads and trails to motorized use

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 it is disingenuous for the agency to cry poverty when it has not applied for that grant money (Federal funding earmarked specifically for motorized trails in NM, available through the Recreational Trails Program). The forest must not ignore the opportunity to apply for the RTP and other grants for motorized trails, such as those offered by Polaris and Yamaha.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 The analysis should also consider the value of volunteer labor. It must acknowledge the proven willingness of the OHV users to paticipate in maintenance programs, and to provide volunteer labor. In the past year OHV volunteers have repaired the extreme ruts in the Griegos RD and other locations, under the supervision of Phyllis Martinez.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The analysis should acknowledge how trail maintenance has been managed in wilderness areas. Users are given the opportunity to maintain and correct trails, instead of being told they will be banned from trails. The OHV community requests we be given the same considerations and opportunity to many trails.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 The OHV community requests we be given the same consideration and opportunity to maintain trails.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 The analysis should take advantage of the opportunity to redesignate Cat. 2 Primative Roads as 'Trails". There is no width limit on a trail. Re-designating Cat. 2 roads to trails can greatly relieve the balcklog of overdue maintenance on the books.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Once we have a system of legitamte official motorized routes, those routes must be allocated a share of the recreation maintenance budget, even if this means the funds fom non-motorized trails has to be decrease.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 243
Comment#

8 The analysis of costs must acknowledge that the motorized trails and roads are open to all non-motorized users also. This means any funds spent on maintaining motorized trails benefits all users, including hikers, mtn. bikers, and horse riders. By contrast funds spent on Wilderness trails benefit only hikers and horse riders.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 244
Comment#

1 We request that the EIS examine a range of alternatives that includes at least one alternative that maximizes motorized recreation opportunity in the planning area.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 In fact, it matches the current Travel Management situation exactly in that the FS could conceivably leave open anywhere from 0 to 100 percent of the existing routes. It concedes that only a reasonable number of alternatives need to be fully analyzed (it uses seven in the example) but, just as importantly, shows the alternatives ranging from 0 to 100 percent. it matches the current Travel Management situation exactly in that the FS could conceivably leave open anywhere from 0 to 100 percent of the existing routes. It concedes that only a reasonable number of alternatives need to be fully analyzed (it uses seven in the example) but, just as importantly, shows the alternatives ranging from 0 to 100 percent.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 There is also a well-documented increasing demand for OHV recreation opportunities on public lands and National Forests. Therefore, the planning team should formulate an alternative that maximizes recreation in the planning area. According to the "Outdoor Recreation for 21st Century America: A Report to the Nation, The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (H. Cordell, 2004), the number of people driving motor vehicles off road in the United States increased over 109 percent from 1982 to 2000. In New Mexico, the report estimates over 25% of the public enjoys OHV recreation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Therefore, an obvious and reasonable alternative would address the issue of the apparent total disconnect between reducing available road mileage in the SFNF by over 50% in the Proposed Action and acknowledged growing use of motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

5 The SFNF cannot legitimately address increasing demand for OHV recreation opportunity by simply refusing to accommodate such demand.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 Specifically, the SFNF Travel Management EIS should include at least one alternative that maximizes motorized recreational opportunities in the Planning Area. The range of alternatives should strive to provide for the current and future demand for OHV recreational routes.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 The alternatives should include identified areas where OHV trails can be constructed and maintained when demand increases.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 244
Comment#

8 The planning team should also look to individuals and user groups for assistance in identifying opportunities for OHV recreation that include new constructed routes that make loops, provide a variety of terrain and challenge levels and otherwise facilitate an enjoyable OHV trail system.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Direction to construct new routes as needed to meet growing needs should be incorporated into each alternative

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 The planning team should develop management alternatives that allow for proactive OHV management.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 All alternatives should include specific provisions to mark, map and maintain designated roads, trails and areas in cooperation with OHV users

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

12 All alternatives should include instructions to engage in cooperative management with OHV groups and individuals.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

13 A range of alternatives spanning the continuum between severely curtailed motorized recreation opportunities and no motorized recreation opportunities at all is not an appropriate range and will not be recognized or tolerated by the motorized recreation community as a legitimate analysis.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 245
Comment#

1 We respectfully ask that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) include a full analysis of 'outside' funding sources available to help supplement Forest Service (FS) funding in the development, maintenance, and monitoring of motorized routes and trails. We also request that the EIS fully analyze the potential impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The FS has the obligation to fully explore, identify, and analyze resources from ALL available sources including, but not limited to, the State of New Mexico's Recreational Trails Program fund (http://www.emnrd.state.nm.us/PRD/rectrails.htm), grant programs available through various manufacturers (http://www.pi54.com/ATV/PDFs/TRAILSGrantAppForm.pdf as an example), and the State of New Mexico's Trail Safety Fund (Section 21 of http://legis.state.nm.us/Sessions/05%20Regular/final/SB0252.pdf).

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The EIS should include analyzing the feasibility of formalizing and enhancing a position to coordinate volunteers from the motorized community to further leverage this abundant potential resource.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 245
Comment#

4 the EIS for Managing Motorized Travel should fully analyze the positive impacts that outside funding sources and volunteer labor would have in supporting the motorized road and trail systems on the SFNF. To ignore the effect of these potentially abundant resources will have a detrimental impact on the accuracy and the comprehensiveness of the EIS and hamper the decision making ability of the Forest Supervisor.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 246
Comment#

1 We respectfully ask that the EIS include a formal, detailed analysis of the feasibility of converting/reclassifying roads to trails. Converting existing road segments into trail has many advantages for the Forest Service (FS) and the motorized recreation community. First, reclassifying existing Forest system roads to Forest system trails would reduce the calculated road density on the Forest. And before the idea is rejected as a case of 'funny road density math', consider that many of the existing system road segments are, in reality, grassy roads with only a slight two track or single track on the former roadbed. Removing road system segments in that situation is, in reality, actually bringing the road density calculation results more in line with reality. Limiting traffic on these 'new' trails to certain types of motorized traffic and pulling the segments off the 'road' system also potentially reduces the 'footprint' of the route. The lower density of roads would actually be true in terms of resource effect by the actual transportation system.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Reclassifying roads to trails reduces the maintenance requirements and maintenance funding backlog.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Next, trails and supporting facilities qualify for Recreational Trails Program (RTP) funding, roads do not. If road segments are being used only for 'trail' uses, it makes sense to reclassify them so that they can tap into this supplemental funding source.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 it will make sense to have held as many of the existing road system segments in some state that allows them to be utilized to meet unknown future needs. Holding these existing roads in some type of 'deep storage' status would be MUCH cheaper than trying to create them from scratch in the future.

Public Concern # 47 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 247
Comment#

1 You must not restrict them to very limited areas as this will cause the exact damage you purport to avoid by increasing traffic over the same area time and again as opposed to allwing these low-impact vehicles and persons to range over a wider area thus minimizing trails, erosion and other evidence of their passing

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 A collaborative approach would be to require the club to 'practice what it preaches' in terms of audited results from impact, trash, erosion control and the like, thereby setting precedents of other users of all types. I think you'd find theclub more than willing to cooperate with any such initiatives and that the results would be pleasantly suprising to land managers.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 247
Comment#

3 The impact to the land is greatly lessened by allowing the club to use different venues at differing times and alternating these annually. In this way the impact is reduced to near invisible levels.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The impact to the land is greatly lessened by allowing the club to use different venues at differing times and alternating annually. In this way the impact is reduced to near invisible levels.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 248
Comment#

1 Please consider offering multiple areas in the SFNF for offroad vehicle use, at least for organized motocycles trails use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Tantamount to the outdoor trails experience is varied terrain.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 The more places to ride, the less overall impact to the land.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 249
Comment#

1 Please consider including as open to riding the many areas that the New Mexico Trails association has historically used with no damage to the environment.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Please consider including as open to riding the many areas that the New Mexico Trails associationhas historically used with no damage to the environment.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 250
Comment#

1 The Forest Service proposal eliminates too many trails, and loops, replacing the routes with unwanted roads of nothing at all.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 [The Proposed Action] also places the riders on dangerous gravel roads

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 250
Comment#
3 The user created trails are not impacting the environment and as stand now, offer a very pleasureable opportunity for the trail rider.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 251
Comment#
0 Not a Comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

1 County road b-52/Los Alamitos Canyon Road runs up through the El Molino Mines Reclamation Area which has a very fragile rubber impermiable membrane to prevent heavy metal contamination of the ground water. NMG&F tries to prevent damage to this membrane by making it illegal to walk or otherwise venture onto this land. Ths road, b-52, leads up to your Forest Road 50A that has no legal public access to the SFNF as it first goes through and gives access to private holding within the SFNF. This is a gated road byt the gate was recently and violently destroyed. This is incorrectly marked on your map as open to all traffic seasonal. B-52 Also leads directly to NMG&F easements to other private property adjacent to or within the SFNF>
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Some of the proposed use areas off La Cueva Road, 275LBB as an example, are in fact Mexican Spotted Owl Protected Activity Center breeding grounds and there is a creek that crosses some of thse trails. Using this area as a dispersed camping area is counter-productive to MSO and riparian protection.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 People like quiet. It is the reason I and my neighbors live in this beautiful area.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 252
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Correspondence
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 253
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 254
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Information request
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 255
Comment#

Letter# 255
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Information that may be helpful for implementation

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 256
Comment#

1 I'm a resident of Cochiti Mesa area. Our driveway is designated as a private easement; our northern boundary abuts a neighbor's, who borders SFNF. For over 20 years he had a gate in place along the FS 284 boundary, always locked and documented annually. Still, the fence around his gate was regularly torn down or his gate was disassembled. He continued to repair what he could and document that there was a locked, signed gate. A few years ago, another neighbor pitched in to strengthen the surrounding fence but that was cut and pulled out soon after as well. People still continue to use our private drive as their thoroughfare. There's also a road coming up from Bland, old FS 268. We've been told ever since we bought our property that that road was abandoned. Still, the "yahoos" from the city come up and "dis" the property up here.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 We Work very hard to live out here to enjoy the peace and quiet of mountain living.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The number of tresspassers and "disrespecting" weekender tourists has greatly increased in the last ten years.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 We absolutely need egress in case of fire, but the roads we would use for fire are currently open and the FS does absolutely nothing to keep them passable. We and the motorvehiclists do.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The tresspassing is getting steadily worse, and having these roads leading directly to private poperty is just asking for trouble.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Please reconsider these roads and come out and look for yourselves.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 257
Comment#

1 I want the SFNF to comply with the EFOIA ACT of 1996.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 257
Comment#

2 I request that the SFNF provide all the underlying documents and records cited and incorporated by reference, formatted as PDF files and posted on the SFNF website at the same time as the EIS is posted and the official comment period starts. The comment period should not commence until all referenced material is available on the Forest's website in PDF format

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

2 Off road vehicles present two threats to the Valles Caldera National Preserve, within which they are prohibited. First these machines are noisy and their noise carries for miles disturbing the majority of the public who visits the VCNP, Bandelier or the Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 We remind the Forest that complete and properly labeled road maps of the ' Existing Condition' have not been available for over half the scoping period.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

3 The Forest Service can deal with noise by requiring strict noise control devices on the machines taken into the SFNF or they can close all roads and trails near sensitive areas like the VCNP and Bandelier to these machines. Given your propcjsed action, the noise issue is clearly not a concern to you as yet

Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Second, with many OHV trails proposed to remain open near the VCNP boundaries, we have a very high risk of trespass by these riders who have cut fences in many instances in the past and who have trespassed on the VCNP in the past. With the USFS having few law enforcement rangers, the chances of OHV trespassers into the VCNP being caught is low.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Even when the maps were finally made available, accessing them required a high level of technical expertise which effectively created a barrier between the public and the information it needed.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 Thus your proposal to keep trails open to the boundary of the VCNP puts the VCNP at risk and puts the burden of protecting the VCNP on VCNP law enforcement. Presently, the SFNF and the VCNP have the same police force which is inadequate.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 We strongly suggest all trails and roads within 3 miles of the VCNP boundary be closed to OHVs of all types.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 258
Comment#

1 I am dismayed at your nearly complete lack of enforcement for the new OHV restrictions. I do not buy the argument that having a plan to limit OHV use is better than not having one, when you are incapable of ensuring the plan will be adhered to

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 258
Comment#

2 I suggest that a complete ban on OHV's in the Santa Fe National Forest would be much easier to enforce than attempting to enforce their use in certain specific areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I also understand that the USFS promotes the "land of many uses" concept and wants to be "fair" by allowing off-road enthusiasts and opportunity to enjoy the forest along with everyone else. Unfortunately their "enjoyment" is inherently destructive to the forest itself. Just because there is a group of people who enjoys an activity does not mean they need to be accomodated, especially when that activity endangers others and the environment.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 259
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that consideration be granted to hunters that use the forest for hunting and need to retrieve big game. I believe that it should be acceptable for a hunting vehicle to travel within 300 yards of the "open route"

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 260
Comment#

0 Form Letter see #327

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 261
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that the FS to define "de-Commissioning" and publish precisely what the agency's plan is for each of those roads.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 As a "trail", a route is no longer on the road maintenance schedule and is not adding to the backlog and costs of maintenance.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Re-designating roads as trails is a better use of an existing resource than decommissioning them.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 262
Comment#

1 I completely agree with the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 262
Comment#

2 They should not be allowed to destroy our natural resources by tromping on our vegetation, tearing up dirt stock tanks that provide water for livestock and wildlife.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 There should be increased Law Enforcement presence and these Law Enforcement Officers should take action against those that are destroyed federal lands and property.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 Also the private land owners and permittees should not be harrassed for going to their property or for checking on their livestock.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

5 There should be no public access to their private land. Permittees should be allowed to travel all main road and trails as well as all other roads and trails for maintenance of livestock and improvements and /or emergency purposes.

Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

6 The proposed action for camping is a great way to limit the destruction of cross-country travel.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 The whole forest should be if you pack it in you should pack it out. This would help alleviate and prevent our forests from becoming a huge dump site.

Public Concern # 44 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

8 Big game retrieval by motorized vehicle should be prohibited except for those with disabilities.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 263
Comment#

1 I would like to voice my opposition to the closure of all the current trails to motorized use. These people who are trying to close these trails are not taking into account the Handicapped who are UNABLE to ride a horse or hike in, yet have just as much ownership of these PUBLIC lands.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 264
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Email Attachment failed. Sent notification to submitter.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 265
Comment#

0 Not a comment/ Correspondence.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 266
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that the Forest Service carefully/fully analyze alternate funding sources (such as grants) and the potential impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 267
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that the SFNF do a full and complete analysis of options if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern or should be determined as recommended for decommissioning.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 268
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that the SFNF implement a complete/comprehensive trail monitoring system. The monitoring system must contain clear, concise definitions, goals, and metrics for a successful trail system.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 269
Comment#
1 The requirements for the designated system should include a diversity of elevations to extend seasons os use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 270
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that all standards which are to be applied for the purpose of identifying and analyzing each trail included in the Black Feather Citizen's Porposal be precisely defined and published in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 271
Comment#
1 The analysis should include cititations and examples of successful motorized recreation systems from across the country.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 272
Comment#
0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 273
Comment#

Letter# 273
Comment#

1 off roaders who use these routes to trespass on private property. Trespassing problem worse.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 274
Comment#

1 The analysis and decisions should treat all roads the same. Some have more potential to cause erosion. Erosion is strongly correlated to the area of bare surface. Ironically, the worst erosion producing roads are exactly the ones the Forest is most likely to leave open, the Category 1 roads which are two lane
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The Category 2 roads produce less impact in every area of concern, less erosion, less impact to wildlife, etc. Category 2 roads should be viewed as lower impact than Category 1 roads.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 275
Comment#

1 The analysis should have a Purpose and Need which addresses the recreational needs of the motorized community.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The Proposed Action present no rationale at all for the number of miles it proposes to designate. The Proposed Action rewards the non-motorized users (who need fewer miles) with five times as much recreation opportunity as the motorized user group
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The Proposed Action is inadequate because it severely underserves the motorized community.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 The non-motorized users are completely unrestricted. Given the extreme inequity, the Forest should provide much more trail mileage for motorized use.
Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The Draft EIS must contain several alternatives with more mileage of trails for motorized use.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 No motorized trails should be closed unless absolutely necessary because there is no way to correct problem areas.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 The Purpose and Need of the DEIS should examine the mileages needed for a day of recreational experience on a dirtbike, an ATV and a 4WD.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 It is abundantly clear that far more recreation is provided for non-motorized users than for motorized.
Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 275
Comment#

9 The analysis should include the current information on recreation trends.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 The Travel Management Rule came into being because of increased motor vehicle use in the national forests. The designated motorized route system should be designated to serve the growing need.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 276
Comment#

1 I enjoy the quiet that is integral to my life and the wildlife around us. I do not consider this form of recreation, by charging around the woods, splashing through potholes, to be of much worth, being just another part of being an "ugly american", for the most part. If there were some reason for the vehicles to be there, such as gathering game that has been harvested, cleaning up the mess already up there, or thinning the forest, harvesting pinon,then I can see doing this.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I believe that we would have more carefully planned small scale access roads in the forest that are designed to be used by pickup trucks for forest care.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Nature deficit disorder is a real problem now and the forests are probably one of the best suppliers of fuel/energy, being renewable solar rresources. the problem is that we need to take a different stance on their management from the 1800s, 1900s.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 That is not good enough. We need public access for the purpose of TAKING CARE OF THE FOREST!

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The forests represent our wealth and our health, not our playground for oil consuming toys.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 277
Comment#

1 After reviewing the new motorized designation maps, I am truly disappointed that so many of the existing roads and trails that we have been riding on are NOT shown! We have ridden every single weekend from April to October over the last two years, enjoying the natural beauty and diversity of the Jemez mountains.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I am a recent arrival to New Mexico, and one of the major reasons for deciding to live here was the vast number of roads and trails available for motorcycle and OHV use! My husband and I were in heaven.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 277
Comment#

3 We need to consider that this form of recreation will grow over the years, and develop maps to include future growth
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 In addition, these trails need to accommodate a wide variety of skill levels. The trails should also include contiguous loops. Loops of single-track, loops of ATV wide trail, and loops of road.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 There needs to be spearation of the trails to maintain interest and redue congestion.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 The existing trails that have been maintained over the last several decades accommodates users need now, and will continue to accommodate needs in the near future.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Should the local trail system become boring and unintereesting, we and others would be forced to travel to Colorado and spend our hard-earned money there instead.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 Therefore, I request that all trails listed in the Citizen's Proposal from the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance be included in the new Travel Management Maps. Do not let their efforts go to waist! Please keep our existing trails open!
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 278
Comment#

1 I feel dismayed because during the question and answer session most of the rangers with the exception of a few seemed to evade directly answering the questions
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 no hard data was given to explain why the move to close the trail is necessary, nor have I seen any data that shows the extent of the impact of those reasons for closure. Part of that may be in the EIS, but as we are not able to see that until after the comments close on this phase it leaves lots of questions still unanswered.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Something else that troubled me was Ranger Decker (I apologize if the spelling is incorrect) stated that not all of the trails had been traversed.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 Closing 53% of the Santa Fe National Forest as proposed would lead to a national forest that is around 80% overall closed. That to me is an obscene amount.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 278
Comment#

5 I am unclear also as to why there has not been a bigger push to manage and regulate the forest mis-users. Field work and making a presence would lead to the public being more aware of the actual consequences of mis-usage, or really that there are consequences at all.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 I think education should be a large priority or you will continue to see decline in preservation, and no progress will be made.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

7 When I looked at the maps posted I was a little concerned with map #8. It could be misleading. They group all trails that are closed into one group and all other trails into the other group. The problem with this is not all of those roads are open throughout the year

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 The question was posed, "if a trail or road is closed can it be re-opened." This question was never directly answered.

Public Concern # 15 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 279
Comment#

0 Not a Comment. Correspondence from FS employee

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 280
Comment#

1 I respectfully submit that the agency must fully evaluate the condition of the 'non-system' routes submitted by the OHV users. There has been no agency maintenance on non-system routes. The criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringent for OHV routes than for non-OHV routes.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 281
Comment#

1 Please consider the many riding areas that we haave historically used with no damage to the environment. We have been good stewards of our riding areas. In fact, for 20 years I have contributed to leaving these areas cleaner than I have found them.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 282
Comment#

1 I would like to see as much expert level single-track trail as possible kept open and a minimal amount of roads used. Riding roads is not the same quality experience as single-track.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 283
Comment#

Letter# 283
Comment#
1 Reducing the number of trails will result in over usage and increase the risk of accidents and possible lawsuits.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 284
Comment#
0 Duplicate/ Form letter of 285
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 285
Comment#
1 Am very concerned. Proposed closure plan to close off areas used for camping near Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. Map #3 does not show that this area has been used in the paast for dispersed camping. This is not correct as it has been used for many years for dispersed camping.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 We need areas close to Los Alamos left open for recreation due to the high cost to travel. The proposed closing date of August 31 each year is not acceptable. This area should remain open as much of the year as possible.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 286
Comment#
0 Already Analyzed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 287
Comment#
1 Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. Not shown correctly on Map#3, as it has been used for dispersed camping. We need to keep enough areas close to Los Alamos open for recreation due to the high cost to travel.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 288
Comment#
1 The agency needs to recognize that the overwhelming majority of the work that been done for OHV's went into trails and roads.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The New Mexico Trails club uses areas and there has been little to no effort done for our land use. More designated areas need to be in the proposed plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 288
Comment#
3 The New Mexico Trals club uses areas and there have been little to no effort done for our land use.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 289
Comment#
1 Constant hiking and bird watching in and around "sensitive" areas will most likely provide more resource damage than a yearly two day even which is what the NMTA proposes.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 If open areas are to be deemed "sensitive" and not permitted to be ridden on by the observed trails club, then the rules need to be consistently applied across all users of the land (bicycling, hiking, running, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, bird watching) and not discriminate based on uses.
Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 290
Comment#
1 The proposed plan stats: "cross-country use occuring once or twice a year leave almost no signs of use".
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 The NMTA needs more open areas to ride in and the club only intends to use each designated area once a year for their events.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 291
Comment#
1 I would like to be able to monitor the status (accepted, rejected, etc.) of each trail or trail section submintted, and if rejected, the reason why and what could be done to macke it acceptable.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 292
Comment#
1 If the trails are deemed "illegal" and closed, they should be closed to everyone, not just motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 293
Comment#
1 I have volunteered my time and labor maintaining the trails in the Jemez Mountains for over 25 yrs. And would continue to do so if allowed to continue riding them.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 294
Comment#
1 I request that all single track trails defined in the Black Feather proposal be included for analysis in the scoping study
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 295
Comment#
1 Because mororized off-road vehicle use is increasing, we should be expanding trail mileage, not reducing it.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I request no action to be taken regarding trail closures.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 296
Comment#
1 Any esixting road that you close will impact the off road community. Do not make new roads, just keep open existing roads.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

2 Off roaders help keep roads clear so fire fighters and search and rescue can get through in an emergency.
Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 297
Comment#
1 Consideration should be given to rerouting sections of a trail as needed to avoid sensitive areas as opposed to closing the entire trail.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 298
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that all the motorized routes on the forest be included in the full analysis, including both 'system' and 'non-system'.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 299
Comment#
1 I know for a fact that there are several cross country trails in the Rowe Mesa Area that are being left off.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I think that a more open policy should be designated for the area since only the BLM has designated OHV areas in the state, and only the La Junta canyon in the Carson NF has some trails for OHV use.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 299
Comment#

3 I would like to ask for an OHV area to be designated, so all the existing trails that my friends, family and I can continue the acceptable use of this area.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I would like to discuss the establishment of a trail system in the area, but the current maps that I viewed at the TMP meeting did not include trails in the Fangio Mesa/Powerline road area in any form.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 300
Comment#

1 Please do not allow all-terrain vehicles and off-road use in the area near Aspen Ranch off of Pacheco Canyon. This is a beautifu; peaceful spot, with a unique ecology that needs to be protected, not destroyed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 There are already plenty of places for these noisemakers - why destroy a quiet, much loved spot for the rest of us?
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 301
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that all routes get into this analysis, including those screened out in the TAP, everything the users submitted, and everything else all the motorized users have been using or ARE currently using.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 302
Comment#

1 Request that FR 289B remain open for dispersed camping. My wife and I have been camping here for years. The area is unique as it provides flat, secluded, forested, campsites away from the main road (FR289), and is easily accessible to Los Alamos. The area is very popular with family and youth groups, and large enough to find a private campsite.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Much of the area near Los Alamos is already preserved and closed to access/dispersed camping. These areas include Bandelier Nation Park, The Valles Caldera, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the pueblos. The FR289B area is about 12 miles from Los Alamos and most of the distance is on SR 4. Due to this accessibility, this area would increase in popularity as gas prices increase and other areas are closed to camping.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The nearby alternative for ispersed camping in the proposed action is within 150 feet FR500 and 289D. These aeas are much less attractive aas available campsites can be seen from these well traveled roads, and vehicle noise easily travels 150 feet.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 302
Comment#

4 When the proposed action is implemented, traffic on FR500 and FR289D is likely to increase. This is concern for security as well as the quality of the camping experience.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 These areas are also near proposed (and noisy) single-track trails. Although I don't mind sharing the forest with the occasional motorcycle, others would prefer the quite of the FR289B area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 FR289B is not popular for ATV/ORV users since the roads are relatively short and do not lead to a destination. As a result, leaving the area open to dispersed camping should not result in unacceptable environmental damaage from ATVs and ORVs. Except for the current roads and single trails the area is grass covered.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 The FR289B area does not contain streams; it is located on top of a mesa. The absence of stream prevents the overuse often seen in streamside dispersed camping areas. It also makes sites attractive for campers who want to get away from people.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 If the FR289B area is closed to camping please identify other aareas that have similar attributes. If you can't please keep this area open. Consider keeping the area just west of the junction of FR289 and FR287 (Graduation Flats) open to dispersed camping. This area is large, open, flat, and near los Alamos. The area is popular for large groups (e.g., for weddings, family reunions, and group events).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 I understand the Forrest Service needs to reduce forest, access, since they have insufficient budget to mange theforest as is, and inadequate mangement leads to environmental damage. I believe Forest Service is trying to keep the most popular and unique forest areas open to the public. The area near FR489B is one of those areas, and I urge that the Forest Service Keep it open for dispersed camping in the Final EIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 303
Comment#

1 The DEIS analysis should provide a matrix for the trails, which records their conditions.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Trails identified as having resource issues must include details of where the problem(s) are, what they are, the extent of the problem and the corrections needed.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Do not recommend an entire trail be closed when problems can be corrected.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 303
Comment#

4 Trails and roads not included in the first round of the designated system should be kept in reserve in an "Inactive" inventory, for possible future inclusion
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 For trails identified as needing maintenacne: the problem must have been verified on site. It is not acceptable to merely look at maps and assume a trail is creating resource damage because it, for example, goes through a mapped area of "sensitive soils".
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 For Trails identified as needing maintenance: the problem must have been verified on site. It is not acceptable to merely look at maps and assume a trail is creating resource damage because it, for example, goes through a mapped area of 'sensitive soils'.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 Determining the causes of resource damage: The Forest must acknowledge that all trails being used by OHVs are also being used by every other type of user. The Forest must not blame the OHV users for all problems or all trail damage.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 The analysis must differentiate between types of impacts and quantify which users create how much impact. If the analysis cannot provide that, it must state that the Forest is unable to differentiate between impacts caused by motorized and non-motorized users on the same trail.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 The analysis must differentiate between tpes of impacts and quantify which uses create how much impact. If the analysis cannot provide that, it must staate that the Forest is unable to differentiate between impacts caused by motorized and non-mkotorized users on the same trail.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 304
Comment#

1 proposed status of Forest Road 500 on Cochiti Mesa near Forest Road 289 and 36. It appears that this road is being considered for closure to all vehcles exceot motorcycles seasoanlly. I would like to request that access to Forest Road 500 by both motorcycles and ATVs be allowed seasoanlly.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The current Forest Road proposal as it stands would block us from being able to ride our ATVs very far from home at all.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 305
Comment#

1 I have a concern that the interests of non-motorized stake holders are considered to be more credible and laudable than those of motorized stake holders.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 306
Comment#

Letter# 306
Comment#

1 I have deep concerns that statements by non-motorized stake holders such as 'I cannot walk in the forest with hearing a motorized vehicle are, firstly, considered credible and secondly considered legitimate as there are HUGE areas designated as non-motorized

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 307
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that ALL the trails/routes included in the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal be included for a FULL analysis in the DEIS

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 308
Comment#

1 Connected, cohesive loops are very important to motorized recreational user, especially to motorcyclists and ATV'ers. Interspersing too many road segments with trail segments has a negative effect on the enjoyment of the user and this impact must be fully aanalyzed in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 309
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that the agency provide a clear and concise description of the parameters and criteria used to evaluate each/all trails included in the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Standards which are to be applied for the purpose of identifying and analyzing all trails included in the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal. Be precisely defined and published in the DEIS

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The criteria used to determine acceptable impacts should be based on science, be explicit and quantifiable and based on actual conditions and data. Decisions should not be based on guesses, bug overlay maps, or imaagined possible impacts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Routes should not be closed to motorized receation unless it can be shown that there is a direct causality between motorized use and significant harm. The agency must provide the specific criteria used to determine which routes to designate, and identify what is acceptable and not acceptable.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 310
Comment#

Letter# 310
Comment#

1 The DEIS analysis should not make accustions that motorized recreation causes 'harassment' of wildlife unless they have proof of deliberate harassment.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The TAP uses 'harassment of wildlife' as a criteria for recommending road closure. This is unjustified and unacceptable unless the agency can provide proof that deliberate harassment is a widespread and ongoing issue caused only by motorized users.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Disturbance of wildlife is cannot be treated as if it were a homogenous effect. Disturbance varies by type of interaction, by species, by intensity of response. This is well documented in the USDA FS General Technical Report PNW-GTR-586, of November 2003. titled Assessing the Cumulative Effects of Linear Recreation Routes on Wildlife Habitats on the Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests William L. Gaines, Peter H. Singleton, and Roger C. Ross
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 311
Comment#

1 We protest the generalized ' negative profiling' of vandalism or theft from ancient sites is a crime independent of the type of access used whether the person came on foot, on horse, or in a motorized vehicle. Clsing trails near culturla resources to motorized use while leaving them open to others is clearly discriminatory.
Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 312
Comment#

1 1) The Guadalupe River crossing just north of the Gilman Tunnels, and the trail that goes up the west side of Holiday Mesa. Will the gate blocking the trail going south from Porter Landing on the east side of the Guadalupe River be opened again to allow access to this trail?
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I was told at the Rio Rancho scoping meeting o 8/19/08 that the reason for closing the trails and the river crossing was to prevent further damage to the water quality. Was a scientific study done on the situation this time? I would like to see the results of the study. It is required by law and the FOIA to make this information available to the public.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Another option would be to allow access from Porter Landing on the east side of the river, currently blocked by the gate
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The short spur trail going south onto Guadalupita Mesa is another one of my favorite places in the Jemez. It is indeed a spectacular view and should remain open to the adventurous.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 An interconnected loop system of roads/trails is important for user compliance, enforcement, maintenance and enjoyment by the public

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 People would be trapped on the southern end of Holiday Mesa if a forest fire broke out and the southern access was closed. Another reason to leave the Holiday Mesa western access trail open is for emergency access and egress. What if the trail was closed and people used the northern access route to drive far south onto Holiday Mesa and a forest fire started?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 Another reason to leave the Holiday Mesa western access trail open is for emergency access and egress. What if the trail was closed and people used the northern access route to drive far south onto Holiday Mesa and a forest fire started. People would be trapped on the southern end of Holiday Mesa if a forest fire broke out and the southern access was closed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 what if a blizzard came in and someone at the southern end of the mesa had to get down quickly? They could get down relatevely quickly using the trail going down to FR376. But if someone had to travel the entire length of the mesa to get out via FR126, they might not make it before snow got too deep to drive. Then it would be a winter rescue situation,

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 In my opinion, it is very important to keep these trails open and I'm sure the NM4Wheelers would assist in any way possible to help with trail maintenance and whatever else the FS needs to keep these trails open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 At the Rio Rancho scoping meeting on 8/19/08 a ranger told me that scientific studies were conducted on water quality downstream from the Guadalupe River crossing north of the Gilman Tunnels. He could not tell me where the results were published. Was he referring to similar studies done at another location, another park, or actual studies done on that particular crossing? Where are those results published? Results of any studies must be available to the public

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 I have been informed that it is possible to take FS Rangers on the trails that we are concerned about. I hope to be able to drive a FS Ranger up the Holiday Mesa trail going up from FR376, and also drive the trail to Amoxiumqua Ruins on Virgin Mesa (see #4 below). I will coordinate with our club environmental spokesman, Mark Werkmeister, about a process for doing this.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 Virgin Canyon. I have not spent much time there but again, due to its remoteness and beauty, it should stay open, leaving something for those who like to get away from crowds.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 Caja Del Rio trail that loops around the blowhole.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 Many of the trails and loops on Virgin Mesa. Among these, the road to the Amoxiumqua ruins on Virgin Mesa,
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 The south end of the Hill and Dale loop near Crow Spring.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 Church Canyon
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 The inner loops of the Rito Del Indio area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

17 Many of the trails on Joaquin Mesa
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

18 Paliza Canyon. This is a favorite trail of our club. It nees a little work but help is available.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

19 Another great trail that is remote and seldom used that I like a lot is the one going up San Miguel Knob. It starts off FR534 in Bales Canyon and heads NW, then NE, then NW, then SW to the top of the knob, where you can see Hiway 550, La Ventana Jeep trail, and Cabezon Peak to the west, on the other side of the Jemez.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

20 Many routes in the forest have not yet been included in the full analysis. As required by law, ALL motorized routes must be included in the full analysis, whether they are currently in the FS database or not.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

21 It appears that the Forest Service has already "pre-filtered" the roads and trails that they intend to analyze in the DEIS. They are not allowed to do this under the law. Again - ALL motorized routes in the Forest MUST be included in the full analysis.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

22 The FS has used "criteria" in a document called the Travel Analysis Process (TAP) to filter the routes they intend to leave open in the Proposed Action. There are several problems with that , the biggest one being that the only route segments in the TAP are the ones that the FS already has in their database. So right away, many of the perfectly legal rouds and trails that have been in use for 30 years or more are not even being considered.
Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

23 All supporting documentation used in the analysis and decision making for the DEIS must be available electronically as soon as the DEIS is published. Thoughtful and substantive comments by the public are almost impossible without having this information readily available on-line.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

24 Maps with COMPLETE information must be posted on the website the same day the DEIS is published
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

25 The Forest Service must define EXACTLY what standards they are applying to identify and analyze trails.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

26 Scientific or environmental study results must be made public. Studies conducted on one particular area, road or trail canot be used to justify closure of areas, roads or trails not included in that study. And of course, studies done in other parks cannot be used to justify closures in the SFNF.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

27 Studies conducted on one particular area, road or trail cannot be used to justify closure of areas, roads or trails not included in that study. Ane of course, studies done in other parks cannot be used to justify closures in the SFNF.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

28 I have concerns that the designated system will not be properly designed to serve recreational needs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

29 User compliance and ease of enforcement goes up when the system is well designed and meets recreeational needs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

30 The FS should define the terms of the decommisioning and exactly what the agency's plan is for each of those roads.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

31 Re-designating roads as trails is a better use of an existing resource, compared to decommissioning them.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

32 The Forest Service must evaluate the condition of the 'non-system' routes submitted by OHV users. The analysis should evaluate the stability of those routes.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

33 the criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringent for OHV routes thatn for non-OHV routes.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

34 The Forest Service must carefully analyze funding soures and the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

35 The Forest Service must carefully analyze funding sources nd the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 312
Comment#

36 The FS claims that they can't support motorized trails because of funding limitations but there was over $700,000 of motorized trail Recreation Trails Program money this year.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

37 The FS must do a full analysis of options if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern. They should provide documented analysis of a full range of options on correcting the concern

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

38 To act in good faith, the Forest Service should fully define definitions, goals and metrics (how they are going to measure) for a successful trail system. TheDEIS should include a clear Purpose and of Need statement that the designated system must satisfy.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

39 The FS should describe the requirements for the designated system to include a diversity of evaluations to extend seasons of use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

40 Experience across the country proves that a well-designed motorized recreation system is primarily a network of interconnected loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 313
Comment#

1 the Travel Management Rule process at this point does not allow for subjective decisions to be made as as to which trails/roads are included or not included in the Proposed Action

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 I and other people I have spoken with have heard Forest Service personnel say at public meetings that the Proposed Action (map as currently drawn) is an attempt to "balance the needs of the various users".

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I believe it is unfair to omit certain trails and roads in advance of an environmental Impact Study whereby conclusions would be made based upon supporting data that is available to the public.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 when trails/roads are omitted at this point it is very difficult (impossible) for the public to understand the reasoning behind it and/or be able to respond.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 The bottom-line is that every mile of trail submitted by users such as Blackfeather and others is important to us. We would like the opportunity to respond to (if possible) the issues that preclude certain trails from being on the map.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 314
Comment#

1 Regarding the trail called "North Pass", as you are aware it is a 4-mile single track trail which accesses a number of other single track trails nearby (Paliza/Peralta - which was omitted from the Proposed Action as well). This trail was established many years ago and is very popular due to its close proximity to Graduation Flats and SR 4, thereby making it an "arterial route" to enter/depart the South-Jemez trail riding system. It is very important to many users that this trail be considered for inclusion in the Proposed Action for these reasons, notwithstanding the beauty, length and challenge of the trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 "North Pass", as you are aware it is a 4-mile single track trail which accesses a number of other single track trails nearby This trail was established many years ago and is very popular due to its close proximity to Graduation Flats and SR 4, thereby making it an "arterial route" to enter/depart the South-Jemez trail riding system. It is very important to many users that this trail be considered for inclusion in the Proposed Action for these reasons, notwithstanding the beauy, length and challenge of the trail.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Groups such as the New Mexico Off Highway Vehicle Alliance and the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance are more than willing to voluntarily work on the trails with Forest Service staff to address those issues that may stabd in the way of this trail being open for many years to come.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 315
Comment#

1 to express my appreciation to the Forest Service for responding to the residents of Canada de Los Alamos almost unanimous desire to have OHVs excluded from the Canada de Los Alamos forest under the Travel Management Rule

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 I believe the Forest service was correct in designating the Canada forest as open to highway worthy vehicles only for the following reasons -- User conflict, Danger, Resource Damage, Imapct on wildlife, Community.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 I would like to encourage the Forest Service to eliminate OHVS from all forests that have significant resource damage from OHVs

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

4 do everything in you(r) power to obtain reasonable levels of law enforcement to enforce the travel management rule

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 I understand funding for law enforcement is limited, so I would encourage the Forest Service to be bold and creative in finding new sources of funding to to work together with the public in finding newways to provide law enforcement.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 I am asking the forest to close any areas of national forest to OHVs that can not be adequately patrolled for compliance to the Travel Management Rule

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 315
Comment#

7 I am also asking that no roads be open to OHVs that are within 1/4 mile of a wilderness area because OHV riders will be tempted to go into the wilderness area and may not even realize they are doing so.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

8 I am requesting that signage be placed ina ll areas and on roads and trails where OHVs are not permitted because it is extremely unlikely that most OHV riders will obtain and follow maps. Even if an OHV rider had the desire to do so, I do not belive most are capable of following maps of trails in the forest.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 Please do everything on your power to reduce the forest areas where OHVs are permitted under the Travel Management Rule and then help bring about legislation to eliminate them completely.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 316
Comment#

1 First I would like to express appreciation for your proposal to keep road 286D open to all vehicles seasonally. That road borders our property and is a very important ingress/egress road from our property In case of fire

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 My biggest concern is your proposal to close roads 286, 286F, 286FA and 286FAD to "all vehicles except motorcycles seasonally. From my interpretation of the map on your website, those roads are the continuation of Forest Road 268, the road I live on, as it continues past the private property along the rim of Pines Canyon all the way to the end. These roads are not single track roads or trails. They are certainly wide enough for an ATV or even a small jeep.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Please consider leaving roads 286, 286F, 286FA and 286FAD open to both ATV's and motorcycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Please consider leaving roads 286, 286F, 286FA and 286FAD open to both ATV's and motorcycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 If you take a look at the overall picture of roads that are being proposed "closed" to ATV's in the Cochiti Mesa area of the Jemez Ranger District, you will see that there are very few that are being left open to those of us who ride ATV's.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 317
Comment#

1 In general, I find the Proposed Action with respect to the Eastside of the Santa Fe National Forest to be a welcome change fro the maps we were shown at this time last year.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 317
Comment#

2 With respect to the Proposed Action for the Mesa, and for the remainder of the Forest, I would strongly object to any additional roads or trails being designated as open to motorized travel.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Eliminate fixed-corridor acess to dispersed camping.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Adoption of the Forest Service Proposed Action on Glorieta Mesa with 4 exceptions: 1-Eliminate fixed-corridor access to dispersed camping
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Close to motorized access those roads or portions of roads that cross private land and for which the Forest Service does not have an easement.
Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 Adoption of the Forest Service Proposed Action on Glorieta Mesa with 4 exceptions: 3 - Close to motorized access those roads or portions of roads that cross private land for which the Forest Service does not have an easement.
Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

6 The Forest Service should close the following roads or portions of roads to motorized access: Forest Road 326PE, the eastern portion running north/south between Forest Road 326W and a southerly in-holding. Forest Road 326WA, the entire length.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

7 Eliminate all fixed-corridor access to dispersed camping on Glorietta/Rowe Mesa to avoid damage to a key resource, to limit conflicts among users, to avoid fostering non-compliance with the Rule and to reduce the potential of negative economic impact to grazing permittees.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 … with respect to the Mesa, that fixed corridor access to dispersed camping is inappropriate on roads through meadows, roads in close proximity to private property and in heavily wooded areas.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 Both Forest Road 594 and Forest Road 594DB, for example, traverse the center of meadows, as do most of the miles of roads on the mesa. Fixed corridor access will trample grass, destroy forage, encourage infill by noxious weeds, greatly expand the area of compacted soils and contribute to erosion, all of which are detrimental to the long-term health and resource value of the grasslands, particulary in so dry a climate as Northern New Mexico.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 The distances from roads traversing the centers of meadows to the treed hillsides cradling those meadows is often greater than 300 feet, not to mention the 150 feet specified in the Proposed Action.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 To the extent that fixed corridor access encourages camping in the meadows, it will encourage camping beyond the corridor in order to find shaded campsites, thus fostering non-compliance with the Rule.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

12 Most of the portion of Forest Road 594 designated in the Forest Service's Proposed Action as fixed corridor access to dispersed camping runs along a fenced private property line. The 2006 guidelines mentioned above set out, as one of the factors that should be considered in designating fixed corridor access, the following;

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

13 In addition to Forest Road 594, the following roads 124, 124S, 124W, 124DD, 124D and 326EJ are also relatively close to private property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

14 Forest Road 594C runs up the spine of a heavily wooded ridge, Hogback Hill. Fixed corridor access to camping is neither feasible nor necessary along the ridge. IT is not possible in many spots to get a vehicle even 25 feet off the road without cutting down trees, a violation of existing resource protection practices. It is not necessary because one does not have far to walk to camp within the trees.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

15 Limit access to dispersed camping on Glorieta/Rowe Mesa to roadside access, utilizing a motorized use distance criteria of no more than 1 vehicle length from the road's edge.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

16 Eliminate loops Open to All Vehicles to avoid negative impacts to the wildlife, to avoid interfering with traditional use and to encourage compliance with the rule.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

17 Loop roads (and trails), especially those used for motorized, off highway recreation, have been shown to disrupt the breeding grounds, nesting areas, dens and, especially, the daily migration patterns of wildlife.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

18 Few roads on the Mesa connect to another road that loops back from the original direction of travel. For example, the northern most loop on Rowe Mesa Open to All Vehicles is cobbled together out of bits and pieces of other roads where they intersect each other. It consists of pieces, but not necessarily all of the pieces, of the following Forest Service roads: 325, 325H, 324HH, and 324HF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

19 Moreover, 324HH and 324HF duplicate access to an inholding (If for only this reason, these two roads could be closed to motorized travel altogether.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

20 It will be difficult for drivers of vehicles <50 inches to tell what portions of which roads they are actually allowed on, especially when there are other roads in the area that are closed altogether to motorized travel.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

21 Similarly, with the more southern loop Open to All Vehicles, an OHV <50" may not take either Forest Road 324 nor Forest Road 330 farther south than Forest Road 330Q, but must return north either by turning around or by using Forest Road 330Q to access the northerly portion of the other road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

22 Unless Forest Road 330Q is prominently marked on both its northern and southern ends, ATV and motorcycle riders will, if only inadvertently, find themselves riding on portions of road closed to them.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

23 Since the primary engine of compliance with the Rule will be a map and road signage, compliant use of the two loop roads, but especially the northern loop, on the Mesa by vehicles <50" is problematic.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

24 Close Forest Roads 324HH, 324HF, and 330, or, in the alternative, designate them as Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways only. Close Forest Service Road 330Q

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

25 Close to motorized access those roads or portions of roads that cross private land and for which the Forest Service does not have an easement in order to minimize the likelihood of tresspass on private lands.

Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

26 …inventory all easements granted to [the FS] by private property owners on the Mesa and investigate any other rights to cross private land on the Mesa it may have. Unless the Forest Service can affirmatively demonstrate that it has such an easement, or can credibly assert some other right, it must eliminate from the mao any roads or portions of road that cross private land.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

27 …the Forest Service should close the following roads or portions of roads to motorized access: Forest Road 324: but only the southern most reach where it exits the forest across private land. Forest Road 330E: the entire length because it is only accessible by crossing private land. Forest Road 326EA and 326EB; the entire length because they are only accessible by crossing private land except for that portion of one or the other necessary for the landholder to access the private land from Forest Road 326.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 317
Comment#

28 Close to motorized access those roads or portions of roads where significant negative impact to natural resources, adjacent private property and traditional uses has already occurred in order to minimize conflict among various users and promote harmony among stakeholders.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

29 This Alternative Proposal endorses the section of the Alternative Proposal put forth by NM State Senator Griego in the matter of the closure of Forest Road 326WA and the eastern portion of Forest Road 326PE because they are superfluous and because of the history of vandalism of natural resources, private property and rangeland improvements in this area of the Forest.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 318
Comment#

1 The Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance and the New Mexico Trials Association hereby formally submit the attached document requesting that a large network of single-track trails and trials riding areas in the Jemez Mountains area of the Santa Fe National Forest (SFNF) be included in the new Travel Plan being developed in accordance with the Travel Management Rule, Part IV, 36 CFR.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The Proposed Action for Management Travel released for comment on July 10, 2008 is unacceptable to the single track motorcycle riding community.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The same holds true for the proposed trails areas submitted. Even though many of the submitted location have been used for trails events under special use permits for many years, only one of the submitted trails areas was included in the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We insist that the EIS follow-on to the TAP include a full analysis on all of the routes and areas that have been submitted by users. We insist that the forest service follow the requirement in CEQ 40 that they evaluate a “No Change” alternative with respect to the Blackfeather motorized trails.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 We specifically request that this alternative be incorporated into the analysis and released for public comment and review within your travel management designation process as a stand alone Alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 319
Comment#

1 I would also like to point out that the current road closure plan appears to be based on the 1994 Forest Service map if Santa Fe National Forest, rather than the 2004 map which made many corrections to the 1994 map, including removal of the road at the bottom of Canyon del Norte. Tus keeping these roads open is inconsistent with the 2004 Santa Fe National Forest maps.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 319
Comment#

2 I would also like to point out that the current road closure plan appears to be based on the 1994 Forest Service map if Santa Fe National Forest, rather than the 2004 map which made many corrections to the 1994 map, including removal of the road at the bottom of Canyon del Norte. Tus keeping these roads open is inconsistent with the 2004 Santa Fe National Forest maps.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 I have also previously submitted a detailed comment on the current plan demonstrating with recorded plats that one section of roadway in Canyon del Norte shown on the current plan as to be kept open does in fact not exist, and there is no current or former, public or private, easement which would allow anyone to legally access the road section from any current roadway.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 That comment also pointed out another section, again removed on the 2004 forest service maps, where an approximately 100 ft deep canyon now crosses an abandoned roadway which is shown on the current plan as an existing roadway.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 I am also in possession of documents showing private access easements across roadways on forest service land have been granted to landowners and residents of the area, indicating there is no need for public access in order to satisfy the forest services requirements for providing reasonale access to private inholdings.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 Hence there is strong argument to indicate significant changes are needed to the current road closure plan for this area to remove several roads currently indicated as to be kept open because the roads are either non-existant, impassable, and/or abandoned.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 320
Comment#

1 With forest service road 271 slated for closure, access will have to be from other forest service roads in the vicinity which entails increased opportunities for collisions with full-sized vehicles. Forest service road 271 is no longer passable by full-sized vehicles and provides a much needed alternative route for OHVS (ATVs and motorcycles). Much of the old road bed is still in good condition and shows minimal signs of erosion as a result of the current OHV usage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Many of the motorcycle routes adjacent to Paliza and Peralta canyon are not included in the proposed action. These trails are well documented in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance 'Citizens Proposal'. The trails in this general area that are not included in the proposed action are the more technically difficult trails and tie in with other trails in the area to provide diverse trail system with adequate loop opportunities. The existing "single track" trail system provides loops of varying degrees of difficulty and length.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 321
Comment#

Letter# 321
Comment#

1 I am opposed to closures of roads within the Santa Fe National Forest. The roads should be maintained and left open for public use.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 There are hundreds of thousands of acres already closed in this reagion. This is a more compelling reason why we need to have all areas open now in the SFNF stay open.It should be an improtant consideration that we are left with adequate open areas to provide recreation opportunites for our region.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 With gas prices going up, we will need to recreate closer to home.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 All areas should stay open the entire year. Hunting begins in September 1 and hunters pay fees for hunting in there areas . They need to be open and accessible.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 I want the Forest Service to reconsider the closure of the area shhown in the proposed Tavel Management Proposed Action on map 5 around FR 289B and 28 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 This area is not shown with the correct designation on Map #3 as it is shown as being used for disperssed camping.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 322
Comment#

1 We are specifically requestion that you add the route identified as the " Osha Canyon Overlook Loop' route to all alternatives for the EIS and complete a full analysis of this route.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 In spite of an illustration of this route being included in the OCT. 2007 submittal by the club, there is a portion of the route that does sohow on any of the Prposed Action maps including the 'Existing Condition for Motorized User-Westside of 'User Provided Routes" maps.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 323
Comment#

1 For some reason my computer/e-mail does not support the Adobe PDF form that is on your site so I can only send comments without the form or mail them by USPS. If your IT staff has a solution please inform.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 I am writing regarding single track trails on the Glorieta Mesa. Currently there is one 12-mile loop available to riders in this geographic region. Please consider including this one loop one the Proposed Action Map for those riders who are nearby this area who ride motorcycles and mountain bikes.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 324

Comment#

1 Overall, I think your plan is great, in that it aims to greatly reduce the number of roads open to motor vehicle use. However, I don't think you've gone quite far enough, based on the low percentage of forest users who actually use off-road vehicles, the great potential for damage that their machines have, the paltry resources you guys have available for road maintenance and enforcement, and the ecological integrity of areas that are inaccessible by road.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I haven't studied your overall plan in detail, but I have looked at the proposed map for the Pajarito Plateau area around Los Alamos, and quite frankly I'm shocked at some of the roads that you have listed for proposed motorcycle use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Specifically, the areas around Pipeline Road, the Guaje Canyon Road, and Guaje Ridge Trail are all just recently showing good signs of recovery from the Cerro Grande Fire, but I believe these areas are still too fragile to support motor vehicle use. I mountain biked Pipeline Road over to the Guaje Ridge Trail and Guaje Cemetary Road just last week, and they're all pretty badly eroded, so much so that even the use of mountain bikes and horses on these roads and trails is questionable. Based on my experience in these areas, it is my belief that you guys should restrict most road access in ALL of the areas that were affected by the Cerro Grande fire, probably for the next 20 years at least until these areas have had a chance to restore themselves.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

4 I know you guys put in aconsiderable amount of time and resources after the Cerro Grande Fire to mediate the damage by putting out seed and saplings and the like.However, I think there is still a LOT that could be done to help speed upthe restoration process, such as using some of the downed logs to make swales that would help prevent further erosion, maintain moisture forplanted trees, and help incorporate some of the decaying wood matter and it's carbon dioxide into the soil.

Public Concern # 24 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 325

Comment#

1 have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. This area has been used for camping for many years.Los Alamos makes it even more attractive as a destination. It is off the main 289 road so is quieter and a great place for a weekend camping trip.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses.This area as is in close prox.imity to several immense areas already designated for preservation in Bandelier NP and also the Valles Caldera area and as such there is not a need for this area to be noted as preservation with no motorized vehicle traffic and should be considered in the NEPA process. There is a need for public access for dispersed camping in this area which already has thousands of acres closed offonly yards from this site.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 325
Comment#

3 I have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. This fact that this area is such a short drive from the Los Alamos community and close to the main road should be considered. It is more important to have areas open which are closer to population bases than in the more remote sections so travel costs and time are minimized to get to the recreation areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 I have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. This area is not shown with the correct designation on Map #3 as it is not shown as being used for dispersed camping. This area is used extensively for camping currently and has been for decades

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 I have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses.This area should not be closed to use as of August 31. This area should remain open until first snow or Sept 30 at a minimum.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 The nearest area shown to be designated for dispersed camping is also the area which is shown for the ATV and motorcycle use. This is fine for people who want to camp near the road and ATV trails. There should be areas designated for motorized camping which are close to the main road for motorized camping and not adjacent to the ATV and motorcycle trails. There are people who want to camp and not do ATV's.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 I have the following concerns with the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action as shown on Map #5 to close the area around Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. 7. This area has been historically used for many years for motorized public use. The main road 289B has denigrated with rotting and needs to be leveled so the public is not forced to find alternate roads within this area. That is the reason for the current road problems

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 I understand that this recommendation may have been made as it will be easy to block this area off. This is not an acceptable reason to deny the camping public the use of this land. I ask that this area be changed to allow dispersed camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 326
Comment#

1 Pecos Las Vegas Rd. East Pecos, 83C & 83CB. I recommend that this section of road remain closed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Pecos Las Vegas Rd. East Pecos, 83C & 83CB. This section of road has been closed since 1980 for good reason. No easement to access and no parking. Road is very narrow and can't handle two way traffic.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 326
Comment#

3 Pecos Las Vegas Rd. East Pecos, 83C & 83CB. Hiking and equestrian use while enjoying the quiet nature.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Pecos Las Vegas Rd. East Pecos, 83C & 83CB. To open it to motorized vehicles would be a costly endeavor for the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 327
Comment#

1 The proposed road closures on the Jemez Ranger District will provide timely protection of severely eroded watershed, waterquality,fisheriesand other natural resource conditions. In particular the areas north of Jemez Springs, West of the Valle Caldera , and the San Antonio, Jemez Springs, and Rio Cebolla Watersheds have experienced extensive erosionto riparian and wetland areas due to excessive and unregulated ATV use

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 Although many of the drainages in these areas are not officially open to ATVs, there are many illegal trails and tracks that are used by hunters and campers because little to no posting of restricted use area signs, there is little to no enforcement and the fines are not enough to dissuade illegal use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Better legal and community enforcement combined with more restricted use area signs will also be crucial to enhance the resource management in these areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 328
Comment#

0 Form letter see 327

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 329
Comment#

1 I repeated to her that U understand she is now asking for us to designate the one from the south (FR268) as well. " We would like as many accesses as we can get. We have one main access road from the north and the only one from the south is the Bland Rd (FR 268). I would really like to keep that open in case of a fire and I would like it maintained as best as possible."

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 330
Comment#

1 We are specifically requesting that you add the route identified as the 'McMillan/Church Canyons' route to all Alternatives for the EIS and complee a full analysis of this route.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 330
Comment#

2 While it may appeat to have many of the same connections and features as the parallel route included in the Proposed Action, each of the routes from the west ridgeline to the Rio de Las Vacas offer unique and frequently enjoyed experiences by our club.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 331
Comment#

1 We are specifically requesting that you add an important linking route to all alternatives for the EIS and complete a full analysis of this important Jemez connector route. The subject route connects Thompson Ridge to FR 144 via FR106 and FR3756R.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Add an important linking route to all Alternatives for the EIS and complete a full analysis of this important Jemez connector route. The subject route connects Thompson Ridge to FR144 via FR106 and FR376R.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 332
Comment#

1 We ware specifically requesting that you add the loop identified as the 'Caja Del Rio' route to all Alternatives for the EIS and complete a full analysis ot this important and historic route

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 The Caja Del Rio/Blowhole loop is one of the favorite routes of the NM4W, especially when winter snow closes the higher elevations of the SFNF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 333
Comment#

1 Road st the bottom of Canyon del Norte is both aabandoned as well as in an unacceptable locatiion adjacent the intermittant stream in Canyon del Norte.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 In Canyon del Norte, 30-100 ft of private property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 causing significant damage to the fragile high altitude riparian zone,

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 I am a resident of Cochiti Mesa area. Our driveway is designated as a private easement.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The gate to my property was destroyed several years ago and I have not replaceed it as I know it would just be ripped down again. All the signs I put at a lower level were within a week removed and/or defaced.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 333
Comment#

6 A neighbor's fence was torn down or his gate was disassembled.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Please reconsider these roads.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Please consider [removing] the above roads and come on out for a look for yourself.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 I have personally observed OHVs cross across my land to access the meadow dispite signs, and use the portion of the meadow that I own for rcreation, causing significant damage to the fagile high-altitude riparian zone, which I then had to spend considerable time and dollars to mitigate.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 time and dollars to mitigate , gate to my property was destroyed, defaced.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 Cochiti Mesa area, driveway, privaate easement.,gate torn down.Road coming up from Bland, old FS 268. meadow,
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 Trash, privacy and property violated.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 The number of trespassers and "disrespecting" weekender tourists has greatly increased in the last ten years. We're constantly picking up their trash and having our privacy and property violated.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 334
Comment#

1 After reviewing the proposed action maps I have concern that FS route 527 through Calaveras Canyon along the Pipeline is not on the proposed action route map. I respectfully request that this be put back on the map for consideration. If mitication is needed to continue use of this route, then that can be one of the first actions taken under the new managemnet of the FS routes. This is a very important connection to FS route 117 from route 144 and is one I use regularly when turkey and elk hunting.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

1 After reviewing the Proposed Action Maps I have concern that FS Route 527 through Calaveras Canyon along the pipeline is not on the proposed action route map. I repectfully request this be put back on the map for consideration. If mitigation is needed to continue use of this route, then that can be one of the first actions taken under the new "management" of the Forest System routes. This is a very important connection to FS route 117 from route 144 and is one I use regulary when turkey and elk hunting.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 335
Comment#

1 The current draft of the SFNF Travel Management Plan has FR268 in Del Norte Canyon closed to motorized use. I oppose this closure. With the closure of 113 and Upper Medio Dia, 268 provides the only reasonable approach to this area for a volunteer crew to access thr trails to remove fallen trees.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 336
Comment#

1 I would like to point out that FSR 268A by the SFnF north of Del Norte Canyon is both not needed and desirable. The section of FSR 268A in Del Norte Canyon is an abandoned roadway. I have a letter from John Peterson of the SFNF, stating the FS abandoned that road at least 15 yrs ago for two reasons. One, it goes through privae and and the other is that it parallels a wetland area. The north section of FR 268a is unnecessary as there is an exisiting accest road that private land owners use that is sout, FSR268, and is maintained by homeowners. FSR 268a ito the north does not provided good access, it is neither maintained nor provides decent access for property owerns and more importantly, it does through approximately eighty acres of private property. This is the genesis of FSR 268, to circumvent going through private property. If you open FSR 268A you will have two access roads to the same property which contradicts the desired plan of one access road to all private land.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 If you open the road, FSR268, to the north you will encourage a whole gamut of vehicles to upset the wetland area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 I would also like to point out that the current road closure plan appears to be based on the 1994 Forest Service map if Santa Fe National Forest, rather than the 2004 map which made many corrections to the 1994 map, including removal of the road at the bottom of Canyon del Norte. Thus keeping these roads open is inconsistent with the 2004 Santa Fe National Forest maps. I have also previously submitted a detailed comment on the current plan demonstrating with recorded plats that one section of roadway in Canyn del Norte shown on the current plan as to be kept open does in fact not exist, and there is no current or former, public or private,easement which would allow anyone to legally access the road section from any current roadway. Thus to legally access that section would require a taking to create an easement, which I do not believe the plan would consider desireable. That comment also pointed out another section, again removed on the 2004 forest service maps, where an approximately 100 ft deep canyon now crosses an abandoned roadway which is shown on the current plan as an existing roadway

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 For over 20 years he had a gate in place along the FS 284 boundary, always locked and documented annually. Still, the fence around his gate was regularly torn down or his gate was disassembled.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 There's also a road coming up from Bland, old FS 268. We've been told ever since we bought our property that road was abandoned. The trespassing is getting steadily worse, and having these roads leading directly to private property is just asking asking for trouble, for US.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 337
Comment#

Letter# 337
Comment#

1 Map #5 Management Porposed Actio has omitted the following dispersed camping area that must be analyzed in the DEIS and considered to be open: The area highlighted above is located on FR 606NE of Cibolita Spring. I have also drawn a short spur road that leads to an open meadow which is another camping area which must be considered to be open to dispersed camping and fully analyzed in the DEIS

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Map #5 Management Proposed Action only allows dispersed camping along the first half mile up from FR 376. The entire length of FR 488 must be considered to be open to dispersed camping and fully analyzed in the DEIS

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Map #5 Management Proposed Action does not allow dispersed camping along the ridge. The entire length of FR 558 must be considered to be open o dispersed camping and fully analyzed in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 338
Comment#

1 The New Mexico 4 Wheelers respectfully request that the road segments near Crow Springs (segments including FR652, FR654, FR655 and or their spurs) that comprise an irreplaceable section of the club's 'Hill and Dale Trail' be included in one or more Alternatives studied in the EIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

1 The New Mexico 4 Wheelers respectfully request that the road segments near Crow Springs (segments including FR652, FR654, FR655 and or their spurs) that comprise an irreplaceable section of the club's 'Hill and Dale Trail' be included in one or more Alternatives studied in the EIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 the only feasible route penetrating the ridge just west of Crow Springs. Mike Dechter accompanied the club on a trail ride to this location in June of 2007 and the visit gave a false impression of the area as very wet. By mid-summer, the 'stream' has dried up and the area can be traversed on dry ground. The New Mexico 4 Wheelers would like the opportunity to adopt the route and work with the Jemez Ranger District to ensure minimal environmental concerns while being able to keep the entire loop open to the public for motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 the only feasible route penetrating the ridge just west of Crow Springs. Mike Dechter accompanied the club on a trail ride to this location in June of 2007 and the visit gave a false impression of the area as very wet. By mid-summer, the 'stream' has dried up and the area can be traversed on dry ground. The New Mexico 4 Wheelers would like the opportunity to adopt the route and work with the Jemez Ranger District to ensure minimal environmental concerns while being able to keep the entire loop open to the public for motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 339
Comment#

1 The New Mexico 4 Wheelers respectfully request that the Guadalupe Crossing and the road from FR376 to the top of Holiday Mesa be included in one or more lternatives studied in the EIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 339

Comment#

2 The Jemez Ranger District made vague claims of Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout habitat concerns as the reason they were not inclined to leave the crossing open to the public. Any sedimentation concerns at the well-armored and historical crossing cannot be considered significant in either quantity or elapsed time, or even measurable, against the backdrop of sedimentation load from precipitation events, spring snow melt, or a very busy Class 3 Forest Service Road (FR376) that runs parallel to the river for OVER SEVEN MILES! Sedimentation, stream temperature, etc. are insignificantly affected by a simple 90 degree crossing on an occasionally utilized Forest Service system road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 While the FS may claim that the road off of Holiday Mesa will still be available as an administrative road during a forced evacuation of the mesas, in reality the road will quickly become impassable due to deadfall etc if the (maintaining) public isn't actively using it.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 340

Comment#

1 The New Mexico 4 Wheelers respectfully request that Paliza Canyon (FR271) be included in one or more Alternatives studied in the EIS. The subject road segment of FR271 is from the Paliza Canyon campground to the road's junction with FR266NAC.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The Forest Service bears sole responsibility for its current condition. To punish the public for the Forest Service's maintenance neglect is wrong and unnecessary. Instead of closing the road, why not invite the motorized recreation community to adopt the road segment and address its concerns? Involve the public in identifying, funding, and executing a fix. Give the 4WD, ATV, and motorcyclists a reasonable timeframe, like three years, to address the erosion concerns and re-evaluate the road's condition for continued inclusion in the designated system at that time.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 This road has been neglected for many years by the Forest Service. The Forest Service bears sole responsibility for its current condition. To punish the public for the Forest Service's maintenance neglect is wrong and unnecessary.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 Instead of closing the road, why not invite the motorized recreation community to adopt the road segment and address its concerns? Involve the public in identifying, funding, and executing a fix. Give the 4WD, ATV, and motorcyclists a reasonable timeframe, like three years, to address the erosion concerns and re-evaluate the road's condition for continued inclusion in the designated system at that time.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The Forest Service bears sole responsibility for its current condition. To punish the public for the Forest Service's maintenance neglect is wrong and unnecessary.
Instead of closing the road, why not invite the motorized recreation community to adopt the road segment and address its concerns? Involve the public in identifying, funding, and executing a fix. Give the 4WD, ATV, and motorcyclists a reasonable timeframe, like three years, to address the erosion concerns and re-evaluate the road's condition for continued inclusion in the designated system at that time.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 340
Comment#

4 'Replacing' this road with FR266 (to the south of the canyon) is not a viable solution. The recreational opportunities associated with traversing Paliza Canyon and FR266 are not similar. The recreational value of FR266 is not anywhere even close to that of FR271. The challenge level is far less, the terrain and scenery are radically less exciting, and the whole 'feel' of adventure associated with Paliza Canyon is lost.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 341
Comment#

1 There is no location that is farther than 50 meters from avisible bulldozed logging road. There needs to be more vehicular access to the irregular boundary of the VCNP. Most points in this area are within 100 meters of a visible logging road. It is proposed that this 1200 acres be designated open to all vehicles as an experimental use area to be self-policed by the users.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 It is proposed that this 1200 acres be designated open to all vehicles as an experimental use area, to be self policed by the users.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 There is no location that is farther than 50 meters from avisible bulldozed logging road. There needs to be more vehicular access to the irregular boundary of the VCNP. Most points in this area are within 100 meters of a visible logging road. It is proposed that this 1200 acres be designated open to all vehicles as an experimental use area to be self-policed by the users.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

3 It is proposed that this 1200 acres be designated open to all vehicles as an experimental use area, to be self policed by the users.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 342
Comment#

0 Please feel free to contact me if you are interested

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

1 Roads 635, 635A, and 635B off of County Road A005 in Section 15 (see enclosed SFNF Eastside Transportation Map). The proposal also shows access directly off of County Roads A005, A007, and A042 in Sections 15 and 22. The end points of these six proposed road openings are all within two miles of each other. I believe opening all of these roads would lead to excessive and unnecessary loss of open space. Therefore, I would like to make suggestions on which road opening(s) would be easiest to maintain and would provide the most benefit to the public while having the fewest negative impacts on owners of private property in holdings.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Motorized access to SFNF land via County Road A0005 has been closed via locked gates for more than 50 years. Public vehicle access has been prohibitted this entire time via locked gate.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Opening these old roads to public traffic, especially during spring runoff and monsoon season, will cause extreme degradation to these roads

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 It is unreasonabble to expect private landowners to maintain these roads for public use when public county roads accessing this area to SFNF already exist.

Public Concern # 61 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 I do not think it is reasonable to expect private land owners to fence and maintain the significant amounts of right of way involved, maintain signage, build cattle gaurds, etc. to mitigate an inevitable increase in trespass problems.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 I have no problem with forest service access for special uses such as habitat studies, logging or thinning operations, firefighting, special use grazing or hunting guide permittees, etc.

Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

7 My family believes traditional cultural livlihood andrecreational land use of the forest by the residents of surrounding communities should be maintained as they have been for generations.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 As a member of the public as well as a private land owner I do not believe these three roads (635, 635A, and 635B) are the best place for opening general public access to this part of SFNF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 635 roads - these roads all continue inside t wilderness boundaries.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 These roads all continue inside Wilderness boundaries

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 I do not believe SFNF can enforce keeping increased off road vehicles from traveling into the wilderness in these areas if it opens the “chokepoint’ at the locked gate at the junction of Road 635 and County Road A005.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 If 635 Roads are opened I believe bridges or at least culverts need to be placed at the two major stream crossings to prevent stream erosion and sedimentation of Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout spawning beds.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 342
Comment#

12 Better alternatives exist to accessing this area of the SFNF than the 635 Roads.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 Gates could be placed at either one or both of these roads where they enter fenced SFNF lands (635 roads)
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 A parking lot/trailhead could easily be established in open areas just inside forest service boundaries here with less impact on private land owners as well as wildlife and sensitive species habitat.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 I am sure volunteer hiking, wilderness, or horseback groups would be happy to connect and maintain this section to the gascon point trail and possibly to other trails.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

16 This (new summer cabins being built by landowners along 635 roads)will increase the number of potential trespass conflicts.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

17 Neighbors in Cochiti Mesa have reached concensus that the FS should remove several roads deisgnated on the proposed action
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 343
Comment#

1 The New Mexico Off Highway Vehicle Alliance specifically asks that the 12 miles of user-submitted single track motorcycle trail on the Glorieta Mesa located near the intersection of county Road 51c and FR326 be fully analyzed in the EIS and incorporated into the designated routes on the Motor Vehicle Use Map.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 In spite the Glorieta Mesa being a very large area, it is grossly under-represented in terms of motorized single track trails.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The user created trails that well sited and not creating adverse impacts.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Incorporating these trails into designated trail system will help meet the need for dispersed and diversed motorized recreation opportunitieson the east side of the Forest.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 344
Comment#

Letter# 344
Comment#

1 I strongly oppose the closure of FR 268 and Bland Canyon
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I am particulary concerned about the proposed closure of the section of FR268 (Del Norte Canyon), connecting FR286 to the Bland Canyon Section of FR 268. In the case of a fire that closes our escape to the north via 268 to NM 4.
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 If motorized use is prohibited,the route would quickly fall fall into such a state of disrepair that would prevent our escape.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 345
Comment#

1 You seem to present a selective, non representative picture of trail 113.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Please, if you are posting pictures, provide a representative sample!
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 346
Comment#

1 I am a mountain biker and I oppose the closure of sections of trail 113 in the vacinity of Cochiti Mesa. In particular, I strongly feel that the Alamo Trail section, connecting Cochiti canyon and Cochiti Mesa and the "Killer Switchbacks" connecting Cochiti Mesa to Del Norte canyon, should be left open for use of motorcycles.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I also feel that FR 268 should be left entirely, as well as single track in Upper Medio Dia Canyon that connects 268 to trail 188.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 I believe without support from the motorcycle community, these trails will become unusable to ANYONE (hikers, bikers, horses) within 2-3 years due to fallen trees.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

4 My ability to ride these trails is entirely due to their extraoordinary efforts in keeping these trails open. Also the general condition of trails in this region has not changed significantly in these 15 years.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 346
Comment#

5 There are certainly areas that have significant erosion problems, but these areas constitute an insignificant portion of the trail system in particular, and of the mountain range as a whole.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 347
Comment#

1 First and foremost, I feel the public has been done a major disservice at the least, and there has possibly been a circumventing of the NEPA process at the worst, by your teams failure to include EVERY known road and trail on the scoping maps presented in this proposal.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 I take serious offence with the presentations made to the public that somehow reducing the mileage of roads and trails in this forest from near 6,000 legitimate use miles to less than 3,000 proposed miles is somehow an expansion of ohv opportunity (not to mention the elimination of legal cross country travel opportunity).

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Therefore, I want to see at least one proposed action that includes every known existing road and trail that is legal for use by OHVs on the SF Forest before the implementation of the TMP process

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 ALL of the ohv trails identified in this area and included in the "OHV User Group Proposal" are very important to me and I want to see them included in the preferred alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 I fully understand that the TMP process is necessary for proper management of our forests for today and beyond, and I am in favor of no cross country travel, I am very concerned that the process is being over utilized to promulgate an anti-ohv agenda.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 I have carefully reviewed Senator Griego's scoping comment letter presented at his meeting at the capitol building on August 27th. In general, I am supportive of the specific requests outlined in his comment. However, I take exception to the position that requests no expansion on the proposed trails included in the scoping maps. Once again, all the trails, particularly in the southern part of this area should be on the table, subject to public comment and analyzed as closely in this area as any other area of the forest. Additionally, I take major exception to the attempted creation of a "Special Zone" under his personally created definition. This Zone concept does not legitimately exist in this process anywhere that I can find and I want no reference to it in any of the proposed alternatives.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Over the years the OHV community has take serious "ownership" of these trails not the least of which has been demonstrated in trail maintenance. Much like a maturely developed ecosystem, this trail network has been relatively self sustaining for over 30 years with very little negative environmental impact and minimal active managements on the part of the forest service staff. Given a chance at even more active management of this OHV trail system, in partnership with the USFS, the OHV user groups would embrace the opportunity.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

8 It is my position that road density is not a legitimate argument for road closure in this particular forest decision. It is inappropriate to break down the 1.6 million acres in this forest area into small 6-10 smaller categories (I believe you refer to these as A, B, C, etc), then further sub-divide those categories into several more fragmented areas only to ultimately chose one subsection of the forest and propose closures on the basis of road density. I want all of the 1.6 million acres in this forest to be divided by the total number of proposed roads in the entire forest with the result determining actual road density for this forest.

Public Concern # 20 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 Even if all the acreage in each category you have created was added together to determine the gross acreage calculation used to determine road density, it would still be obvious that there is not an overall road density issue. For example, all the acreage in category "A" sections should be added together and divided by all the roads in all category "A" sections to determine road density for category "A".

Public Concern # 20 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 Although this is not the methodology option you have chosen to date, I believe this option is available by interpretation of your authority under the current forest plan.

Public Concern # 20 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 While the ATV users have been under represented in this process, this very fragmented user base is growing.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

12 I am concerned about the lack of opportunity for the ATV users in this area. Simply eliminating or severely limiting their legitimate access in this forest on paper WILL NOT SOLVE this management issue

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 I would like to see more effort put into reaching out to this user group and addressing the future needs of this user group and am willing to work closely with your team in an effort succeed

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 The use of an OHV may be their only option for a quality forest experience or continued hunting and fishing opportunities.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 347
Comment#

15 This is the one area where I have serious concerns about the elimination of cross country travel specifically for game retrieval.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 OHV recreation has been identified as a viable and desirable form of Tourism by the State of NM. Recent laws, sponsored and managed by the Tourism Department, have been passed to provide land managers like the USFS with some tools to provide structure to this activity. Given this areas proximity to the ABQ/SF area and more importantly many of our rural NM communities, its value as it relates to tourism for these communities and NM should be a consideration.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

17 I have heard several comments in the open meetings concerning OHV access and its effect on property values. Property values are determined purely in the bias of the seller / purchaser.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 348
Comment#

1 I'm having second thoughts about some of the sections like 938C. Leaving it open makes sense from a safety and convience standpoint, but it also leave all the side roads vulnerable to encroahment. Most of the problems along it come from the wood cutters.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 On the other hand, people don't tend to follow dead-end roads if they know they are, unless they go some where or want to get to that area or are just exploring. People like to follow loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 It would be nice to have some long loops for vehicles, but that would focus usage on those loops rather than things being random or specific.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 I think if there are not enough roads in an area, or the connection is 'inconvenient' that people will poach and go where they want to. Monitoring roads in the more remote areas, like Crow Spring, could be very difficult.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 If roads are left very challenging, fewer people will follow them. At the same time, that's what others are looking for.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 If 135 on Cat Mesa was made street legal only because of fire considerations, the same argument could be made for Virgin Mesa. I can't think of other reasons for that designation. 135 doesn't get used much, but it is the only real access to Cat Mesa. Because it's so far out there, I can

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 348
Comment#

7 The mountain biking and hiking side of me would like to see the vehicles, especially ATV's, closed off of most of the roads, but I've come to realize that without them, many of the roads would become impassible within a few years. This is especially true in the Cuba District where many roads get just enough travel to keep them open. OHV use is a legitimate use on NFS lands. This process is so hard because OHV use can result in numerous resource and user conflicts if not managed or managed poorly. In other situations, OHV use and management can serve the interests of many different users.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 The motorcycles help the trails as long as they don't overuse them. When that happens the trails either get trenched which makes it hard to ride because our pedals hit the sides or turned into 6" of fine powder where the trail is on pumice or tuft. Fortunately, it packs nicely as soon as it gets wet.

Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 349
Comment#

1 I am writing to request that the Forest Service remove the auxiliary road off Forest Road 79, called Garcia Ranch Road, from the travel management plan. The reasons include: that the road is only for a private inholding.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 350
Comment#

1 What is it about Lost Jug that is not designated?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 John complained that user-provided roads/trails were/are not available to public for comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 John mentioned there are alternative routes in this area. "Shady Lane parallels 282 for 1 mile

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 We are going to re-consider this portion of trail "over 40"

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Black Feather said they don't use this moute that goes through private property to the East, but cut strait. Will re evaluate this trail

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 North Lower grassy roads adjacent to west side of Del Norte Estates, some maps show it is in JMS occupied. Forest Serivce needs to double-check the JMS habitat

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 John complained that this takes out route connectivity and you have to double back to get from FR 280 to FR 268.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 350
Comment#

8 Portion of 271 between easy Out and Paliza Canyon small portion of road not designated.(Mike Dechter said this small portion may be a GIS error - should show some connectivity here along 271 for this 1/4 mile portion of road/trail

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 John is concerned about driving on dangerous parts of FR 266 because there are some sheer falls , we disignated the sheer part as "Highway Legal only"

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 Gordy Spingler discussion: Gordy: I would claim the proposed action of the SFNF is siding with environmental groups and Sam Hitt.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 Gordy Spingler discussion: Gordy: We believe that real peer renewed science would support all of our trails and we believe the Forest Service has untold resources compared to bladk Feather to prove their what I bellieve is the …..If you had the midset of creating a good OHV system this is what you would do.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 351
Comment#

1 County Road B-52. Los Alamitos Canyon Road (aka Molino Rd) runs up through the El Molino Mines Reclamation Area which has a very fragile rubber impermeable membrane to prevent heavy metal contamination of the ground water. NNMG&F tries to prevent damage to this membrane by making it illegal to walk or otherwise venture onto this land. This road B-52, leads up to your forest road 50A that has no legal public access to the SFNF as it first goes through and gives access to private holdings within the SFNF. This is a gated road but the gate was recently and violently destroyed. This is incorrectly marked on your “Map” as “open to all traffic, seasonal”. B-52 also leads directly to NMG&F easements to other private property adjacent to, or within the SFNF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 352
Comment#

1 As a 4wd and motorcycle user of the Santa Fe National Forest I was alarmed that we might loose some of my favorite trails. Some of these trals have fantastic views (like Virgin Mesa and Holiday Mesa areas) that would be terrible to loose access to. Other trails grant access to geological formations that adults and children alike should be able to enjoy and experience for years to come. I can't imagine loosing access to the historical old Rout 66 trail up La Bajada Hill and not being able to share it with my fellow OHV users. Please reconsider the closing of the following routes: McMillan/Church Canyon Route, Smokey Bear Hill, Rito del Indio/ Trail Canyon Group, Rio de las Vacas, Joaquin Canyon, Virgin Mesa Group, Stable/Cebollita Mesa Route, Holiday Mesa Route/Guadalupe Crossing, Paliza Canyon, Hill and Dale Route, Virgin Canyon Route, Osha Canyon overlook loop. Caja del Rio 4WD Network: Sage Brush Flats, Caja del Rio, Tank Trap, La Bajada Hill

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 353
Comment#

1 She said she had wanted to keep access to the south of her property through FR 268

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 353
Comment#

2 D. Seligman told us that she never meant to shut down the south road and wouldn't say that had she known the road wasn't already going to be closed. She said she never considered fire ingress and egress and thought that road and wouldn't consider closing it had she known it could be an issue. She said she was only focusued on the problem with ATVs and motorcycles before.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 We would like as many accesses as we can get. We have one main access road from the north and the only one from the south is the Bland Raod (FR268). I would really like to keep that open in case of a fire and I would like it maintained as best as possible.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 We discussed the fact that many people currently drive through her property illegally as there are no gates and there are forest roads on the north and south end. She said she understood this probably occures, but that fire egress for future property owners and others who own property nearby is the most important factor for her.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 354
Comment#

1 he said he likes to drive and camp along the road through the Gillman Tunnels, but doesn't know the road numbers. He likes to drive his pop-up trailers off the road and is concerned travel management will affect his ability and his familes ability to camp and enjoy the forest

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 355
Comment#

1 Please do not close any of the areas that are used by the New Mexico Trails Association for riding trails motorcycles. Also, please do not close any trails that are used for off-road motorcycle riding.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 356
Comment#

1 The SFNF has not included all these trails(trails submitted in the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance) on the open/ closed maps for the west side.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 357
Comment#

1 We note that our concerns were not addressed in your proposed action and that dirt bike trails go right up to the boundary of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and between the VCNP and Bandelier Nations Monument, another sensitive area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 358
Comment#

Letter# 358
Comment#

1 I would like to comment about the road and trail closures in the Jemez Mountains. I use these roads and trails on a regular basis with family, friends and myself. For off roaders we need all of these roads and trails with loops and connections open.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 359
Comment#

1 I am requesting that all trails in the BTPA be kept open

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 360
Comment#

1 The NM Trails Association submitted locations of 8 trails areas which we have used in the past, but 7 were categorically excluded from consideration. Those excluded are known as Bland, Cochiti, Dome Road, Guadalupe, Spruce, Bear, and Barley Canyon. Additionally they should be considered in the context of motorcycle trail riding, and not lumped into a catch-all "cross country travel" category which would invite abuse from unregulated ORVs of every type.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 361
Comment#

1 Request to add the following in the Jemez District: 271 and 271L as ATV trails from 270D and 270BD,270BDA. 4AA off of 4A for another loop. 271JA to 271JC to 266NA, these three do connect back to 271 and make a 270D to 270DA to 4A and to be able to connect with 281(Peralta). Intersection of FR10 and 266 for ATV's, to access the trail head @ 266NA.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Disperse Camping: Add all of the lower section of 270 for additional disperse camping. Add the lower section of FR10 to FR270 for disperse Camping, this adds additional areas for unloading or camping along FR10 without over crowding in the present proposal. By allowing more disperse Camping along FR10, over usage will be kept down.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 FR10: Request all of FR10 to be open to all Vehicles including ATV's from Highway 4 at Sierra Los Pino's to Highway 290 near Ponderosa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 362
Comment#

Letter# 362
Comment#

1 I request the corridor shown inside the Blue zone of the graphic below (Lat/Long median of 35,78000, 106,47000) which is the double track road running north from the Media Dia single-track trail for approx. 3.5-4.0 miles, to be fully analyzed in It's entirety for OHV motorized use, for two-way bidiredtional travel The analysis is requested for inclusion in the Santa Fe Forestry's 2009 EIS and the road's inclusion in the 2010 Final Motorized Travel map, with the road scheduled for usage between May 1 to November 1, annually. This road already exists and provides a road that is critical for having access to Cochiti Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 363
Comment#

1 motorized traffic has severe negative impact on soils, wildlife-not simply threatened and endangered species, and watersheds

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 noise, dust, and pollution limit

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 quality of life. Previous comments have also questioned why the Forest Service proposes

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 motorized routes through areas currently managed to protect and enhance endangered and threatened species habitat.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 motorized routes upon our traditional motor-free trail system, and in areas where trails have been developed in defiance of designations prohibiting cross country travel, and prohibiting motorized use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 responsible officials are directed to mimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, and other forest resources, minimize the harrassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitats, and minimize conflicts between motor use and existing uses. The significance of defining the existing direction

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Jemez Ranger District, JRD, of the Santa Fe National Forest, SFNF, lies in the fact that all proposed routes were previously defined as user-provided routes. Every route proposed for R4E T18N, and R5E T18N, appears previously on the User provided map, JRD of the SFNF. Previous correspondance has detailed the many significant issues in the above area. I would refer to previous comments that illustrate pre-existing use, wildlife, and resource issues.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 363
Comment#

8 The premise that the acceptance of user provided routes illustrated the existing direction is both flawed and erroneous

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

9 members of the Black Feather Motorcycles began to appear on FT424, FT132, FT113-which was designated as non-motorized-Cochiti Mesa, Bruce Ridge, Upper Medio Dia-all private properties, or areas designated as restricting off road use. This area is R4E T18N, and as previously discussed, included significant habitat
issues for a wide range of species, heritage sites, and watershed issues.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 the motorized impact in this area has been substantial. If a goal of the travel rule is to build local collaboration, cooperation, and ease of understanding, then the Forest Service has failed here.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 The JRD of the SFNF has no trail record in this area. Less than 10 miles of motorized trail exists in the JRD that received management decision to encourage motorized use. Travel Management Rule Guidelines of 06/12/06, section C,3. Clearly state that motorized trails should NOT be included in the existing direction that are unauthorized trails incorrectly coded as system trails...after January 12, 2001. Thus all trails submitted by Black Feather Motorcycles in their map submitted to the JRD in 2002, and all subsequent trails described as user created should NOT be considered part of the existing transportation system, and should NOT be given weight as existing system trails. This includes the so-called "cross-town", and "Tin-cup" motorized trail systems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 Black Feather Motorcycles in their map submitted to the JRD in 2002, and all subsequent trails described as user created should NOT be considered

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 protecting Heritage resources, Endangered and Threatened Species Habitat, Watersheds, and pre-existing uses. I exhort the Forest Service to uphold all these previous protective decisions in the Jemez Ranger District, to create an even handed application of the Travel Rule, and to provide for the Traditional way of life here in New Mexico, a big part of which is motor-free travel in the National Forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 365
Comment#

1 I object to off road vehicles being allowed on Routes listed above (53,375,375l,375lbb,375g). These areas are pristine examples of New Mexico wildlife and plants, are susceptible to vehicles pollution and erosion, and there are homes nearby. It is spotted Owl Critical habitat.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 off road vehicle owners make no attempt to stop their noise pollution.

Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 365
Comment#

3 Only the handicapped should be allowed to use them in the National Forest, other than emergency personal.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 366
Comment#

1 Close 113 to all motorized travel. This is also a sensitive wildlife area with known wildlife corridors, avoid animal/motor collisions
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 367
Comment#

1 I disagree with your decision of closing down the Jemez Mountains/Blackfeather trails/trails off of forest road 144 and trails off of forest road 280 because my family and I go camping a lot and go riding our dirt-bikes and four wheelers, which means we need lots of room to do so.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 the use of off road vehicles is growing fast. By closing trails and roads you are reducing the amount of space in these trails will result in overcrowding.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We need to keep trail loops open for all skill levels of riding.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I am insisting on you keeping these trails and roads open for us offroaders to keep riding and camping freely with plenty of room to do so
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 I am insisting on you keeping these trails and roads open for us offroaders to keep riding and camping freely with plenty of room to do so
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 368
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that dispersed camping up to 300' be allowed on FR144 to the intercetion of FR315.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 369
Comment#

1 Please remove Garcia Ranch Road from the Travel Management Plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Also, Forest road 79 needs to be enforce as a road for street legal vehicles only. ATVs currently use it as a race track.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 370
Comment#

1 I also understand that Garcia Ranch Road is shown on the map. Please know that this is not a road, but rather a private drive that drops down onto the ranch. It is narrow, steep and there is no way to turn around until one is actually on ranch property. For this reason, I ask that this road be removed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 371
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 257

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

1 We note that our concerns were not addressed in your proposed action and that dirt bike trails go right up to the boundary of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and between the VCNP and Bandelier National Monument, another sensitive area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 Off road vehicles present two threats to the Valles Caldera National Preserve, within which they are prohibited. First these machines are noisy and their noise carries for miles disturbing the majority of the public who visits the VCNP, Bandelier or the Santa Fe National Forest for purposes other than riding a machine. The noise is a critical issue as it is annoying to the public and stressful to wildlife. The Forest Service can deal with noise by requiring strict noise control devices on the machines taken into the SFNF or they can close all roads and trails near sensitive areas like the VCNP and Bandelier to these machines. Given your proposed action, the noise issue is clearly not a concern to you as yet.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Second, with many OHV trails proposed to remain open near the VCNP boundaries, we have a very high risk of trespass by these riders who have cut fences in many instances in the past and who have trespassed on the VCNP in the past.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We strongly suggest all trails and roads within 3 miles of the VCNP be closed to OHVs of all types.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 372
Comment#

1 Trout Unlimited applauds the Santa Fe National Forest for the agency's action on travel management planning and the resulting proposed action which we believe is a positive step towards a healthy forest and the future on hunting and fishing in the forest.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 We respectfully ask the Santa Fe National Forest to reconsider motorized routes, both seasonal and year-round, that have the potential to impact core or conservation populations of Rio Grande cutthroat trout. Specifically, we are concerned with in stream crossings and motorized routes within 300 feet of streams designated by the USFWS as containing core or conservation populations of cutthroat trout.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 372
Comment#

3 Specifically, the current West side map indicates a motorized route designated 539 along the Rio de Las Vacas and motorized route designated as 422A along Polvadera Creek. Both of these streams are important to the long-term health of Rio Grande cutthroat in the Santa Fe National Forest and we believe these routes, especially 422A, are damaging to the fish populations in those watersheds.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

3 Trout Unlimited is supportive of the proposed action, though we do seek to minimized impacts on Rio Grande cutthroat trout.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 373
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "Salt Lick Trail" (Lat/Long:35.77457 106.53228) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirctional usage between May 1 and November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 374
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "Horn Mesa Loop" (Lat/Long 35.76379 106.43622) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to Novemeber 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 375
Comment#

1 I want the Blackfeather Citizens Proposal tral known as "Horror Show" (Lat/Long 35.80345 106.50733) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional useage between May 1 to Novemeber 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 376
Comment#

1 I I want the trail known as "High Line"(Lat/Long: 36.01586,106.62923) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 377
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "J-Line"(Lat/Long: 36.01586,106.62923) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 378
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Paliza Peralta" (Lat/Long: 35.80186,106.52631) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 379
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Paliza Canyon Trail"(Lat/Long: 35.74049 106.57895) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 380
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Popovers" (Lat/Long: 35.97986,106.62698) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 381
Comment#
1 want the trails known as "Point and Counterpoint"(Lat/Long: 35.74467, 106.42455) in it's entireties to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 382
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Mainline" (Lat/Long: 35.93280,106.65376) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 383
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Lost Jug" (Lat/Long: 35.78328,106.50822) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 384
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Lower Grassy Road" (Lat/Long: 35.81001,106.48947) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 385
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Killer Switchback"(Lat/Long: 35.77686,106.46378) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 386
Comment#
1 duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 387
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Media Dia" (Lat/Long: 35.73616,106.42894) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 388
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Over 40 Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.81001,106.48947) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 389
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "North Pass/Extension" (Lat/Long: 35.82154,106.49209) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 390
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Mr. Butthead" (aka"Cherry") (Lat/Long: 35.78237,106.46281) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 391
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Motown" (Lat/Long: 35.79955,106.42066) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 392
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Over Rover Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.79488,106.46914) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 393
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Alamos" (Lat/Long: 35.78064,106.44368) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 394
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "The Wall Alternate" (Lat/Long: 35.10593,106.55238) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 395
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Tower Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.77027,106.52792) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 396
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Bonding Rock Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.75368,106.54101) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 397
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Bear Butt" (Lat/Long: 35.77005,106.51785) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 398
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Bear Butt Bypass" (Lat/Long: 35.78516,106.52061) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 399
Comment#
1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Carl Shipman" (Lat/Long: 35.77844,106.42728) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 400
Comment#
1 I would like the corridor shown inside the BLUE zone of the graphic below (the valley Lat/Long 35.73948,106.42000, which is the valley between the southeasternly pointing Cochiti Mesa fingers) to e fully analyzed in it's entirety for a single-track, motorized trail whlich would permit two-way or one-way access from Cochiti Canyon to the top of Cochiti Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 401
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Airplane Trail")Lat/Long: 35.75581, 106.47712) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 402
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "120 Bypass")Lat/Long: 35.75581, 106.47712) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 403
Comment#
1 I want the trail know as "75%" (Lat/Long 35.77210 106.45443) in its entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 404
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizens Proposal tral known as "7 Miles 7 Meadows" (Lat/Long 36.06978 106.42215) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional useage between May 1 to Novemeber 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 405
Comment#

Letter# 405
Comment#

1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "The Wall" (Lat/Long: 36.09371, 106.57759) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 406
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as “The Wall Return” (Lat/Long: 36.13325, 106.51265) in it’s entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry’s 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1. This trail is critical for having the ability to ride a single-track loop through the Forest.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 407
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "TeePee 2-Track Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.74392, 106.54778) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 408
Comment#

1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "upper Grassy Road" (Lat/Long: 35.81830, 48161) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 409
Comment#

1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Extension 2DD" (Lat/Long: 36.07506, 106.48117) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 410
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "Flat Box Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.76265, 106.54315) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 411
Comment#

Letter# 411
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Gold Cup Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.79397, 106.48112) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 412
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Electric Fence Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.78928, 106.53941) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 413
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Espanola Trees" (Lat/Long: 36.04116, 106.50816) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 414
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Teakettle Return" (Lat/Long: 36.02193, 106.64049) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 415
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Shady Lane" (Lat/Long: 35.77952, 106.50332) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 416
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Shorty Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.78364, 106.53941) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 417
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Teakettle Loop" (Lat/Long: 36.03639, 106.66873) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 418
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Teakettle Overlook" (Lat/Long: 36.03422, 106.69465) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 419
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Dragon Tail" (Lat/Long: 35.78990, 106.52355) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 420
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Crosstown" (Lat/Long: 35.82117, 106.46392) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 421
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Deadhorse" (Lat/Long: 35.77793, 106.49434) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 422
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Cerro Pelon" (Lat/Long: 36.79397, 106.48112) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 423
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Cerredo Pelado Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.77967, 106.54574) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 424
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Corral Canyon" (Lat/Long: 35.81371, 106.50528) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 425
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Chili Relleno" (Lat/Long: 36.01658, 106.49332) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 426
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Chainsaw" (Lat/Long: 36.02345, 106.47884) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 427
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Sal &Pepper" (Lat/Long: 35.78157, 106.49696) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 428
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Red Stake" (Lat/Long: 36.04673, 106.49529) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 429
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Road to Insulator" (Lat/Long: 35.78800, 106.48474) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 430
Comment#
1 duplicate of 429

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 431
Comment#
1 I want the trail known as "Pyscopath" (Lat/Long: 35.75882, 106.43284) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 432
Comment#
1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Insulator Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.77418, 106.46914) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 433
Comment#
1 I want to ensure that the route to Holiday Mesa remains open to have an accessible route to the big foot Trint ruins to show those who come to visit me.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 434
Comment#
1 I am requesting that the trails in Paliza Canyon and Kitty Lake be kept open for ATV use. These areas provide important connection points to other trails that you are keeping open.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 435
Comment#
1 David is a landowner along Santiago Creek, in Sect. 15. He has concerns about Forest Roads 635, 635A, and 635B being open to off-road vehicles in Sect 15 & 22, as these roads are currently closed via gates. The road over Santiago Creek has no culverts and crosses the stream at least twice. Santiago Creek has a population of Rio Grande cutthroats that is 98% genetically pure. In addition, these roads go through private lands. While he understands the need to give the public access to the wilderness area, he believes that the existing road system that leads up to the Gascon Trail (A007, connecting to FR 636) would be a better alternative for off-highway vehicle use. This road system does not go through private lands, however, it does cross Rito Morphy, which has genetically pure cutthroat trout. He cautioned, "be careful about opening up to many roads.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 436
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that you include the Rio Guadalupe crossing and the road to Holiday Mesa for permanent “open routes” in the scoping
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 437
Comment#
1 There are 2 trails 271AJ and 271JC that connect that Julie L. Found for me during Albuquerque Meeting. These trails are ones that we, :Sierra Riders" ride and will be happy to take ownership/adopt for maintenance. This will add very nice ATV little loop.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 438
Comment#

Letter# 438
Comment#

1 The EIS analysis must evaluate the resource impacts of all allowed past and present activities and of reasonably foreseeable future activities, in its discussion of cumulative effects. Each alternative must assess the cumulative effects of all allowed uses, as well as the risk of resource damage from motorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The EIS should evaluate the alternatives based on resource impacts from use of designated routes. The evaluation of alternatives should not be based on supposed or actual impacts which may have been caused in the past by the 'open' travel policy which will be discontinued.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Discussion of the resource impacts caused by motorized vehicles on trails, roads and areas should be placed in context of all allowed forest uses, through a cumulative effects analysis of the past, present, and foreseeable future environmental changes.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The analysis of cumulative effects must include as assessment of the resource damage from all projects, plans and activities which have been approved by environmental review such as vegetation projects, fuelwood thinning, habitat improvement, critical habitat decisions, grazing, timber permits. Where available, the analysis should include survey data for protected endangered, threatened and sensitive species. Where data is not available, that data gap must be identified. The travel management analysis and decisions must be consistent with the analysis and decisions must be consistent with the analysis and decisions done in prior environmental reviews.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The EIS should identify what activities and occurrences have been part of the incremental change in ecological conditions in the project area, and which may continue to influence conditions in the project area. The analysis should demonstrate that resouce damage has occurred and assess the negative impact contributed by each activity which occurs in the area.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 439
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that the Forest Service fully define definitions, goals, and metrics (how you are going to measure) for a successful trail system. Please ensure the DEIS includes a clear Purpose and Need statement that the designated system must satisfy. These goals should include specifics of what the system must offer in terms of connectivity, variety of topography, and diversity of challenge (skill levels).

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 439
Comment#

2 Please describe the requirements for the designated system to include a diversity of elevations to extend seasons of use. Thank you!

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Please ensure that DEIS includes a clear Purpose and Need statement that the designated system must satisfy. These goals should include specifics of what the system must offer in terms of connectivity, variety of topography, and disveristy of challenge.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 440
Comment#

1 I request the agency evaluate the condition of the non-system routes submitted by the OHV users. The analysis should evaluate the stability of those routes. The routes have existed for decades with absolutely no maintenance other than that done by the OHV users,

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The condition of the routes should be compare/analyzed to the condition of system routes the agency maintains, both in and outside the Wilderness areas. The criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringent for OHV routes than for ono-OHV routes.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 441
Comment#

1 There seems to be no consideration of the option of the Forest Service working with local clubs or organized groups to mitigate adverse impacts of certain trails, and leave
them open, rather than close them because of localized portions that could be rerouted or maintained properly.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 442
Comment#

1 Considering that the New Mexico Trials Association has always been a good steward of the land, caused few impacts to resources, and has worked well with the Forest Service, I find that limiting us to 40 acres is totally unconscionable.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 443
Comment#

1 Concerning the closing of 7 of the 8 motorcycle trials areas identified by the New Mexico Trials Association..... If more areas are designated for our use, these areas would be used less frequently.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 444
Comment#

1 This concerns the exclusion of 7 of the 8 areas which the New Mexico Trials Association has used for events. Historically, we have had only one event per year in any one area. These events have always been organized and controlled, and there is no unacceptable resource damage that I know of. So now the Forest Service is proposing to close these areas? Why?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 445
Comment#

1 This concerns the method by which trails or roads were proposed to be closed. It appears that much of this was done without site-specific analysis, and was therefore a possibly inaccurate assessment.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Since closure of a well-used recreational trail is a major step, and a major loss for the users, this should *not* be done without an accurate, on-site analysis.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Since closure of a well-used recreational trail ia a major step, and a major loss for the users, this should not be done without an accurate, no-site analysis.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 446
Comment#

1 This email concerns the designation of "Motorized Areas" where cross-coutry travel is permitted. The proposed action states that there is no distinction to be made between various types of use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Our club (the New Mexico Trials Association) is highly controlled, has always worked well with the Forest Service, and does little resource damage in the course of our events. These activities are now being lumped together with unregulated, often destructive ATV or 4x4 drivers operating with no regulation or control. This does not address the situation based on the reality of the various uses.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 447
Comment#

1 Regarding the current SFNF Proposal, how do I obtain a list of North and South Jemez, single track trails (by name) that were not included in the proposal and the exact reason(s) the NF chose to propose them (erosion effects, animal inhabitations, etc.) at this time?

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 448
Comment#

Letter# 448
Comment#

1 Any review (DEIS ect) of a trail should have a record which describes the trails condition. A trail that only needs minor improvement should not be closed. Those trails identified with issues must define the problem, with location, type or extent, and what modification(s) are needed.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 449
Comment#

1 Regarding the concerns relating to Habitat Fragmentation it's very important to recognize the different impacts of roads vs. trails. They should only be evaluated using recognized studies. To use studies, such as the GTR 509 to support trail closures is incorrect. GTR 509 only rferred to roads. Since all trails are used by more than just ohv's the Forest Service must not blame all the damage on the ohv group without regard to the impacts from hikers, horseback, and any other nonmotorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 450
Comment#

1 Your own research has indicated that OHV users represent no more than 3.5% of all SFNF users, yet the damage that's going to result because the USFS has no plan or budget for enforcement to make sure these folks restrain their activities to the established, published trails, you should be seriously considering severe restrictions on where those vehicles may be used.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Further, you should also be advocating a stiffening of fines and punishments for illegal use of those vehicles. In all candor, $50 fines are too small to have any impact on illegal vehicle use. Users will merely consider that "the cost of doing business." Rather, because of the severity of the damage that can result from illegal use of these vehicles fines should start at the $500 level for the first offense, go to $800 for the second offense and escalate to $1,000 plus 30 days jail time for the third offense.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The SFNF includes 1,567,181 acres, and OHV users should be restricted to their proportion of that acreage, or no more than 54,852 acres

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 While my neighbors won't be pleased with this suggestion, Rowe Mesa would appear, at first glance, to be at least one area where part of that acreage could be set aside for OHV use. It's remote, does not appear to have the wide variety of wildlife seen in nearby areas, and does not, to my knowledge, include endangered species habitat. There are, however, valuable archaeological sites on the Mesa that would require serious protection.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 451
Comment#

1 My feeling is our National Forest are of no use to anyone if they are not used by the public

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 451
Comment#

2 Utah has used their trails to help local bussinesses abd allow 4x4's to travel there streets to gas stations restaurants, motels, etc.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 Charge if you have to, place more regulations if you have to, but don't stop the public from visiting our Forest and streams.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 452
Comment#

1 I would hope that the Forest Service takes the practice of Leave No Trace into consideration when finalizing this management plan.

Public Concern # 44 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 453
Comment#

1 Please do not close roads in the Jemez Mountains

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 454
Comment#

1 We request that the EIS fully analyze all of the roads and trails submitted by the New Mexico 4 Wheelers in their Citizen's Proposal. This specifically includes all routes where the FS has eliminated from consideration through pre-analysis filtering or decision-making due to concerns about habitat for the Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout (RGCT). While the FS is under the obligation to protect and enhance RGCT habitat, it cannot simply eliminate routes due to contact with RGCT habitat.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The analysis for each of these particular areas needs to determine the amount of impact the crossing or route proximity is having on the habitat in order to be able to determine the significance of the impact. All human presence, and many naturally occurring actions, in the SFNF have some impact on the RGCT habitat. To blithely eliminate motorized recreation impacts as 'unacceptable' while leaving other uses intact is arbitrary and capricious and will not stand the test of appeal or litigation scrutiny. This is especially true given the long history of allowing all uses, motorized and not, on these routes and in these areas.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The RGCT have evolved to tolerate higher turbidity caused by spring run-off and precipitation events, continuously high levels of turbidity that last days or even weeks. Claims that OHV's or 4WD's occasionally crossing a stream have any measurable or lasting significant impacts on the habitat or the fish must be established through measurements of the amount of suspended particles created, the distance those particles are carried downstream, the timeframe for the particles to settle out, and the distribution of where those particles settle out. Only after those measurements are collected and a detailed analysis is performed on them, including the significance of the impact when compared to other sources (including natural),can a rational and defendable position on impact be formed.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 454
Comment#

4 The same holds true for the broader subject of water quality. There are many challenges to water quality in the SFNF including, but certainly not limited to, the presence of roads, trails, and motorized recreation. But, again, the site specific and cumulative impact must be measured and carefully analyzed and compared to the other sources of impact before motorized use is singled out for elimination. And remember, the elimination of motorized use on the existing roads and trails in the SFNF only removes a portion of the impact the roads and trails impart. The mere continued presence of the roads and trails and the use by a plethora of other user populations will continue to contribute a percentage of the impact long after motorized use is removed. The management activity to improve water quality must not arbitrarily fall on one particular type of Forest user more heavily than their actual contribution to the issue.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The mere continued presence of the roads and trails and the use by a plethora of other user populations will continue to contrbute a precentage of the impact long after motorized us is removed. The management activity to improve water quality must not arbitrarily fall on one particular type of Forest user more heavily than their actual contribution to the issue.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 455
Comment#

1 To facilitate meaningful public involvement, we request that all of the DEIS, all of its supporting maps, all of the underlying documents, and all of the citations used to support the DEIS be available electronically to the public on the day the comment period starts. Thoughtful and substantive comments by the public are almost impossible with the means to efficiently access all of the supporting documentation used in the analysis and decision process. Having these documents readily available to the public at the very beginning of the comment period helps support and foster the process transparency and public participating that is so crucial to a successful NEPA process.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 456
Comment#

1 We request that the analysis documented within the EIS specifically include a careful study of a full range of corrective options if a road or trail is identified as a resource concern and the public has specifically requested the route segment be included in the motorized system. We are gravely concerned that the analysis for route inclusion for these contested segments will focus entirely on the existence/level of impact and totally ignore the possible methods for correcting the concern. Almost all resource concerns can be corrected with a certain degree of effort. The EIS should ensure that each decision for inclusion/exclusion from the system is accompanied by an analysis of a full range of options to correct the concern. Closure of the precious motorized recreation resource should be the LAST resort used only when no viable correction exists.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 The EIS should also consider the significance of effects if the corrections are competed within a reasonable amount of time. Bringing a designated system into full compliance all at once is a daunting task. The EIS should make use of a prioritized system of correcting identified concerns when considering whether a route segment is included in the designated system.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 457
Comment#

1 We respectfully ask that the EIS Purpose and Need include a clear Purpose and Need statement that the designated system must satisfy.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 Forests while maintaining other important values and uses on NFS lands." The Purpose and Need should contain clear language determining how the Santa Fe National Forest (SFNF) will measure the enhancement of motorized public enjoyment of the Forest. The EIS should include specific goals the designated system should attain in terms of mileage, connectivity, variety of topography, diversity of challenge (different skill levels) and user satisfaction.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

3 The EIS should include full details on the definitions, goals, and metrics (how are they going to measure) for quantifying all these categories of enhancement and detailed response plans if the designated system of roads, trails, and areas falls short in enhancing the quality of the motorized recreation experience on the SFNF and the motorized public enjoyment of the Forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 458
Comment#

1 the original east-west northern boundary of the Baca and the present irregular boundary between the VCNP and the Santa Fe National Forest. Whether VCNP eventually reverts to the Forest or not, decisions for Forest roads and trails need to consider access to the Caldera lands, and it was not clear at the recent Forest Service meeting in Los Alamos that anyone was thinking about that.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 Also, there is no problem with mountain bikers, trail bikers, ATV riders, and 4-wheel drive enthusiasts as long as all vehicles remain on the north side of the boundary fence. Anyone capable of using such machines to get to the fence is capable of walking 200 to 400 meters to check out the view.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

3 A lot more thought needs to be given to what is done with the area between the original east-west northern boundary of the Baca and the present irregular boundary between the VCNP and the Santa Fe National Forest. Whether VCNP eventually reverts to the Forest ornot, decisions for Forest roads and trails need to consider access to the Caldera lands, and it was not clear at the recent Forest Service meeting in Los Alamos that anyone was thinking about that.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 459
Comment#

1 What is the fine or other penalty for riding a motorized vehicle in a federally designated wilderness area such as San Pedro Parks, Dome, or Pecos?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 460
Comment#

Letter# 460
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that you include the Rio Guadalupe crossing and the road to Holiday Mesa for permanent “open routes” in the scoping. Even if it requires temporary closure and mitigation to make it usable, it is a very important route for not only us 4 wheel drive individuals, but it also provides a great (read:safely passable) escape route for Fire Fighters who may be fighting a fire on the Mesa and get caught in a wind movement towards the edge of the Mesa. Keeping this route off the map is not acceptable. Please add it to the proposed alternatives.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 461
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 462
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 463
Comment#

1 Why can't you follow Colorado's lead and designate large areas as "open to off-road vehicles", and close only areas that have specific wildlife concerns. I know areas that we ride in Colorado that close off sections for "Elk calving", but only for April to June, opening up in July to Jeeps and motorcycles. They maps I have show "A" areas, "B" areas, etc., some open only to snowmobiles (which I also have and use), some to all ORV's, some always closed to off-road use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Or, perhaps you can designate "off-road trails" open only to motorcycles & quads that are all the old logging roads shown on your map (the grey colored roads), and post warnings that say "off-road vehicles must remain on the trails, do not cut across open areas that do not have historically existing roads", and "the Forest Service is not responsible for the condition of the trails/abandoned roads, nor intends to maintain them".

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I realize not all riders are as 'nice', but it is wrong to restrict all access just because a few do not. Those same riders will still ignore the new rules and ride anyway.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 464
Comment#

1 Pumice mines area located north of los alamos - Please do not close any roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 Please DO NOT close any roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 465
Comment#

1 I request that all single track defined in the Blackfeather proposal be included for analysis in the scoping study.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 To maintain an adequate trail system for the "single track" rider numerous trails must remain to make enjoyable loops.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 466
Comment#

1 in the past five or so years I have found that more and more of the areas are being closed, restricted and constrained due to an ever more overbearing contingent of environmentalist who seem feel that off-road motorcyclists have no right to any of the national forest in which to enjoy our sport. This contingent has significant areas in which motorized transportation of any kind is not allowed but yet there is the perspective on their part that they should continue to decrease and at the very least place strict controls over where I can ride.
Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 What I demand is equal representation and consideration for the use of the “National Forest” and equal protection from the aggressive behavior demonstrated by these individuals.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 Please be non-partisan in your consideration of the scoping process. Remember that all access of all types impact the forests. Have you ever watched a horse on a damp or wet trail? Our views must be included and considered!
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 467
Comment#

1 I respectfully insist that the FS do a full analysis of options if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern. Please provide documented analysis of a full range of options on correcting the concern. Closure of the recreation resource should be the LAST resort.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 468
Comment#

1 I respectfullty insist the FS carefully analyze funding sources and the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 469
Comment#

1 I respectfully insist that the FS define 'de-commissioning' and exactly what the agency's plan is for each of those roads.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 469
Comment#

2 I believe many of those roads should be re-designated as trails. There is no limit on width of a trail. As a 'trail', a route is no longer on the road maintenance schedule and is not adding to the backlog and costs of maintenance. Category 1 or 2 roads designated as single track trails will, over time, revert to narrower trails. Re-designating roads as trails is a better use of an existing resource than decommissioning them.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 At the very least, decommissioned roads that aren't causing insurmountable resource issues should be 'held' in that state so that they can be re-used at some future date. Leaving these roads in 'deep storage' is much cheaper than 'ripping' them or having to build roads/trails for some future need.

Public Concern # 47 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 470
Comment#

1 I would like the Forestry to provide a table within the EIS that identifies a particular trail length with all it's submitted, User created,GPS trail names(whether in a TMR alternate proposal or a TMR Proposal scoping comment), a cooresponding SFNF track/trail designation(e.g., TR1102, FD3048, etc.), and the trail length's latitude and longtitude found mid-way from the trails endpoints, regardless if the Forestry proposes to include that road is trail in it's final TMR map version. I request that if a road segment is being referred to within the EIS, that by definition the road be greater than 50" in width, and that a Forestry road have a prefix designation "FD____" only. If referring to a segment less than 50", I request that all those trails be given the prefix designation "TR_____" only. The "_____" suffix portion would have numerals ONLY- no alpha characters. I additionally request that the TMR EIS have maps depicting all these trails, in color,and their track/trail designation, for identification purposes.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 471
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 472
Comment#

1 I would like to take this opportunity to protest the proposed closing of many trails and roads in the Jemez Mountains to motorized vehicles.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Limiting the open trails will only serve to overuse the few designated trails and will, of course, lead to the eventual closure of these trails due to overuse.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 473
Comment#

Letter# 473
Comment#

1 On studying the maps you provided of your proposed action, I see that open trails for OHVs (any off road vehicle) are evenly distributed over the whole forest. I see very few places where there is not an OHV trail or road within a mile orv two. This means that the noise from OHVs, will potentially be present for all users in all places. Noise from 2 cycle engines disturbs wildlife and ruins the experience of people wishing to find solitude or peace in our public forests.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Next I notice that all wilderness areas on the Santa Fe National Forest have OHV trials or roads right up to their boundaries and in many cases (Dome Wilderness) the trials end at their boundary. Two poblems arise here. First since the Forest Service has little law enforcement, the temptation for OHV riders to enter wildernes is greater when they are invited by the Forest Service to ride to the very boundary of a wilderness area. We already have OHV trespass into all the wilderness areas of the Santa Fe that being a violation of federal law on the part of the OHV rider and on the part of the Forest Service to allow it.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 OHV riding next to wilderness areas, Bandelier National Monument , or the Valles Caldera National Preserve creates noise that carries into these areas where motors are forbidden. This means that visitors to wilderness areas and our national parks and preservees must endure the racket of dirt bikes even as they seek the only places on earth where such noise is sopposed to be prohibited. There should be a buffer of at least three miles of no roads, no trails open to motor play around all of these critical areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 The Forest Service should strictly prohibit cross country travel on all parts of the national forest without exception since this activity allows members of the public to destroy public heritage values for the sake of short term thrills.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

5 I also note that the mesas on the Jemez District where a great density of nationally significant archaeological sites exist are generally open to OHV play. Places like Vigin Mesa, San Diego Mesa, Mesa de Joaquin should be closed to OHVs to protect these cultural sites that are important to the Jemez Peublo as well as to researchers.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 it's critical that barriers and clear signs stating penalties be posted at these and all other trailheads into Pecos and other Wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

7 I hope that the final Travel Management Rule will make clear to the public exactly how the open and closed roads and trails square with threatened and endangered species habitat, the Forst Plan and all other closures and restrictions that are placed on activities like logging.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 473
Comment#

8 I hope the Forest Service will make it clear to all interested parties how the TMP will be enforced once it is in place. The Santa Fe National Forest has few patrol officers for a large area of land. When OHV riders are riding at high speed, in remote areas, it sems unlikely the Forest Service will be able to effectively enforce it's closure with law enforcment officers.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Finally, I am disapointed that there are no large areas of the Santa Fe National Forest outside wilderness that will be free of the noise and destructive tracks of these machines. The Forest Service should close the areas close to Bandelier, close to the Cochiti Canyon residential areas and areas where people fish to OHV's to protect the experience of the majority of forest users who do not engage in OHV thrill riding.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 474
Comment#

1 If appears that someone has made some decisions not based on a full analysis. If not, wher is the analysis.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 5. Thoroughly define all standards and criteria used in the analysis.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Once again, loops, loops, loops, connected to more loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 475
Comment#

0 Duplicate text of Y. Smith Letter #476

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 476
Comment#

1 Roads and trails should be rated as to difficulty.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 As a system, your proposal falls far, far short of what is needed for a forest of this size. What you've proposed will be overused and will result in damage to the environment.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 All known routes should be included in the DEIS, including those submitted by users such as those submitted by Mr.Mark Werkmeister of NMOHVA and those submitted by Blackfeather.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 476
Comment#

4 There need to be loops connected to other loops to allow travel across the forest. Unless a trail/road goes to a particular site, it should not be a dead end. User compliance and ease of enforcement goes up when the system is well designed and meets the needs. A poorly designed system is asking for trouble.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The use of roads to make loops for singletrack is aceptable, but it should be minimized for safety concerns. I don't like to ride on the roads where there are cars and trucks.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 If a road is de-commissioned, use it as a singletrack trail. This cuts down on the maintenance investment and still leaves it open for use. It also no longer counts in the road density system.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 If there is no study showing that wildlife in the area of these trails has suffered, then removal of the trails for concerns of wildlife suffering is not valid.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Make all the supporting documentation and maps available to the public immediately upon publication of the DEIS, otherwise the public does not really get the entire comment period to analyze the proposal.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 477
Comment#

1 The DEIS must analyze every mile of trail submitted by the public, and every mile of road which it admits exists on the ground. It must not limit itself to only the routes listed in the Proposed Action or the TAP.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The so-called "Existing Condition' omits over 3,000 miles of roads. The Forest admits in the Proposed Action document that over 7,000 miles are in their inventory. The reason given for not showing them is that the road segments did not meet certain 'criteria' the Forest imposed. Many of the criteria make a pre-analysis decision which bypasses the NEPA process.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

3 Routes were rejected for inclusion in the TAP because of generalized, unquantified and unproven claims of damage. The damage was assumed to exist merely because overlay maps showed that the routes co-exist with some particular resource or area. Routes which the Forest assumed to be 'duplicate' were eliminated without asking the public if the route provided a valued recreational experience.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 477
Comment#

4 Routes have been denied the benefit of consideration in the Proposed Action merely because they are in habitat areas, even though no analysis was done to show if motorized use on established routes has had or will have any impact on the particular species. This is contrary to other directives which call for specific analysis and surveys.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 The 2004 Amendment also gives the decision-maker the power to consider all the factors, " the agency decision-maker must have the latitude to make the determination regarding how to proceed if there is a compelling need to develop the road or allow public access on a specific road within T&E species habitats."

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

6 There must be causality, a connection of cause and effect, to support the claim that an activity is harming a species.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

7 The TAP eliminated over 3,000 miles of roads in a 'behind closed doors' process, performed by the Forest staff with no public participation, no scoping and no public comment allowed. The Santa Fe National Forest has described in an email to the OHV users that each ranger district was allowed to decide which roads would be in the TAP and which would be excluded. The TAP project was going on many months before the Notice of Intent was issued and Scoping began.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

8 The Proposed Action admits to 271 miles of previously unrecorded single track motorcycle trails which were submitted by the public. The Proposed Action reduced this to 77 miles although clearly no NEPA analysis had yet been done. All the miles of trail submitted by the public must be analyzed thoroughly, and be field inspected.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

9 By CEQ regulations, the DEIS must include a No Action alternative which includes every route that the Forest knows is on the ground.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 the Forest MUST provide 'starting point maps' which include the system routes and all the route information submitted by the public.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 478
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action says that of the trails submitted by the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance, there are 271 miles which are not coincident with system roads. I request those trails be incorporated into the INFRA database, and into the Existing Direction map and the No Action Alternative in the Draft EIS. All the trails should be fully analyzed for inclusion on the MVUM.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 478
Comment#

2 The "Travel Management Rule Implementation Guidelines , USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region June 12, 2006 " addresses how to incorporate such non-system trails which are existing routes and legal to use.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 The Santa Fe National Forest currently allows cross country travel on 53% of the forest. The motorized road and trail users have submitted data on non-system routes which the Forest has agreed are legal for motorized use under the current policy. Under the Region 3 Guidelines, those trails should be incorporated into the INFRA database as 'allowed use'.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 in some cases, trails that meet the preceding criteria should not be included in the existiong direction. Exclude trails where any of the following can be credibly documented: • Technical corrections—Incorrect coding in Infra such as:
o Trail record in Infra but no corresponding trail exists on the ground.
o Jurisdiction incorrectly coded as Forest Service.
o Unauthorized trails incorrectly coded as system trails as a result of any inventory or data editing process after January 12, 2001 (See FSM 7711.03).
• Changes on the ground—The trail is in Infra but no longer exists on the ground or the trail has been converted to another use.
• Decision not recorded in Infra—A NEPA decision to close a trail exists but has not been recorded in Infra.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 479
Comment#

1 lose FT 113 to all motorized travel. As it is, this trail connects 3 areas closed to OHV use, the Bland Canyon Rd., the Tent Rock area, and bandelier National Mon. This is also a sensitive wildlife area, and with known wildlife corridirs running perpendicular to the trail in many places, it makes sense to avoid animal/motor vehicle collisions on this narrow trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The proposed action contains 17 miles of road and motorized trail on just 4 sq. miles of land in Dear head Ridge area. This adds up to over 4 miles/sq. mi. of road and motorized trail in an area known to be Jemez mt. Salamander habitat, as well as Spotted owl and Goshawk habitat. This greatly exceeds the ratio recommended by NMDGF of one mile of road or motorized trail per square mile of land. To correct this and provide the necessary protections, these routes should be closed; the loop off of FR 282 and FR 188; the unnamed motorcycle loop off of FR 188. All of FR 188JA and the unnamed loop fromit to FR 282. All of FR 188. Redundant loops on FR 282 from Woodard Ridge to FR 280

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Maintain the seasonal road closures as they were, from Dec 22nd to May 1st. It doesn't make sense to open up the forest during the holidays when DWI and icy roads are at their peak. This will also help protect the habitat by decreasing erosion, preventing rutting of roads, and giving the land a chance to rest and recover from all the human activity during the spring, summer, and fall months.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 480
Comment#

Letter# 480
Comment#

1 I am strongly opposed to allowing off highway vehicle use in the Santa Fe National Forest. OHVs are essentially incompatible with other forms of forest recreation. They endanger wildlife, pollute the air with fumes and noise, and contaminate riparian areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 the USFS is not capable of enforcing the plan, especially when the designated areas for oHV use are scattered throughout the forest. A(n) outright ban on OHV use in the forest is your only hope of being able to have any enforcement effectiveness.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 481
Comment#

0 The National Park Service has no comments

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 482
Comment#

1 All trails and roads including user submitted singletrack trails must be included in the upcoming EIS for the Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 483
Comment#

1 The Santa Fe National Forest Service should consider publishing user specific maps to avoid user conflicts. Maps should be available for singletrack users, ATV and Jeep users, hikers… etc.

Public Concern # 38 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 484
Comment#

0 Not a Comment. Correspondence.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 485
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Correspondence.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 486
Comment#

Letter# 486
Comment#

1 We also agree with the Chief that the rapid expansion of motorized vehicle use on National Forests and Grasslands is damaging the ecological and cultural resources of federal lands and that unmanaged motorized vehicle use has resulted in unauthorized routes and trails, erosion, water quality degradation, habitat destruction and conflicts among users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 We agree with the Forest Service's overall goals to create an ecologically sustainable, fiscally responsible, manageable and enforceable designated motorized vehicle route system.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 We use the generic term "routes" given the Forest Service's allowance of motorized recreation use on both roads and trails and to emphasize the point that environmental impact analysis and protective management standards and guidelines should be predicated on the physical footprint of a particular route and the use of that route – not bureaucratic classifications.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 Accounting for the spatial scale of resource impacts and opportunities is essential to effective travel management. The logical, science-based starting point for planning and analysis should be the landscape scale, a scale that accounts for the broad sweep of resource values on the SFNF and how those resource values interact to form an ecological whole. To do this, we recommend that that the Forest Service conducts landscape-scale analysis and planning to: • Identify ecological units, such as subwatersheds, that should be closed to motorized use to protect ecological values and quiet-use recreation opportunities. Identify priority areas for law enforcement, such as areas that appear predisposed to the proliferation of user-created routes and unlawful cross-country use.3 • Identify opportunities to use geographical features to constrain motorized recreation within ecological limits and prevent the unlawful cross-country travel and the proliferation of user-created routes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Identify priority areas for route maintenance and restoration activities, including route obliteration and decommissioning.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 Ensure that the Forest Service minimizes motorized recreation impacts within acceptable ecological limits, minimizes user conflicts, and optimizes the use of limited agency resources. Executive Order 11644 § 3, as amended; 36 C.F.R. § 212.55.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

7 It would be naïve to assume that the promulgation of the TMR and SFNF's implementation of the TMR through publication of an MVUM will prevent the proliferation of unauthorized and illegal user-created routes. At best, given current realities in terms of actual motorized recreation use and Forest Service management, enforcement and
budget constraints, we anticipate that the proliferation of such routes will only be slowed. To the extent that the SFNF disagrees, it is incumbant upon the Forest Service to provide substantial evidence supporting its position.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 To illustrate, the direct impact of a particular route may seem insignificant. However, cumulatively, the broader network may be causing significant impacts to a subwatershed through sediment loading, or may unacceptably fragment important wildlife habitat. In other instances, a particular route may create a specific, direct, and significant impact on a particular resource value such as by bisecting a critical wildlife migration corridor. The key is to understand the relationship between individual resources, and individual impact vectors, such as motorized routes, and how these relationships play out through time. This also underscores the importance of understanding temporal, not just spatial, scales; some impacts are long-term in nature, while others are short-term. For example, a route may persist on the landscape for decades, wearing down the resiliency of a particular resource value, such as aquatic habitat. A snapshot of the route's impact may not disclose that, long-term, the route's impact is significant, perhaps threatening the aquatic habitat's ability to sustain viable aquatic species.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 By focusing on travel management issues at the landscape-scale, travel management decisions can also better reflect a recent Forest Service Survey which found that a substantial majority of visitors to the SFNF prefer quiet recreational activities such as viewing nature (including wildlife), relaxing, hiking and walking (See Forest Service 2004b). Only a small minority of Forest users – about 3.54% –report that they participate in motorized recreation activities and only a tiny minority – 0.42% –report that motorized recreation is their main activity.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 We are deeply troubled that the Forest Service seems to be capitulating to the narrow, though vociferous, interests of the motorized recreation community and, in so doing, compromising the experience of the vast majority of National Forest users.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 Importantly, this landscape-scale approach should account for both public and private lands.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

12 the TAP's use of a bottom-up "filter" process fixates on individual routes and leads to a presumption that a route, and motorized use of that route, is acceptable based on a set of criteria listed on page 36.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

13 the TAP does not demonstrate that the Forest Service is properly addressing landscape-scale concerns and evaluating the significant impacts of a given route by addressing both landscape and site-specific analytical scales, and how impacts at these scales play out in the short and long terms. Indeed, our review to the TAP, and the Proposed Action, suggest a resistance by the Forest Service to constraining the route network within acceptable landscape and site-specific ecological scales. Instead, it appears that the Forest Service is trying to fit the landscape into the route network.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

14 We recommend that the Forest Service broaden the scope of the RDS to include all motorized routes, whether classified as a road or trail and create a Motorized Route ensity Standard ("MRDS"). The MRDS would function as a ceiling on the density of motorized routes and reflect the bottom-line fact that it is the impact of a route – and the impact caused by the route's use by motorized vehicles – that is important to resource protection and management, not whether it is classified as a "road" or "trail."
The MRDS should be calculated at clearly defined, science-based ecological scales (e.g. watershed, sub-watershed, habitat, or management area) and avoid simplistic forest-level calculations. Accordingly, Wilderness and other analogous protective designations that prohibit motorized use should be excluded from MRDS calculations. Including these designations in MRDS calculations creates an illusion of low route densities when, in reality, the density of route networks outside of these protective designations is, in reality, very high and likely causing longterm, unacceptable resource degradation (e.g. northwest of Jemez Spring on the Virgin Mesa and east of the San Pedro Park Wilderness Area). We recommend that the MRDS also acknowledge the presence of non-system routes. This can be done in one of two ways. First, the Forest Service could include non-system routes within MRDS calculations. Second, and alternatively, the Forest Service could exclude non-system routes. However, in this latter situation, the NEPA process would have to acknowledge that the presence of non-system routes and work to eliminate those non-system routes to comply with the spirit of the MRDS.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 Regardless, the MRDS – coupled with the associated NEPA analysis – should be used to prioritize and plan for the management and reclamation of unneeded and non-system routes, whether through physical closures, obliteration, or other restorative actions. This is critical: we firmly reject a narrow view of TMR process that fixates solely on the publication of the Motor Vehicle Use Map. Instead, the Forest Service must contemporaneously address the legacy of degradation created by motorized recreation use on the SFNF as part of the route designation process as it is an essential element of complying with Executive Orders 11644's mandate to minimize resource impacts and minimize conflicts with other National Forests and nearby communities.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

16 At present, the Forest Service states that there are 3,239 miles of unneeded Forest Service roads that should be decommissioned in addition to the extensive number of user-created, non-system routes (Forest Service 2008b:36-37; Forest Service 2008:22). However, there is currently no plan to eliminate these routes and their impacts to the land. To emphasize a key point, just because they are not on a map does not mean they are not on the landscape. Furthermore, given the very limited law enforcement capacity of the SFNF, it would be prudent to create a plan to decommission these routes to assist law enforcement efforts. We recommend that the route closure and decommissioning plan use the following variables to prioritize, guide, and schedule route closure and decommissioning activities: • A "damage" rating, e.g.,1-5, based on the amount of damage occurring or imminent to the route area (e.g., potential slope failure, stream sedimentation, intrusion into critical habitat, incursions onto non-motorized trails). • A "resource protection opportunity" rating, e.g., 1-5, to determine whether there are direct or cumulative conservation benefits, and to identify nearby or linked routes that can be grouped within the same closure project to promote efficiencies of scale. An "law enforcement" rating, e.g., 1-5, to determine how effectively motorized use can be prohibited on the route pending closure and to identify whether closure of the route would effectively prevent motorized trespass on linked, or nearby routes, thus improving the ability of law enforcement to leverage their limited resources as effectively as WildEarth Guardians et al. Comments on SFNF TMP Proposed Action September 2, 2008 Page 11 of 62 possible. Also important to this rating would be the estimated number of times per year (or month, or week) a law enforcement officer could visit the closed route. • A "recommended method of closure" category, based on the nature of the surrounding terrain and the current use situation (e.g., full road removal and slope recontour, blocking with logs, ripping the first hundred yards, lining a roadsides with large rocks). • An "ease of physical closure" rating, e.g., 1-5, based on the recommended method of closure and the ease of implementing that method (e.g. accessibility of site for equipment) • Estimated costs of physical closure.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

17 A TMR plan provides the Forest Service with clearly defined management direction and the authority to take effective remedial action to protect Forest resources when motorized recreation exceeds the limits considered in the TMR process or violates TMR designation decisions. While the Forest Service, regardless of a TMR plan, retains authority to impose closures where motorized recreation "will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects" (Executive Order 11644 § 9, as amended), this authority, if decoupled from the TMR planning process, is difficult to leverage in the face of a vociferous motorized recreation community. Line officers and resource specialists deserve and need meaningful travel management plans to provide them with the authority and basis for making field level decisions to protect Forest resources. Furthermore, a TMR plan provides the Forest Service with the ability to manage and adjust the route designation network through time.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

18 The MVUM, simply put, is inadequate, standing alone, to satisfy the Forest Service's responsibility to manage motorized recreation use within acceptable limits.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

19 The "thresholds" would include use of the recommended MRDS, discussed above, and be articulated, depending, as "Road" and "Trail" "Management Objectives" ("RMOs" and "TMOs") or as Forest Plan-level standards and guidelines.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

20 These thresholds would be linked to monitoring protocols implemented at specific, defined intervals (especially for indicator and sensitive resources) to determine whether on-the-ground conditions have breached those thresholds.8 The monitoring protocols would, in turn, be used to determine whether resource thresholds have been xceeded and, in that event, trigger adaptive management actions that would be defined as "conditional decisions."

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

21 The monitoring protocols should incorporate the monitoring provisions established for Management Indicator Species ("MIS").

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

22 The TMR plan's Resource Protection Strategy would divide the SFNF into ecological subunits (preferably subwatersheds) and, for each subunit, require the preparation of an annual monitoring report that compiles and details: (1) illegal intrusions into areas closed to motorized use; (2) conflicts with quiet use and non-motorized recreationists; (3) relevant summaries of monitoring data obtained via forest plan-level monitoring protocols (e.g., for MIS); and (4) any considerable adverse impacts identified within the subunit (Forest Service, 2005b).

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

23 We anticipate that the network of routes requiring soft (non-invasive vegetation recovery methods) or hard (physical obliteration) will be extensive and we are under no illusions that the Forest Service can wave a magic wand and make these routes disappear. Nonetheless, it is incumbent upon the Forest Service to provide assurances and commitments to address this serious problem – a problem that causes persistent, ongoing, landscape-scale negative impacts to the SFNF and its natural and cultural resources.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

24 The SFNF should include an educational program explaining the travel management process, the role of the MVUM, and the role of the TMR plan. While the MVUM would serve as the cornerstone of the Forest Service's educational strategy, the SFNF would also host post-Travel Plan/MVUM workshops for motorized recreationists to explain the purpose behind the route designations and the consequences of violating the MVUM. The TMR plan's education strategy would also require more intensive signage to explain and educate the motorized user community with a focus on placing large, visible and compelling signs at key points of the route network that focus not simply on the designations, but the resource protection goals, objectives, standards and guidelines that underscore those designations.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

25 The SFNF should implement a Law Enforcement Strategy that is expressly linked to the Resource Protection Strategy and Route Closure & Decommissioning Strategy. As a component of travel planning and NEPA processes, the SFNF would coordinate with Forest Service line, law enforcement and forest protection officers, as well as resource specialists, to identify solid, effective strategies to best ensure that motorized use is constrained within the limits defined by the Travel Plan. These strategies could include concentrated enforcement patrols during high-use weekends and high-use areas linked to conditional decisions such as area closures such that if there were a certain number of law enforcement violations, line officers would impose an area closure. This provides an important incentive for the motorized community to self-police its activities.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

26 We strongly support the conclusions of anecdotal research (Archie, Walder and Jackson 2007; PEER 2007) that argues for increasing enforcement and especially increasing the consequences for breaking the law, through mechanisms like vehicle confiscations, increased fines and closing areas to all motorized users when motorized trespass occurs.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

27 Visitor education (including the MVUM and signage), decommissioning efforts and other route closure procedures require funding that needs to be addressed in the development of the plan.

Public Concern # 53 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

28 The Forest Service should restrict the system of OHV trails to that which they can maintain and enforce.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

29 Non-motorized trails are at risk for abandonment from lack of funds despite the fact that the maintenance cost per mile is substantially less than for OHV routes, the resource damage is far less severe, and our organizations organize volunteers to perform maintenance.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

30 The Forest Service needs to increase motorized recreation enforcement and monitoring to WildEarth Guardians et al. Comments on SFNF TMP Proposed Action
September 2, 2008 Page 16 of 62 minimize illegal cross-country motorized travel and the proliferation of user-created routes.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

31 The SFNF should designate motorized recreation routes only if the Forest has adequate resources (including funding and staff) to monitor and enforce compliance on these routes.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

32 We are thus troubled by the Proposed Action and the prospect of a high-density motorized route network that we believe will not effectively halt unacceptable resource degradation or minimize user conflicts. Moreover, the designated route network will divert resources away from route closure and decommissioning activities. We thus fear that the route designation process will do little more than produce a map and not produce real, meaningful on-the-ground change.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

33 In our view, the no action alternative should be limited to the designation of existing motorized system routes that are supported by prior NEPA analyses and decision documents that justify their inclusion on maps and in spatial databases. We believe that any routes without documentation, including routes which were constructed or came into being before NEPA was enacted, should be analyzed as new unauthorized routes, in recognition of the fact that there is no record of administrative decision or analysis addressing the environmental impacts of motor vehicle use on these routes.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

34 We are concerned that a significant discrepancy may exist between what the Forest Service is calling its "system" and the routes which are supported by appropriate documentation.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

35 To the degree that our description of a "no action" alternative limited to NEPA-documented routes differs from the Forest Service's conception of "no action," we request consideration of an additional, separate alternative limited to documented routes as described above.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

36 Consider alternatives that would aggressively reduce overall route densities within acceptable science-based ecological limits and determine when, where and how these route densities will be reduced;

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

37 Consider alternatives that would determine how best to physically close, decommission and obliterate unnecessary or unacceptable routes, in particular unauthorized, user-created routes;

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

38 Consider alternatives that would not only reduce route densities, but entirely eliminate routes within key areas to protect environmentally sensitive watersheds and wildlife habitats and minimize user conflicts by establishing quiet-use recreation areas;

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

39 Consider alternatives that would not provide an exemption from the ban on crosscountry travel for purposes of dispersed camping. Instead of the proposed designation of over 516 miles of routes with 150 to 300 foot corridor in which motorized travel will be authorized, that will effectively designate approximately 21,099 additional acres of the forest to motorized travel (Forest Service 2008:19), we recommend that motorized vehicles are allowed to park within 1 vehicle length of a designated route and in a limited number of designated popular dispersed camping areas;

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

40 Our fundamental concern is that the Forest Service, even though moving towards the mandated prohibition against cross-country travel through the designation of a route system, will not properly address the past and ongoing harm caused by the "ghost" network of user-created routes and routes that have been ineffectively closed.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

41 Decisions made in minimizing damage to soil, watersheds, vegetation, wildlife and habitats should incorporate and reference findings of relevant university, government and other studies regarding the negative or positive impacts of OHV use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

42 Where the TMR process precedes the Forest Plan revision process, this suggests that the TMR process should focus on reducing route densities by designating a limited, baseline travel system using a minimum of existing, authorized routes and refrain from designating new routes, in particular unauthorized, user-created routes. This should provide at least some assurance that the Forest Service has not prejudiced or compromised the Forest Plan revision process. Route designations could, obviously, prejudice or compromise these recommendations if the Forest Service takes a narrow view of the TMR process and rejects these conservation-oriented management recommendations on the basis that they are more properly considered as part of the Forest Plan revision process. While the Forest Service may state that they retain the authority to revisit TMR designations during the Forest Plan revision process, it strikes us as that the Forest Service will, generally speaking, resist revisiting route designations to make room for conservation-oriented management recommendations. This scenario undermines the spirit and intent, if not the letter, of the TMR and Forest Planning processes. If the Forest Service is unwilling to broaden the TMR process to consider these recommendations, or to conduct the TMR process concurrently with the Forest Plan revision process, the Forest Service must provide assurances to the public that the TMR process will not prejudice or compromise conservation-oriented management recommendations.

Public Concern # 34 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

43 We fail to see how the TAP report provides a basis to justify the PA consistent with the SFNF Land and Resource Management Plan ("LRMP").

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

44 The Forest Service must therefore demonstrate in the draft NEPA analysis how its TMR decisions will ensure consistency with the LRMP and address the legacy of abuse caused by out-of-control motorized recreation use, in particular relative to water quality, limited agency resources, safety and enforcement, and the LRMP's calls for closing routes

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

45 we are highly skeptical of the SFNF's ability to maintain its road and trail system to prevent "natural resource damage, erosion that damages the surrounding forest" (Forest Service 2008b:17). We are thus skeptical that the "minimum road system" identified in the TAP (Forest Service 2008b:37) and, in turn, the PA's proposed 3,737-mile motorized route network, has been properly justified.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

46 This fiscally irresponsible proposal will result in an unreasonable transportation system that will be impossible to maintain, will result in continued natural and cultural resource damage, and has no connection to the SFNF's demonstrated inability to enforce motorized recreation restrictions on the ground. Thus, there appears to be a serious disconnect between the SFNF's actual budget and the SFNF's needed budget to properly maintain the route network presented in the PA.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

47 the SFNF should also consider whether the roads budget can and should be spent to upkeep existing routes or to remedy the harm caused by motorized use. To the extent that these funds would originate from a different source, it is incumbent upon the SFNF to explain where these funds would actually come from and whether they would be sufficient to restore ecological conditions degraded by motorized recreation use.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

48 the solution requires that the SFNF address both the management of a designated route system as well as the restoration of the user-created and ghost-route system and other impacts caused by motorized recreation use over the course of the last decades.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

49 During the next stage of this process, the SFNF should identify the motorized route system they can afford to administer and maintain and develop and analyze such an alternative.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

50 Neither these ML 1 roads, the user created routes, nor the other ghost roads on the SFNF, such as unsuccessfully closed timber sale roads, have been accounted for through road density calculations.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

51 We believe that current SFNF route density calculations, by management area, are invalid to determine the ecological impacts of routes on wildlife, watersheds and other natural resource concerns, in particular because the SFNF management areas are not necessarily ecologically, biologically, or hydrologically defined.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

52 The SFNF assumes that the "tremendous" increase in "recreational use" in northern New Mexico reflects the need to provide a motorized trail system on the SFNF (Forest Service 2008b:17).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

53 as populations increase, so too increases the need to protect rapidly shrinking wild and scenic places to which urban populations can escape the sights and sounds of urban life. Also increasing is the need to protect watersheds and air quality.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

54 OHV users will create trails and roads (25 miles of user created roads, 291 mile of user created trails) illegally, disregarding the law and other forest users right to enjoy the forest and without regard for the environmental impacts of their actions (Forest Service 2008b:10;13). This irresponsible abuse of the forest should not be rewarded by the designation of user-created routes in the SFNF.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

55 Off-Highway Vehicle users are free to develop private land for motorized recreation, away from critical watersheds, airsheds, viewsheds and wildlife habitat that is not found anywhere in the state except on public lands and they will likely not do so until motorized use is limited on public lands.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

56 The conversion of "49 miles of closed forest roads, 13 miles of previously decommissioned roads, 7 miles of non-system roads and 1 mile of undetermined road" to trails will result in what is a de facto road that will be maintained as a trail and will not in fact provide for a safer, less harmful, and more economical motorized route system (Forest Service 2008:25). It is, instead, a bureaucratic reclassification, not a change in reality. Indeed, because maintenance will not be provided to the same extent, there is a possibility that these routes could cause more harm to the environment. For example, if not maintained, then drainage systems could be compromised, increasing sedimentation and water quality impacts. Rather than artificially reducing the number of miles of system roads without actually reducing the impact of those roads, the SFNF must develop a plan to identify and obliterate unnecessary roads.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

57 The SFNF acknowledges the role roads play in inhibiting the spread of natural fires, minimizing the benefit of natural fires. The SFNF should analyze the current route system and reduce the route density in the Forest, with complete obliteration of unnecessary routes, to allow for a healthy fire ecosystem and to enhance the wildland fire use program.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

58 Also completely lacking in the TAP is the effect of noise caused by OHVs within the SFNF.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

59 A fiscally manageable route system could be classified as a road system that falls within the 8% that the forest acknowledges it can afford to maintain, we do not expect the SFNF to reduce its existing system by 92%. The current proposal is clearly unmanageable, unsafe and will not do enough to improve the health of the forest or increase user comfort.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

60 Despite the criticisms and concerns noted above, we strongly support the following components of the Proposed Action: • The closure of 2,615 miles of official forest routes; • The elimination of cross-country travel; • The publishing of a motor vehicle use map (MVUM) depicting motorized designations

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

61 Conspicuously absent from the Proposed Action is credible rationale for the proposed OPEN route network.14 While the SFNF has used "filters" to remove routes from the open system the PA has not provided any legal or science-based methodologies or "sideboards" indicating how the proposed open routes comport with legal protections afforded to watersheds, water quality, wildlife populations and quiet use recreation interests. Thus, it is not apparent how the PA comports with motorized recreation designation criteria set forth in Executive Order 11644 § 3, as amended, the TMR (36 C.F.R. § 212.55) or functions as part of the "minimum road system needed for provide safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization and protection of National Forest System lands" required by 36 C.F.R. § 212.5(b) (emphasis added).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

62 Furthermore, while the SFNF has identified a minimum road system necessary for safety and administration in the Travel Analysis Report (TAP) there is still a need to identify how the route network in fact minimizes impacts as per the designation criteria. Therefore, the SFNF has not completed critical steps in developing a travel management plan. The travel analysis report process is meant to produce science-based foundational data that can be used by the Forest Service and the public to analyze the adequacy of the proposed Travel Management Plan.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

63 Decisions made in minimizing damage to soil, watersheds, vegetation, wildlife and habitats should incorporate and reference findings of relevant university, government and other studies regarding the negative or positive impact of ORV use, automobiles and roads. The Forest Service must describe what methodology and scientific information they used to determine how motorized routes could potentially impact natural resources on the Forest and how this information drove the project design criteria with respect to soils, watersheds, vegetation, threatened and endangered species, sensitive species and management indicator species. The agency should cite all science-based decisions and provide a list of references from peer-reviewed publications from universities, government agencies and other researchers. The Forest Service must describe how they used the best available science (or if lacking, whether they employed the precautionary principle) to make their decisions. Specific methodology for determinations should be given.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

64 the SFNF must take action to reduce route densities to within the recommended one-mile per square mile road density standard (Union of Concerned Scientists, 2004). Until route densities are reduced within acceptable limits, the SFNF should not consider incorporating user-created routes or the creation of new routes.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

65 Identifying which routes to obliterate to reduce route density should not be difficult. Many of the user-created routes are simply "short cuts" between existing authorized roads. Regardless, these routes may have caused unnoticed but nonetheless "considerable," and woefully unmitigated, "adverse impacts," do not adhere to any safety, design, or engineering standards (Executive Order 11644 § 9, as amended) and have not been vetted through the NEPA process.18 Furthermore, these routes should not be considered part of the minimum necessary road system. Their inclusion in the PA rewards off-road vehicles users who have created them without consideration to the impacts they cause. These routes thus constitute a priority for decommissioning and obliteration.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

66 In demonstrating compliance, the SFNF should calculate route density as all routes designated open to motorized use – whether classified as a road or trail. User-created routes that are not designated for motorized use should be excluded from route density calculations once they are decommissioned and obliterated. Until that point, these routes are still relevant to route density calculations.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

67 At this time, it may simply be too difficult, as a legal and practical matter, for the SFNF to conduct the requisite NEPA analysis to justify the designation of new or reopened routes. This is particularly true given that proposed new routes are also unauthorized, user-created routes that have caused "considerable," but woefully unmitigated, "adverse impacts," and do not adhere to any safety, design, or engineering standards(Executive Order 11644, § 9, as amended). Such designations – and their impacts – are best addressed on a case-by-case basis. Through this approach, the SFNF can focus the NEPA analysis on specific route designations, but still ensure that each route is consistent with the entire SFNF travel system by tiering to the landscape-scale NEPA analysis completed for the travel planning and forest planning processes (40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.20, 1508.7, 1508.8 and1508.28).

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

68 While we believe that the conversion of roads to trails is generally preferable to the creation of new motorized routes or the authorization of user-created routes, these conversions will present the SFNF with significant issues that must be considered in the EIS. These issues include: (1) less frequent maintenance and lower standards for trails than roads which could cause increased resource degradation; (2) underestimated wildlife and watershed impacts from motorized use if trails are excluded from road density calculations; and (3) the false impression that maintenance backlogs are being reduced if trails are excluded from maintenance backlog calculations.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

69 To address these issues, we recommend that the SFNF include all motorized trails for purposes of calculating route densities, understanding environmental impacts and complying with protective standards and guidelines. We also recommend that the SFNF track and ensure the maintenance of motorized trails in the same manner as roads.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

70 Although motorized use and routes are prohibited in designated Wilderness, route designations and use can have indirect or cumulative impacts to Wilderness and Wilderness resources and can enable illegal motorized intrusions into Wilderness. Route designations and use therefore can have indirect and cumulative impacts and can enable illegal motorized intrusions. Given documented OHV trespasses within the SFNF, and the Forest's lack of funding for law enforcement, we recommend that all routes terminate at least ¼ mile from Wilderness boundaries unless they access a recreation facility or Wilderness trailhead.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

71 Designating such a vast area for motorized use, even though nominally limited to seeking dispersed camping, would inappropriately allow motorized travel into sensitive species habitat, such as Mexican spotted owl and goshawk – habitats within which all motorized recreation use should be prohibited. See Appendix I. We recommend, instead, that the SFNF consider designating a limited number of popular dispersed camping sites only and allowing parking within one car length of a designated route such as is proposed for Bland Canyon. This system of dispersed camping will be easier to manage, enforce, and fund. In addition, this would restrict motorized use within a well-defined space adjacent to the designated routes, thus better protecting the myriad of resources that would otherwise be impacted in the 150-300 foot dispersed camping corridor.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

72 We are particularly concerned about the impacts of dispersed camping on cultural resources, damage which could go unnoticed if proper, comprehensive archeological surveys are not completed for the entire area under consideration for dispersed camping. To the extent that these surveys cannot be completed, the SFNF should not designate areas for dispersed camping. Only as necessary archeological surveys are completed should any areas be opened to dispersed camping (See Standard Consultation Protocol for Travel Management Route Designation, included as Appendix N).

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

73 Accounting for agency resources during the TMR process also provides stakeholder groups with a basis to work with local communities and our political leaders to advocate for increased funding or obtain grant funding necessary to implement conservation-oriented management actions. We are committed to continuing to support our members in participating in volunteer work and thereby providing the Forest Service with significant in-kind contributions. If we could point to agency documentation explaining the importance of this work and conditionally giving that work a "green light" pending funding, we anticipate that we could continue, if not expand, these contributions. Underlying agency documentation provides us and our supporters with assurances that the Forest Service is operating in good faith as a partner with the public.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

74 We support the identification of additional areas within the SFNF that may significantly expand areas without motorized routes, therefore creating biodiversity refuges for wildlife and larger areas for quiet use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

75 Because the SFNF is a biologically rich landscape that harbors a vast array of important vegetative types and wildlife species, from raptors and songbirds to carnivores, it is important to create core and buffer areas that are free of roads and motorized trails.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

76 While the SFNF contains high-elevation IRAs and Wilderness areas that protect biodiversity values and either do, or should as we recommend, prohibit motorized use, few of these protected areas are found in the lower elevations, where species richness is significantly greater. We have mapped out these suggested "biodiversity refuges," including smaller roadless areas located at lower elevation habitats that possess important fish and wildlife values.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

77 Access to private inholdings, outfitter guide routes, research sites, quarries and corrals need only be reasonable and we urge that cost share agreements for these types of routes should be the rule and not the exception. All routes accessing inholdings should be fenced, gated and locked.

Public Concern # 45 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

78 Administrative routes can simply remain restricted to necessary minimal administrative activities, permitted activities and emergency access needs. In light of limited and dwindling maintenance funds, the agency should maintain roads to lowest maintenance level required for the intended use.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

79 The SFNF must consider a substantial reduction in the number of roads in the system so that those roads that are used by the public can in fact be "well maintained."

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

80 The designation of routes, or lack thereof, for motorized use will in no way alter the ability of emergency vehicles, including ambulance and fire vehicles, from traveling anywhere in the forest where they have need. However, by designating a motorized route system that is well beyond the ability of the forest to maintain, forest users will be located in areas where roads are not maintained in a manner that will allow "rapid access" to fires, emergencies, or illegal activity without putting emergency workers at risk.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

81 We ask the SFNF to reduce the number of routes within the forest to protect watershed and wildlife resources, especially in areas with steep slopes and highly erosive soils.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

82 What are the short and long-term impacts, positive and negative – taking into account whether these impacts are felt at specific points-in-time or persist – of each management alternative to the SFNF's natural, cultural and recreational resources? In particular: Watersheds and water quality, Native wildlife populations and habitat Soils, Native vegetation, Air Quality, Inventoried Roadless Areas, Primitive and Semi-primitive Non-motorized Areas, Research Natural Areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

83 Wilderness Areas Although motorized use and routes are prohibited in designated Wilderness, route designations and use can have indirect or cumulative impacts to Wilderness and Wilderness resources and can also enable illegal motorized intrusions into Wilderness. Route designations and use therefore can nonetheless have indirect and cumulative impacts and can enable illegal motorized intrusions. Our recommendation is that all motorized routes terminate ¼ mile from Wilderness boundaries to discourage OHV trespass.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

84 As motorized use on the SFNF increases, non-motorized users are displaced to IRAs and Wilderness areas. This increased use in wilderness areas will increase the impacts to those areas that will require additional monitoring to prevent or mitigate ecological damage to these environmentally critical areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

85 The SFNF should develop an alternative proposal that would take into consideration the negative impacts of motorized use on the non-motorized user and ecologically important areas such as wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

86 How are impacts to the SFNF affected by global warming and climate change?

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

87 the Forest Service must address the issues of global warming in conjunction with Travel Management Planning.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

88 The SFNF must address the issues of reduced snowpack, earlier snowmelt, less rainfall, increased temperatures and the impacts associated with these phenomena on ecosystems in connection with the Travel Management Plan to properly determine the impacts of the proposed route system on the SFNF. Additionally, impacts associated with pest and disease outbreaks in forests should be analyzed along with the TMP as these impacts are expected to increase with global warming (Saunders et al 2008). The analysis of the impacts of global warming in conjunction with the impacts of off-road vehicle use are especially important given the known ability of off- road vehicles to act as a dispersal agent for noxious species.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

89 Given the extent of use that motorized areas will receive, these areas will be sacrificed and the ecological value and the area will not be retained; therefore the area should not be important ecologically or for quiet users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

90 Motorized play areas should be contained so that the impacts and the OHV riders do not expand beyond the zone.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

91 Building off these core elements, we used several criteria to identify and determine what areas should be designated for motorized recreation use and, importantly, what areas should be protected from motorized recreation use. These criteria, also set forth in our May 4 and October 17 letter and set forth again here are as follows (See Appendix B). A. Mexican spotted owl Protected Activity Centers. Ensuring critical habitat and PACs for Mexican spotted owls are protected from roads should be a critical consideration of the SFNF when determining where to allow roads and dispersed camping corridors and areas (See Appendix B and I). Northern goshawk nests or Post-Fledging Family Areas, Jemez Mountain Salamander, Gunnison's prairie dog active and abandoned colony sites, Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout Habitat, Pronghorn core habitat, Black bear core habitat, Mountain lion core habitat, Neotropical migratory birds, Elk summer/winter and calving habitat, High risk soil erosion hazard, Permanent closure of current seasonally closed "quiet areas," and other areas restricted to motorized use, Wildlife Corridors, Riparian (we recommend that routes in riparian areas be closed as they cause erosion and otherwise damage a critical ecosystem. Stream crossings should be closed to motorized vehicle
traffic, but where that is not possible; all crossings should be perpendicular to the stream and outside of the recommended buffer zone), Impaired Waters (All of these provisions indicate that the Forest Service's current PA and subsequent environmental analysis should take into account all motorized routes that intersect impaired waters – or waters that, if impacted by designated routes or motorized use, are threatened with impairment or water quality degradation. 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 (antidegradation provisions). Using GIS we determined a list of SFNF routes, (see Appendix B), that are within proximity of,
are located within, or traverse impaired waters. These routes therefore require careful
consideration in the TMP analysis and should be candidates for closure, decommissioning or minimally seasonal closures to motorized use. Our route closure recommendations – contained in Appendix B – should be considered both on a case-by-case basis and as a collective alternative for consideration in the NEPA process). We do not foresee a situation where the incorporation of a user-created route is warranted. The only plausible exception to this general position is where a compelling case can be made that the new or reopened route would improve resource protection. Our recommended designations would also permanently close all routes within sensitive areas. These closures are recommended to protect significant and sensitive wildlife and plant habitats, watershed and archaeological resources. While seasonal closures benefit some wildlife during critical reproductive periods, these routes and their use cause persistent, serious and long-term impacts that should be permanently eliminated.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

92 Appendix A (road density)

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

93 Appendix B (route closure recommendations by criteria)

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

94 Appendix C (legal framework for NEPA)

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 486
Comment#

95 Appendix I (dispersed camping closure recommendations)
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

96 Appendix J (other peoples comments)
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

97 Appendix K (Biodiversity refugia areas)
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

98 Appendix M (Wildlife corridor map)
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

99 Appendix N (Heritage protocol)
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 487
Comment#

1 We request that the analysis documented within the EIS specifically include data documenting direct casualty for any road or trails eliminated /closed due to resource concerns or impats. We are gravely concerned that the analysis for route inclusion or exclusion of contested segments will be based solely on 'broad-brushed' resource concerns and impacts.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

2 Action due to Jemez Mountain Salamander (JMS) habitat concerns. Yet, the obvious missing link is any direct causality between the continuation of motorcycle usage and any impact to the JMS population or habitat. Any disturbance of habitat predated JMS concerns and the EIS must show that continued use of the motorcycle trails will have a significant and measurable effect on the JMS. The EIS should also clearly show why other activities by other user groups do not have the same causality linkage and effect and why they should be allowed to continue.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The EIS should include data that clearly defines the scale of impact of motorized usage and correlates this scale of impact with measured deterioration of the JMS population or habitat.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 488
Comment#

1 The analysis must consider impacts in terms of "order of magnitude". Even if all the existing roads were designanted for use, they would occupy approximately one percent of the forest area. The designated road system will be less than half that amount, meaning the designated roads will occupy less than one half of one percent of the forest surface area.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 488
Comment#

2 The analysis and decisions should treat all roads the same Some have more potential to cause erosion. Erosion is strongly correlated to the area of bare surface ironically, the worst erowion producing roads are exactly the ones the Forest is most likely to leave open, the Category 1 roads which are two lane (the most surface area) and maintained for passenger car use (entirely) bare surface which is routinely graded.) Those cat 1 roads are also the ones most usually located in valley bottoms, and closest to streams. They are the roads most likely to contribute to stream sedimentation, and are the ones which receive the most public use by far since they access popular camping sites.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 489
Comment#

1 It is quite clear that the Chief's intent was for the Forest Service to analyze the so called "user-created" trails.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 the Santa Fe National Forest must not use the TAP and Proposed Action to eliminate any routes or areas from consideration the Draft EIS. That is not to say the routes and trails would all be included in the final decision, But the Forest must NOT refused to even consider and analyze them. It woud be in violation of the spirit and intent of the Chief to restrict the DEIS analysis to only that limited set of routes and areas which are erroneously shown as the Existing Condition in the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 490
Comment#

0 no comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 491
Comment#

1 I am concerned that no single track trails were included on the existing map or proposed map for the SFNF TMP on Cochiti Mesa. The only trails that are shown are in reality old roads that lead to the east finger of the mesa and back. These trails start at the top of the Alamos Trail that winds up the west side of Cochiti Canyon approximately 7.2 miles from the Dixon Apple Farm. The trails cover most of Cochiti Mesa and offer a very pleasurable and challenging ride to off road motorcyclists. Green Comments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 492
Comment#

1 We appreciate that the Forest Service has reflected some of our comments in their Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 I strongly oppose the Travel Management Proposed Action for La Cueva Canyon, which still designates trails and 150' dispersed camping in Protected Activity Centers and Critical Habitat, and at the top of the La Cueva drainage; and designates the addition of a motorized route which drops into the Canyon at the gorge, crosses the creek and riparian area, and designates camping in the meadow by the creek.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 the Proposed Action is still far too expansive for OHV use management and that use is planned for inappropriate areas.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Note: Please refer to my letter of July 1, 2008
375 LBB – This route travels into the PAC and should be removed and decommissioned. This route is not necessary for motorized travel as it is only .79 mile, not far to walk, and goes nowhere except into the PAC to a deadend. 375LBB is adjacent to 375M, is unnecessary, and will encourage cross-country travel between upper Dalton Canyon, the PAC and La Cueva Canyon. The route continues on the ground a short distance beyond the route length pictured on the
Proposed Action map, traveling further into the PAC with no on-the-ground indicator of where the designated route ends, thus encouraging expanded use and disturbance to the PAC. 375LBB is designated for dispersed camping of 150' on each side of the route. (There is a discrepancy between the Proposed Action and the TAP, which indicates 100' for camping.) There should be no dispersed camping in the PAC, nor is it necessary. There are many good camping sites on nearby routes outside the PAC. The current condition of the route is very light use. It will receive increased use as a designated motorized route, causing increased noise, air pollution, habitat damage and disturbance to the Mexican Spotted Owl and the Protected Activity Center. 375LBB is listed as a Level 1 Maintenance road (closed) in the Forest Plan; and in the TAP as a non-system road. The Proposed Action upgrades it to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved
Highways Seasonally." This higher level will require increased maintenance by the Forest Service, despite the fact that the Santa Fe National Forest is able to maintain only 8% of existing Maintenance Level 3 and 4 routes, according to the TAP.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 2) Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat
375L – leads to 375 LBB (the PAC)
375M, 375MB
OHV routes should not be designated in ESA designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered species. Dispersed camping should be limited to 1 vehicle length from the road rather than the proposed 150' on each side of the road. This alternative does not represent a hazard on these remote roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 3) 375 -- the main road. We do not object to 375 as a motorized route. However, 375 is designated for camping at the upper end of La Cueva Canyon where the creek runs, just beyond 375M. This is a spectacular riparian area, and the head of the watershed for La Cueva Canyon. Dispersed motorized camping should be eliminated on the lefthand side of the road near the creek. (GPS 431 112E 3946238N)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Comment#

7 4) 375G and 53.

These routes were added in the Proposed Action. This is a riparian area with the largest, most watered pools in the La Cueva Creek, archeological sites, the La Cueva watershed, rock gorge, and a severely eroded route which is impassable for motorized vehicles other than motorcycles or ATVs. According to Forest Service representatives, this route was added to the Proposed Action map in order to access private inholdings, and the Forest Service can be sued if they do not provide "reasonable access." NOTE: The requirement is for "reasonable access" not motorized access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 Description: 375G – A highly eroded route with a steep grade which travels down into the Canyon, to the La Cueva Creek, the gorge and meadow. At the bottom at the creek, to the left, is a horse and hiking trail which travels along the edge of the gorge, and to private land. This area is not on the Proposed Action map; however, increased OHV use has recently eroded the single hiking/horseback riding trail into an ATV 2-track. The righthand trail, which is shown on the Proposed Action map, crosses the meadow, where the Proposed Action has designated a small camping area. The route then crosses the creek and continues for +/- 2 miles to 2 inholdings which were mining claims, passing through mixed conifer forest. At some point (I'm unable to determine from the TAP whether it's before or after the route crosses the creek) the route designation changes to #53. The route to the inholdings has not been maintained for decades and in places is hazardous even on foot. One of the inholdings is Vacant Land; the other is a Mining Claim which in 1993 was designated as "Functionally Obsolete" by the Santa Fe County Tax Assessor and is not subject to taxes.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 ACTION ALTERNATIVE: 375G and 53 should be removed from the map entirely, and gated near the top of 375G. The owners of the inholdings should be given an easement by the Forest Service and a gate key. A gate near the top of 375G will allow access to the inholdings but will protect them and this fragile area from OHV damage.
Reasons:
a) 375G is severely eroded and dangerous on the steep hill down into the canyon, and near the mines. It is impassable by vehicles other than ATVs or motorcycles. Attached are photos of the erosion. It is irresponsible for the Forest Service to encourage motorized use of this route.
b) The route provides motorized access to a fragile riparian area with a gorge and creek, which will be devastated by OHV use. OHV routes should not be designated in wetlands, wet meadows, or other wet areas.
c) Motorized vehicles crossing the creek would drop oil and pollute the creek, the riparian area and ultimately the water wells in La Cueva Valley. It is the responsibility of the Forest Service to avoid adversely affecting beneficial uses of water, such as for wells.
d) This area is traditionally used for quiet recreation including hiking, horseback riding, birdwatching and picnicking. By encouraging OHV use, the Forest Service is creating user conflict, which is contrary to the mandate that "Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands."
e) 375G is a Maintenance Level 1 (closed) road in the Forest Plan; 53 is designated as a Maintenance Level 2 road. This in itself is questionable, since 375G, the closed section, provides the only access to #53. The Proposed Action upgrades these routes to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways Seasonally." This higher level will require increased maintenance by the Forest Service, despite the Santa Fe National Forest's ability to currently maintain only 8% of existing Level 3 and 4 routes, according to the TAP.
f) #53 would need major work in order to be passable by motorized vehicles other than motorcycles. It is not possible for a full-sized vehicle to cross the creek without cutting down trees; and the route becomes impassable before it reaches the first inholding. g) #53 deadends adjacent to a Jemez archeological site which is a cave with petroglyphs.
h) Dispersed camping should be eliminated in the meadow by the creek. This is not a popular camping area for motorized vehicles; the area is only accessible by foot, horseback, ATV or motorcycle. The Proposed Action eliminates ATVs in the area; thus motorized dispersed camping in the meadow would only benefit motorcycles. There are a few very old fire rings; one newer one; no indication of recent use.
i) Opening this route to motorized use is in direct conflict with the mandate of the Executive Order which states: Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 The Forest Service should restrict the system of OHV trails to that which they can maintain and enforce. Instead of upgrading Maintenance Level 1 and 2 routes, the Forest Service should concentrate on decommissioning unneeded routes and ensuring that closed ML1 roads that will not be decommissioned are gated.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 All proposed changes to the existing route system should be aimed at improving the control of OHV activity and not to increasing its impact on the forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

12 The Forest Service should, therefore, refrain from designating new routes or upgrading ML1 and ML2 routes which they cannot maintain or enforce.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 492
Comment#

13 The Forest Service should include an enforcement plan which estimates the current and future # of law enforcement officers, and the estimated # of officer visits to each area. The Forest Service should enact sufficient penalties to deter abuse of Forest resources.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 Motorized vehicles should be allowed to park no more than 1 vehicle length from the road's edge, in a limited number of designated popular dispersed camping areas. The proposed 150' or 300' on each side of the road is unnecessarily extensive and will result in damage to resources and habitat.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 The Forest Service Proposed Action should include a plan for effective long-term management. If a route is not included on the maps it still remains on the land and acts as a vector for impacts. What is the Forest Service plan for undesignated routes that remain on the land and still contribute to impacts? The TMP should include a timeline and priorities for decommissioning routes.

Public Concern # 36 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

16 The noise from OHVs travels up to 2 miles depending on landscape and vegetation.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

17 Therefore, routes for Off-Highway Vehicles, specifically ATVs and motorcycles, should be kept a distance of ¼ mile or greater from the boundary of any Wilderness area, in order to preserve the size of the Wilderness, wildlife habitat and the Wilderness experience, and to discourage OHV trespass.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 493
Comment#

1 As a motorcyclist, hunter, cyclist, and hiker, I would like to express my concerns of a proposal to shut down many trails in the Jemez Mountains. Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance 'Citizen's Proposal'.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I feel it is very important to maintain trails which can be used as loops, to avoid overcrowding on these trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 494
Comment#

1 The Forest Service can and should remove from the proposed action all the trails that were created by the motorized users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The Forest Service has one set of rules for hikers, and another, far easier set for off roaders. Its time to make the motorized trails equally accountable to Forest Service regulations, and the health of the land.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 We ask the Forest Service to please remove from the proposed action, and any future alternative action, motorized trails in area T18N, R4E. Miles of these user trails were cut into areas with restrictions limiting motorized use

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The dominant management designation for this area is "A", which specifically prohibits cross country travel.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

5 Motorized routes here occupy around 13 square miles, for a real route density of over 2 ½ miles per square mile. In area "N", motorized routes account for over 18 miles in a 6 square mile zone, equating to a route density of more than 3 miles per square mile. Scientific study concludes that no more than 1 mile of road or trail per 1 square mile of land is allowed to have healthy habitats. This means that area "N" has more than three times the number of roads and trails to have healthy habitat!

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 If the proposed amount of motorized routes for the above area go into effect, habitat for large animals decreases. There will be adverse effect on the habits of Elk and Deer, on nesting Mexican Spotted owls, on Northern Goshawk populations, and a severe effect on the state listed Jemez Mountain Salamander, by habitat fragmentation.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 The Forest Service observes in its analysis of impacts on Jemez Mountain Salamanders, that motorcycles and atvs can contribute both direct and indirect effects of disturbance."

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Climate change should prompt the Forest Service to remove even more roads and trails, to provide for more opportunities for the plants and animals to respond to the changes in their habitats.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 Science tells us that climate change is impacting both sensitive and non-sensitive species. The recent Mule Deer study sponsored by NMDGF reveals that drought, and food shortages, are causing Mule Deer populations to plummet. They are literally starving. We last saw deer two weeks ago, and their body fat is so low their ribs are sticking out, corroborating the study.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 The proposed action continues to island hiking and horse riding trails with motor vehicle areas. Because these trails are surrounded, motor vehicles invade these trails

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Comment#

11 We fully support the Forest Service proposal to remove all vehicles from the access trails for Bearhead, R4E and R5E T17N.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

12 Remove motor vehicles from trail 113 on this and any future proposed alternative.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 We propose for the Forest Service to grant an easement for the private property access on Horn Mesa at Medio Dia Canyon, and return the Paso to traditional non motorized use. This will protect trail 424, allow true motor-free access, provide greater safety, and enhance recreational experiences- all goals of the travel management plan.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 close the Paso Del Norte to all but private land access, reconnect trail 424, and trail 113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 The Jemez Ranger district covers less than 1/3 of the Jemez Mountains, yet is proposed for 58 miles of motorcycle trails. This is just shy of half of all proposed motorcycle trails for the entire Santa Fe National Forest.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 The travel rule states that its purpose is to control off road vehicles, and protect resources, promote safety, and enhance recreation. This number of motor trails will harm resources, harm non-motorized use, all the while doing little to promote safety, or recreation

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

17 This year, the Jemez District received funds for 2 whole miles of trail maintenance. What is going to happen with the additional 58 miles they want to add? At current funding levels, it will take the Jemez District 29 years to just to maintain their new additions.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 The Forest Service claims that they are reducing road density by 53%. This statement does not take into account that the 53% are almost all temporary and previously closed roads. The road reduction will not save the Forest Service any maintenance money, because these routes have not seen any money in decades.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

19 Looking at the situation realistically, the Forest Service needs to make even deeper cuts into their road system. They need to remove the 58 miles of trail that only serves a single purpose.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 494
Comment#

20 We thank the Forest Service for its proposal to protect the heritage resources in Bland Canyon. We support designating the Bland Road, 268 for only highway legal vehicles. This will go far to protect the vital history in this special place, as will removing motorized dispersed camping. Hooray for the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

21 Please, Forest Service, come up with a sign or posting that tells off roaders to stay on the Bland Road

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 495
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action for Management Travel released for comment on July 10, 2008 is unacceptable to the single-track motorcycle riding community. The proposal has only included a small subset of those trails originally requested. This results in loops cotaining widely disconnected segments of single-track trails. The recreatioinal experience of single-track trail riding has been nearly completely lost.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 the same holds true for the proposed trials areas submitted. Even though many of the submitted locations have been used for trails events under special use permits for many years, only one of the submitted trails areas was included in the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We insist that the EIS follow-on to the TAP include a full analysis on all of the routes and areas that have been submitted by users. We insist that the forest service follow the requirement in CEQ 40 that they evaluate a "No Change" alternative with respect to the Blackfeather motorized trails.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 We specifically request that this alternative be incorporated into the anlaysis and released for public comment and rreview within your travel management designation process as last and alone Alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 496
Comment#

1 At the public meeting August 20, 2008 in albuquerque, the SFNF admitted that they had in effect pre-filtered the actual 7154 miles of existing roads and trails down to 4924 miles, and they were proposing only 2309 miles to remain motorized. This was done through the Travel Management Process. By doing this the SFNF eliminated from consideration many of the perfectly legal user-creaated trails that have been created over the paast 30+ years.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The SFNF must anlyze and evaluate the condition of these non-system routes that have existed for decades without any maintenance. The condition of these routes must be compared to the condition of SFNF recognized system routes, both inside and outside Wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Comment#

3 Experience across the country has proven that a well-designed motorized recreation system is primarily a network of interconnected loops. User compliance is enhanced in such a system, and the need for law enforcement is decreased. The SFNF must recognize this planning principal and accept the suggestions for routed employing interconnected loops, namely the NM4W Citizens Proposal.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Road Density goals should not be used by the SFNF as a reason to not analyse, not designate, or to close a route.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 The SFNF has not provided the public any anlysis which identifes a risk to benefit ratio such as RIVA analysis for determinging what should happen to an existing route. Likewise, no analysis with options for corrections (old term mitigations) to keep routes open has been provided to the public. Specifically, with regard to road density, no methodology has been prresented to help decide which routes should be closed and others left open. There is no way to quantitatively compare the impacts to forest resources caused by forest users, both motorized and non-motorized.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 The SFNF must provide evidence of acturally using the best available science. Without such a firm rational and scientific basis, closing one route over another becomes arbitrary (and possibly even capricious) and will onl lead to future needless and expensive litigation.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

7 Habitat fragmentation likewise should not be used by the SFNF aas a reason to not designate a route for motorized use. Stopping motorized use by the general public will not solve a habitat fragmentation situation because all of the other users (including motorized administrative use by the SFNF itself and by private inholding property owners and permitees) will continue.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Lack of funding should not be used by the SFNF as a reson to close routes to motorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 The SFNF must get busy and apply for RTP grant(s).

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 A related issue is the use of OHV volunteer labor. While the SFNF has acknowledged that volunteers area a valuable asset, their potential work to correct resource concerns has not been actively factored in to decsions and proposals forroute closures. We the users would much rather volunteer to do a significan smount of free work than to see a route closed. The SFNF must factor this into future analysis and decisiions and actually give us the chance for correction to save routes from closure.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

11 The criteria for closing a route to motorized use must not be more stringent than the criteria for non-mkotorized use.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 496
Comment#

12 If a road really does qualify to be closed after corrections have been tried and have failed, it should be considered for re-designatioin as a trail. There is no limit on the width of a trrail. As a trail, it no longer needs to be on a road maintenance schedule and would not be part of the road density.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

13 Likewise, if considered, decommissioning a road must be clearly defined. It would be better to change the designation of a road to a trail, or to hold it in an unused state for possible future use. It is much cheaper to hold a road this way than decommission it by "ripping".

Public Concern # 47 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 Closure of a route or road or trail by the SFNF must absolutely be the last resort. Merely stating that correctiion is felt to be not possible/practical is not acceptable. Closure should be undertaken only if correction haas been aadequately tried and has failed.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

15 throughout the scoping process thufar, the SFNF has been tardy at best at providing the public with adequate, and especially timely, information,. All supporting documentation used in the anlysis and decision making for the DEIS must be available electronically on-line as soon as the DEIS is published and released. The Electronic Freedom of Information Ammendments of 1996 require such posting of information to the public, as well as supporting documents the public is likely to request. Likewise, a set of maps with complete information must be available on-line the same day the DEIS is released.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 497
Comment#

1 I am requesting we keep all trails open for off road riding.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 if you close them we will be limited to riding areas and it will become over crowded.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 498
Comment#

1 Please do not close the trails for off road riding. We like the loops of riding.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 499
Comment#

1 Closing roads and trails does not serve the needs of the public with the growing number of ORVs.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 500
Comment#

Letter# 500
Comment#

1 I oppose closing roads in Jemez because it would effect my camping, hunting, wood cutting, and using my ORV's.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 501
Comment#

1 the point that off-roaders constitute a danger to the general public. Discussions at the open meetings at Pecos and Honda Fire Station elicited the admission that there is but one deputy in this area charged with overseeing violations in this forest. Other National Forest personnel evidently may issue citations, but the areas to be overseen are so extensive and the personnel so few that the notion of an effective Forest Service presence is laughable.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 If safety cannot be offered, motorized off-road use should not be allowed unless and until the forest service has the manpower to oversee what it is charged with overseeing.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 The technology of the ATV makes those vehicles inappropriate for use on the public lands.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 They have no rights that I am aware of that confer on them the privilege of degrading the soils, polluting the waterways, disrupting the lives of the forest animals, and interfering with the public's peaceful use of the common lands.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 THERE SHOULD BE OFFICIAL SIGNING PUT IN PLACE advising off-roaders of statutes restricting off-road use of the public lands. There should be stiff penalties for the removal of such signs -- including the forfeiture of drivers' licenses. If the signs are taken down, they should be put up again, together with signage that cites the statutes regarding defacing official signs.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

6 The tearing down of such official signs should be met with EXTREMELY high fines together with the forfeiture of off-road vehicles and forfeiture of drivers' licenses.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

7 THERE SHOULD BE AN EDUCATIONAL TASK FORCE, hired/appointed to bring the ethical issues concerning the land to the grade- and high-school classroom.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

8 WE NEED LEGISLATION addressing the problem, asserting that off-road vehicles should not be allowed on public lands because they are disruptive and destructive and the land is fragile. And if there isn't such a law now, one should be drafted. If it is going to take acts of congress to stop this onslaught, then at least sufficient time should be allowed for the ordinary citizen's awareness of the plague sweeping through the forests to catch up with the facts surrounding this dire situation. Until there has been fact-finding by the legislators, THERE SHOULD BE A TEMPORARY INJUNCTION BROUGHT AGAINST THE USERS OF OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ON FOREST LANDS.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 501
Comment#

9 users should be required to REGISTER AT RANGERS' STATIONS, at which time they should have to sign an annual permit after they have checked the boxes on a list of requirements regarding riding in the forest.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE OFF-ROAD USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES ON THE LANDS PROTECTED BY THE NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE AND THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 the Forest Service is afraid to take a stand on this one. It is allowing itself to be pushed around by aggressive, determined, and selfish members of the federation of off-road enthusiasts, people who believe that fun-at-any-price is their birthright, people bereft of allegiance to anything as commonplace as a land ethic. I hope that commentator was wrong.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

12 THERE MUST BE SUFFICIENT STAFF ALLOCATED TO PROTECT AGAINST MISDEMEANORS AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING IN THE FOREST.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 502
Comment#

0 Conversation between Jemez Ranger District and public- not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 503
Comment#

1 Per discussion, hear are some pictures of ATV and motorcycle damage done to roads near the Rio Puerco SW of Albuquerque.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 504
Comment#

1 Estevan's pile

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 505
Comment#

1 Please look carefully into not allowing all terrain vehicles from retrieving down big game animals, especially elk. 1.) It will be detrimental to local elderly hunters. It will make it hard to remove all edible meats. 2) Please do not punish all for a few that abuse all terrain vehicles. 3) Allow outfitters to at least infirm where and when the outfitter will be retrieving elk from certain areas. We don't pack just one elk.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 506
Comment#
0 no comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 507
Comment#
1 please also remove all orv/dirt bike createdtrails and roads and move to restrict rather than increase motorized access. One need only look aross the border to colorado for the catsstrophic consequences of motorized traffic on the forests.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Please remove forest road 79 from your travel management plan. The road is for an inholding access only. It has no turnaround and is used as a traget shooting area illegally.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 508
Comment#
0 no comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 509
Comment#
0 no comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 510
Comment#
0 foia request not tm
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 511
Comment#
1 I agree with two aspects of Senator Griego's alternative proposal : 1)removing fixed corridor access to dispersed camping on Glorieta/Rowe Mesa and 2) closing two superflous roads.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I agree with two aspects of Senator Grieogo's alternative proposal: 1) removing fixed corridor access to dispersed camping on Glorieta/Rowe Mesa and 2) closing two superflous roads.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 511
Comment#

3 However, I wish to make it clear that I oppose the special pleading of the Senator's alternative proposal with respect to a so-called "historic, living culture protection zone" at the Santa Fe County end of the Mesa. The creation of a "more than Forest, less than Wilderness" zone would be bad public policy.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 Nor does the fact of noise compel such a creation, unless the forest on the whole Mesa should be so protected because sound travels all over the Mesa.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 Nor does the fact of noise compel such a creation, unless the forest on the whole Mesa should be so protected because sound travels all over the Mesa.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 I believe that vigours, consistent enforcement, in itself a kind of education, can be sufficient to douse "hot spots"..
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 512
Comment#

1 I found the plan to enforce the proposed regulations unrealistic. The areas must be limited in size because it is clear that the majority of off road vehicle users are interested in exploring and establishing new roads.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I have done a fair amount of reclamation and can testify to the expense and work that is takes to stop erosion after someone has driven over an undisturbed slope. I am sure the Forest Service is also aware.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 I would also like to state that I am very concerned with the ability to the Forest Service to enforce non violent behavior of ATV users.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Remove all users created trails within the Agency's own designations of "A" and "D" prohibiting cross country travel.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 All dispersed camping should be removed (150') and localized to designated camping areas.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Remove any road traveling thru Roadless Areas such
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 512
Comment#

7 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads "touching" these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement. There should be a logical buffer of about 1/4 mile around all the Wilderness areas for at least minimal protection.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 The vast numbers of roads in the SF National Forest still exceed the Minimum Road Density Standards and their required maintenance. This proposed network also exceeds the manageable and enforceable limits for appropriate land management of wildlife habitat, soil erosion, water quality, protection of sensitive species, and low impact recreation.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 The Western SF National Forest "road dense" system not only will become more difficult to manage, but opens the door to more destructive "wreckreation" from the large urban population of Albuquerque and surrounding areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 513
Comment#

1 On August 7, 2008 Senator Phil Griego submitted an alternative plan for TM on Glorieta Mesa. The plan asks for special protection for some of his constituents on Glorieta Mesa, by creating a 'Historic Living Culture Protection Zone.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I request that the Draft EIS analyze the Griego alternative plan, to determine what parts of it are within the scope of the Travele Management Rule or within the authority of the SFNF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 The Griego plan asks the SFNF to restrict pulic use on some 7680 acres of FS land, solely for the benefit, protection and comfort of a few local residents.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 There is nothing in the TMR directing Mr. Dan Jiron , Foreest Supervisor of the Santa Fe Nations Forest, to crease special management areas for other purposes.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I also request that the SFNF investigate and report the status of the so-called 'Historic Living Culture Protection Zone. If there is no such official designation, there are no rules, guidelines, or mandates for how to creat or manage such an area.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 513
Comment#

6 The Griego plan wants to put 7680 acres of public land under some sort of vague, unofficial designation which has no specific rules for how it would be managed, how decisions would be made on it, or who would be authorized to make decisions. The Griego plan seeks to usurp and compromise the authority of the Forest Service over public lands.

Public Concern # 35 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 The Forest can not implement any designations without a full NEPA process and public praticipation.The state can't unilaterally impose designations either.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 This area is not any more or less challenging to manage than many other areas of the SFNF.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 The Griego proposal includes at least one request that is beyond the authority of any individual Nation Forest. The Griego proposal seeks to add a provision in the Travel Management decision that 'requires notification and involvement of the permit holders, in-holders and adjacent property holders before modifying the plan in any way."

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 All of us who have experience with NEPA processes know that NEPA (and the body of regulations around it) has extremely detailed requirements about notification.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 The Griego plan advances an inexplicable attempt to supplant federal law with its own notification rule and restrictions on the US Forest Service

Public Concern # 35 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

12 I was very disappointed to hear an elected official in our great democracy argue that some people deserve more because their ancestors arrived earlier.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

13 I don't recall anything in the Bill of Rights or the Constitution saying that longevity of occupancy confers powers which allow some people to restrict the rights of our citizens.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

14 The Griego Plan advocates no cogent argument that this is anything special about the Glorieta area. It states that motorized route designations "represent significant departure from traditional patterns of use."

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 514
Comment#

0 not a comment. Info request

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 515
Comment#

1 I ask the US Forest Service not to close the opportunity to close the opportunity for the disabled to be able to hunt/fish and or just enjoy seeing the wildlife we adore.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 [Positive] Stories like this don't seem to make it to the news (only negative news about ATV's).
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 These are the stories that the hateful environmentalists hate to hear. The Forest Service is not to be hasty in making their decisions.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 1. Plan to meet with ATV owners and dealers separate to get input without a hostile environment. 2.) Plan to meet with off road motorcycle owners and ealers separate ato get input without a hostile environment. 3. Plan to meet with moutain bike owners separate to get input. 4. Meet with disabled ATV owners and the ALCU so there will be no discrimination against the disabled. Forest Service should cut in trails to prime hunting areas where they are able to hunt. Draft rules and regulations that they would plan to apply and give the opportunity to those aboe the review prior to final approval.
Public Concern # 40 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 [Reference to roads on other forests]
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 The Forest Service Road to Elk Mountain should be open to hunters on ATVs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

7 I also think a trail should be cut from Elk Mountain to the N.E. side of Las Vegas designed for ATV use only. Fees could also be charged by the Forest Service.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 I would like someone to explain to my why the cattlement associations and the ranchers of NM ca use ATVs to round up cattle and install fence lins in wilderness areas.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 Thank you for helping me. I hope you can direct my ideas in the directions that are most helpful to us.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 516
Comment#

1 We are specifically requests that you add these routes identified as the "Telephone Canyon Spurs' to all alternatives for the EIS and complete full analysis of these routes. The Telephone Canyon Spurs take motorized recreationalists to two senic overlooks and provide access to wondeful camping areas along FR117FRB and the end of FR527DK.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 517
Comment#

1 I enjoy traveling on public lands using my Jeep Charokee. My ability to hike long distances is limited due to my Rheumatoid Arthritis, so motorized travel on appropriate trails is preferred.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 System and Non-Sytem motorized routes must be included in the analysis. The SFNF admits that they have already eliminated in the Proposed Action from 7154 existing miles of roads and trails down to just 2309 miles proposed for continued use. Such pre-analysis decision making is unfair.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 All the routes designated in the Citizen's Proposal sibmitted by the New Mexico 4-Wheelers should be given complete analysis by the SFNF in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Camping should be allowed along Nacimiento Ridge. The area for allowed camping should be increased at 488KA. The McMillian/Church Canyon route in the Citizen's Proposal is more interesting that that in the PA and should be considered for open designation. More trails and more camping opportunities should be allowed in the Smokey Bear Hill/Rito del Indio/Trail Canyon group. Additional routes should be considered for use on Virgin Mesa. Expanded camping opportunities should be considered. Consider route restoration off of Holiday Mesa and the east bank of the Rio Guadalupe as far as Schoolhouse Mesa to complete a loop. The road crossing Rio Guadalupe provides excellent access to Holiday Mesa. Keep the road to the Big Footprint Ruins open. Increase route opportunities in the Paliza Canyon region. Include the entire southern loop shown in the Citizen's Proposal called Hill and Dale (near Crow Springs). Analyze the roads in Virgin Canyon for continued use and designation. Increase motorized route opportunities in the FR 532 region. Include the loop route at Osha Canyon Overlook. Caja del Rio routes that loop around the Blowhole should be dsignated open for use. Include the loop trail at La Bajada Hill.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Provide maps with complete information available online as .pdf files when the DEIS is released. All supporting documentation used in the analysis and decision making for the DEIS should be available online as .pdf files when the DEIS is released. Define exactly what standards are being applied for identifying and analyzing roads and trails. Clear, concise description of parameters and criteria for route evaluation must be provided.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

6 The SFNF must recognizxed during analysis that a well-designed motorized recreation system includes a network of interconnected loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Closure of existing routes by the SFNF should be a last resort. If a route qualifies to be closed after corrections have been tried and failed, it should be considered for redesignation as a trail.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 Decomminsioning must be clearly defined by the SFNF.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 517
Comment#

9 Criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringent for OHV routes than for non-OHV routes.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 Road Desity goals should not be used by the SFNF as a justification to not analyze, not designate, or to close a route. Closing a route to motorized use will not decrease road density, unless the route is closed to all of the public.
Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 518
Comment#

1 The jeep gets my body into the hills where I can camp and day hike and where my spirit is renewed. The jeep has been a minor miracle for me.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Club members are serious about protecting the environment while using it – never abusing it.
I am also a licensed social worker, a student
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I mention this because I am concerned the plan negatively impacts seniors and people with current (and future) pyhsical limitations.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 I believe older people need more access to the forest, not less. Closing so many miles of 4-wheel roads hurts current (and future)
older people who return to the forest as they age. 2. The plan needs to specifically address how people who are thirty, forty and fifty will use the forest when they are sixty, seventy and eighty. If the timetable proceeds as planned, the opportunity for future senior citizens to voice their future needs will be lost. There has not been enough outreach to senior citizens. 3. The plan is geared for younger people who can hike or bike but it's unfair to older folks like me. The plan needs to address the needs of aging people who need 4 wheel drive vehicles to use the forest. The plan essentially discriminates against older folks who do not have the physical capacity we once had by significantly limiting our options to use SFNF.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 While I am not thoroughly familiar with National Environmental Policy Act, I question if the SFNF plan is overly aggressive in applying the tenets of NEPA. I think some elements of the process are rushed, the deadlines are compressed and the plan is not complete.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 6. I think the plan arbitrarily limits the number of miles available to 4-wheelers. By framing the number of miles available to 4-wheelers narrowly, the Forest Service is trying to accomplish by fiat what should be debated. All motorized routes should be included in the full analysis.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Some of the roads the Forest Service defines as "user created" have been in use for decades. The fact that the Forest Service database does not include these roads should not be the reason to exclude them from the plan. More time should be available to fully identify and analyze these old "user created" roads before restricting people from them. This is an example of the rapid process hurting the formulation of a good plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 I think there are unintended consequences to the plan. For example, the plan inadvertently benefits rule-breakers. A rule-breaker will bypass a locked gate while a law-abiding citizen will turn around. If there is a hooligan damaging the forest, law-abiding folks will no longer be there to be a=20 deterrent or a witness.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 I think the plan should include a concept that volunteers can help authorities protect and maintaint he forest.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

10 The plan needs to include The Guadalupe Crossing.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 The plan needs to include All the Virgin Canyon roads and loops

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 The plan needs to include the south end of Hill and Dale Loop new Crow Springs.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 The plan needs to include the Caja Del Rio routes that loop around the blowhole.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

14 The plan needs to include all the routes of Church Canyon

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

15 The plan needs to include the inner loops of the Rito del Indio area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

16 The plan needs to incorporate more loop roads.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

17 The plan should allow for more motorized dispersed camping. The 150-foot limit to camping from a road is not enough in certain places. I think 250 feet is more appropriate.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

18 Put all the supporting documentation used to construct the plan on line.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

19 Please state clearly the exact standards and parameters the FS is using to identify and analyze trails

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 518
Comment#

20 Please include in cutural appreciation of the forest the concept that urban recreational users also have powerful cultural connections to the forest.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 519
Comment#

1 375G, 53, 375LBB, and 375 ATVs and motorcycles would readicate the areas tranquility, the road would become dangerous and noisy, potentially destryoing the required peace of our area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 No vehicles should be permitted into the spotted ouwl critical habitatl endangered species require quiet.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 I totally have to oppose the proposed camping 150 feet on each side of the Route 375LBB. This was done in order to preserue habitat for the area's wildlife and to defend the forest against development
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 Land is not conducive to off-highway vehicle use since it would destroy the residents environments, wildlife habitat, wildlife watching, horseback riding and family outings.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 520
Comment#

1 During that time I have come to know and love this portion of the Santa Fe National Forest (SFNF) for its quiet solitude, wildlife viewing opportunities, horseback riding and hiking.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Within the last year or so this area, like others in the SFNF, has been negatively impacted by a marked increase in OHV use, use which has resulted in erosional damage and wildlife disturbances due to off-trail driving.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 In addition there have been increasingly confrontational interactions between hikers and horseback riders and OHV users, and probable long term damage to the area's water resources by these vehicles crossing the La Cueva Creek, which is the primary source of water for many residents of LA Cueva Canyon. I urge you… to protect this area's limited natural resources.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Immediately and permanently remove FR 375G and 53 from the Proposed Action
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 520
Comment#

5 That means with each crossing the water quality is seriously deteriorate, ultimately leading to loss of wildlife, to say nothing of the human damage that can result from downstream use of that water - and that's the source for many La Cueva residents.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 I have personally witnessed a USFS employee telling a resident that the USFS must maintain FR 375G and 53 or face possible legal action by the owners of inholdings that these roads ultimately lead to. Ainxw these inholding include both vacant land and mining claims that have been considered completely inactive for at least 15 yrs, this argument is simply untrue.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 I have also witnessed this same USFS employee telling area residents that the meadow at the bottom of FR 375G is a "popular camping spot." However, I have hiked this area numerous times and assure you that there are no signs of recent camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 The USFS should place a gate with sufficient side fencing to preclude OHV users from simply driving around it, along with signage indicating the road is permanently closed to all motorized vehicles, at the junction of FR 375 G and FR 375

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 Immediately and permanently remove FR 375LBB from the Proposed Action, as this route is directly in the Mexican Spotted Owl Protected Activity Center.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 521
Comment#

0 Not a comment.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 522
Comment#

1 Tony called to inquire about the meeting in Jemez on 7/31. He wanted to know if his atendance was required. I informed him attendance was voluntary and that if he would like to meet with me personally at a later date that U would be happy to do so. He also asked how we were going to provide for their access to traditional use areas. I informed him that we would work with Native American communities to provide access.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The existing network of trails has been in use by OHV riders for over thirty years WITHOUT detrimental effect. The trails are maintained by hundreds of volunteers who help to minimuze environmental impact. In fact many of the areas proposed for closure are impacted in a far more negative way by allowing cattle to graze in those there.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 523
Comment#

Letter# 523
Comment#

1 Paul Lewis called and wanted to have FR132 that is open to the public on the PA map closed to the public.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 He lives up 132. It has a cattlegaurd and a gate and is just past the San Antonio Camoground right before you get to the creek. He said that the FS acquired an easement in 1957 to go through private property on FR132.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 524
Comment#

1 Please help out community retain it's rural nature of quiet. I am begging you to act to preserve out FR 79 from off-road access by all motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 What we want is : Well marked trails. Funding for enfocement to encourage quiet, non-overnight, non-camping, non-destructive or disruptive uses of our forest lands. No campfires, no smoking. Set fines for destruction of forest properties. Signs describing these fines.
Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 525
Comment#

1 We requested approximately 500 miles of single track trail loops of 50-100 miles each- has anyboyd in the SFNF even read out proposal- it was widely and officially distributed?
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 There area almost no single track trail loops that meet those criteria (discussed in meeting with SFNF).
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We know the answer to that-they must listen to us and of course we must listen to them-then we can have a meaningful discussions.
Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Nobody on the Travel Management Team that has a real interest, experience or training in motorcycle travel. On the contrary, at the present time the specialty of all but a couple of the members is "tuned" to minimize motorcycle tavel in the SFNF… In the future, a reasonable number of Team members meet the above stated criteria. After all, it is a "travel" management proccess. From my point of view, the cards, for whatever reasons, have been stacked against us.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 As was also indicated in our proposal, we too are very concerned about responsible resource management and believe that we have many years of experience doing ust that.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 526
Comment#

Letter# 526
Comment#

1 As far as we're concerned, this is great news for out part of the forest. They finally heard our complaint that the spur road corssing out property is not a FS road- took three tries to get it off the map.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 527
Comment#

1 Needless to say we are not happy with the Proposed Action that just came out, but more on that later.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 528
Comment#

1 Dear Mr. Jiron , I have been informed that Canada de Los Alamos , my dear home , has been taken out of the Travel Management Plan for allowing OHV use in our area. Specifically Route 79 and all the logging roads that feed off of it . I can't thank you enough for this consideration on your part ! The erosion , noise and impact on the wildlife has been terrifically upsetting and intense and the people who live here have been very , VERY disturbed by this kind of use and over use of the privilege of having the forest so near to our homes .

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 529
Comment#

1 While we're very please with the proposal for La Cueva, Los Alamitos and Dalton Canyons, there are a few routes on the proposed map with which we take issue.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 530
Comment#

1 I am a resident of La Cueva and am writing to express my concerns about the inclusion of Trail # 375 in the current plan. Origianally taken off the map. The road is virtually impassable to most vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 The creeek is an extremely delicate reparian area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 That trail very soon comes to private property.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 There are homes not far down the creek from this area. To have people potentially comping in that area represents a fire hazard to the whole area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 530
Comment#

5 If the trail is on the map because there are still people who have to have access to property by that road reach a private arrangement with the parties involved.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 In general, I am very encouraged by the plan.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 531
Comment#

1 The potential closure of historic lower FS 268 would result in dangerous lack of Southern access-egress for the community of Cochiti Mesa in the even of an evacuation emergency as a result of fire.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 We realize that it is not a matter of "if" but "when" there will be a large fire that impacts out community and most residents understand the risks of living in a designated "community at risk."

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 First, Change the proposed closed road designation of Souther FS268 to " open or "open seasonally."

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 532
Comment#

1 We are requestiont that the FS omits the lower fork of Road A042

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 A007 or A005, which I believe is currently utilized by the public , would be the best choices for accesss to the NF.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Public Access trough the narrow canyon, within a few feet of our home, would be a catastrophic blow to my family as we have put all our resources, hopes and dreams into our future there.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 533
Comment#

1 I am terribly upset at the amount of closure of the Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I have been riding that area for quarter of a century. While I understant the need to take care of the forest, shutting it off to cross country travel completely and reducing the road and trail system by more than 50% is a disservice to the tax payers.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 533
Comment#

3 Forest foad 106 has already been removed from the map beyond Thompson Ridge. This a change from previous mas and don't recall seeing any notification of its impending closure.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 I would request that you leave FR 106 open to the San Antonio river, where it connects with FR 376R that goes west to FR 144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 In the event of a serious forest fire on FR106 fbetween Thompson Ridge and HWY 4, FR 106 to the north is the only alternative means of escape for the residents there.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 This new plan will seriously effect the public's ability to access areas of the roest that have been open for years. Phisically challenged people won't get to their favorite spots. There will be no way to inforce the plan, and effectively, keep the public off it's own land.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 I would really like to see you leave FR106 and FR 376R open so we can have access to what little you are leaving us.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 534
Comment#

1 Include the first mile of FR117 as a dispersed camping area north of NM SR 126.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 535
Comment#

1 I highly recommend that in general the Forest Service should study key wildlife habitat, crossings, and migration and modify or eliminate all roads in those sensitive areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Specifically for the Glorieta Mesa area, all routes present a danger to wildlife due to collisions, poaching, habitat disruption and noise. I am therefore asking the Forest Service to consider the following changes in their proposal: Substitute roadside parking access for fixed-corridor camping. Therefore driving up to 150 or 300 feet Off Road for dispersed camping will not be allowed. Remove at least the following routes which either do not serve any other purpose than motorized recreation or are redundant: FR326WA, FR326PE, 326AK, 326B, 124V, Either 330 or 330G (redundant routes)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 536
Comment#

Letter# 536
Comment#

1 I want all existing roads and trails to be included in the analysis and the motorized designation decistions to be made with the same tolerance for risk and damage that is applied to wilderness.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The EIS must analysze all exissting routes. It must not summarily deny analysis to a route because of the mere co-existence of motorized use and a resource.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The EIS must analysze all exissting routes. It must not summarily deny analysis to a route because of the mere co-existence of motorized use and a resource. The EIS analysis myst include all existing routes and not be limited to only the routes in the PA as recommended in the TAP.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I have attached a study by the Nature Conservancy on damage from (non-motorized) recreation. ATT Ecological Imapcts of Trails-Nature Conservancy,doc

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 537
Comment#

1 Habitat fragmentation should not be used as a reason to not analyze a route for motorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Tha analysis must recognize and account for the combined effects of many types of users and of the existence of the road itself.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The forest should not cite studies on road impacts as support for the closure of trails.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 538
Comment#

1 The forest must not use road density targets as a reason to not analyse or not designate roads.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 538
Comment#

2 The forest has not provided to the public any analysis such as a RIVA which identifies a risk-benefit for each route. I want the forest to provide a RIVA analysis an analysis of options for correcting problems, a methodology for comparing roads, and a methodology for scaling which will assess and compare impacts from various users. Baniong motorized use will not decrease road density unless the road itself is closed to all users.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 539
Comment#

1 I support the Citizen's Alternative H.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 540
Comment#

1 I support the Citizen's Alternative H.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 541
Comment#

1 There exists nearly 300,000 acres of wilderness in the SFNF with further acreage off limits to OHV. The remainder of the forest must remain accessible to all visitors, yound and old, healthy and disabled.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Reduction of OHV-accessible trails creates a condition of increased user density

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 all establised OHV trails such as those submitted by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance in its Citizen's Proposal be placed back onto the map as open OHV routes.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 542
Comment#

1 The trails located near the intersection of County Rd 51c and FR 326 approx 12 miles need to be included in the proposed action on Glorietta Mesa and the single track motorcycle trails be included in the scoping and analyzed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 543
Comment#

Letter# 543
Comment#

1 The open trails included in the proposal are only a small subset of those originally requested and historically used by motorized recreation. We insist that the EIS include a full analysis on all of the routes that have been submitted by users.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 544
Comment#

1 A key recreational criteria is to have various loops for different skill levels, have a variety of trails in loop form to ride also prevent overcrowding and overuse. For a loop to meet users needs for single track use they need to have very little road sections included for them to be workable for all.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 545
Comment#

1 OHV users generally keep the trail network clear on a yearly basis, but once the trails are closed to off-roaders these trails will become overgrown with deadfall and will not be usable for any form of recreation ie hiking, mountain biking or horse back riding.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 546
Comment#

1 OHV use is less damaging to the environment than other forest uses such as horse back riding, cattle grazing, mining, logging and others.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 547
Comment#

1 We are willing to reroute trails with the Forest Service Guidance to mitigate trail damage and sensitive areas and animal habitats.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 548
Comment#

1 I was disappointed to find out that the camping areas will be decreased.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The majority of the people who camp along the main forest roads are there for the party and have no respect for the forest. Along the main forest roads I have come across more than a few empty camp sites that look like a small dump however this is the opposite when you go further in the forest.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 548
Comment#
3 One of the first times that I took my family camping we stayed along FR 376 and we had to leave in the middle of the night because of loud music and gun shots. This is no way to enjoy the outdoors and my fear is that by limiting the camping areas that the increased number of campers along the main roads will cause more damage to those area and increase the tension between campers.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 549
Comment#
1 This relatively small amount of trails aren't hurting anyone and will allow some of the young men that live in the Santa Fe area a place to ride without travelling long distances, such as the Jemez Mountains to recreate.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 550
Comment#
1 All the trails in the Blackfeather Preservation Alliance “citizens proposal” should be kept open for access by off highway motorized vehicles.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 551
Comment#
1 Users need access to loop trails for varying skill levels to prevent overcrowding and overuse of particular segments of trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 552
Comment#
1 The existing network of trails has been in use by OHV riders for over thirty years WITHOUT detrimental effect. The trails are maintained by hundreds of volunteers who help to minimize environmental impact. In fact many of the areas proposed for closure are impacted in a far more negative way by allowing cattle to graze in those there.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 553
Comment#
0 no comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 554
Comment#

Letter# 554
Comment#

1 As you may be aware, the NEPA process indicates that you must consider the impact on the human environment of your actions. Since you have not done this prior to making the decision to close many of the single track trails submitted to you by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance, I request that these trails be considered for future NEPA analysis.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 555
Comment#

1 Please include a reasonable amount of single track trails for motorcycle recreation on Glorietta Mesa.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 556
Comment#

1 We believe that many of the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance singel track trails have not been included in the Proposed Action due to the potential presence of the Jemea Mountain Salamander. (Information to confirm this conclusion has not been made available to us).

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 (The Cooperative Management Plan for the Jemez Mountain Salamander publishe in January 2000 has been suggested as the rationale for the Santa Fe National Forest's arbitrary decision not to include these trails. Any fair and unbiased reading of this document would come to the opposite conclusion).(Please include these trails for for future action.)

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 557
Comment#

1 As the Proposal for the North and South Jemez trails does not recognize most of the 35-year single track trails, it does not meet Derek's stated purpose. The traditional and culture use of the forest will be lost if the current Proposal state is passed. There are virtually no loops or choices of loops in the proposal.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Therefore I request that the Blackfeather "Citizen's Proposal" be adopted and the SFNF's Proposal be discarded ast it does not meet Derek's stated purpose. I also ask that the Citizen's proposal trails be fully analyzed.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 558
Comment#

1 I want to see a legen equating All the user-submitted trails versus Forestry0designations, even if specific trails have not been included in the current proposal. This requires the Foresty to enumerate/title each User-submitted trail, regardless if the Forestry thinks it will be included in the Proposal.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 559
Comment#

Letter# 559
Comment#

1 I believe that since the single-track trails have been used for some 30-40 years that today's trail network can remain without adversely affecting animals or dirt.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Examination of the trails in the Proposal will demonstrate that greater weight has been given to protecting certain animals and dirt, than to man's recreational use of the Forest (which should be greater; man is *above* the animals).

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I want a full analysis of all the trails with the North and South Jemez Areas

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I want to see that man's request has equal or greater stage than animals or dirt, by way of adopting Blackfeather's Citizen's proposal and the trail loops and routes dictated within.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Disregard and throw away the current SFNF's TMP Proposal.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 560
Comment#

1 I request that the Glorietta Mesa single-track trails be INCLUDED in the scoping effort for the Travel Management Plan.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I also request that a full analysis be done on each single track trail and that thoes results be made publicly available. The GPS data for these tracks has been provided to the SFNF.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 561
Comment#

1 I want the single track trails on the Glorietta Mesa "Included" fjor public use

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I also request that a full analysis be done on each single track thrail and that those results be make publicly available. The GPS data for these tracks has been delivered to Julie Bain. SFNF.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 562
Comment#

Letter# 562
Comment#

1 The observed trails motorcycle has not been borken out by class of vehicle as we are being lumped in with a goup of users that have different uses of the land.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I want to see the observed trails bike broken out by class of vehicle as one of the requirements of the travel management rule due to the fact that we are being lumped in with a group of users that have conflicting desires. We are an area user, not a road user and we need to be classified accordingly so that our needs in the public can be clearly defined.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 563
Comment#

1 Please consider closing the section of FR 83(between MB/203 and 66F) to motorized travel through the La Cueva spring Canyon area from Corrales Canyon to Commissary Canyon (T16N and R13E). This is an East-West road that is redundant and in-between two existing roads that all access the same interior. It does not serve private landowners and it only serves to feed the "spaghetti" roads and trails as well as it is a very difficult area to enforce.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 564
Comment#

1 Loop traials are especially damaging as they drive out wildlife by isolating tracts of land and amaplify the soil, water and land damage caused by off-road vehicles. Two examples of this in your proposed action are; the "Tin Cup" trail FT # 188D connecting to FR 282 (T19N/R4E) and the "old" FR 286F connecting to 286FA and then FAD near Cochiti Mesa (T18N/R5E).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The "Tin Cup" trail is rutted,k braided and 2 feet deep as it goes through a meadow, up a hillside and through erosive pumice soil. It is also primarily located in a travel area designated by the Forest Service as "A". It links to FR188 and 188JA, further incrreasing the acres of damage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The "old" FR 286F is a heavily used access point for many miles of unauthorized trails on Cochiti Mesa and If closed to mkotirzed travel it would assist in enforcement and preventing further damage in the area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 565
Comment#

1 Please keep the seasonal road closues on FR 268 and 289 from the junction with Sate Road 4 - south and enforce it with locked and closed gates. These closures do not show up on the proposed actioin or seasonal maps.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 565
Comment#

2 Please consider allowing only ghighway legal vehicles on these roads (FR 268 and 289) and close it to ATV and motorcycle traffic due to their position in a wildlife corridor between Bandalier NM and the Valles Caldera and Jemez Mtn Salamander habitat as well as the proximity of Rabbit mountain and the erosion associated with the grade in that area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 566
Comment#

1 The Ridge Trail - FT #188D used to be a good area for hiking, biking, and wildlife viewing (especially elk) and it was easy to get to. (T19N/R4E - south of SR4 and connecting to FR 282). Now it is known for traffic, confusing spur trails and noise and the numbers of widlife have decreased dramaticallly. This essential Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat as well as it is a general wildlife corridor between the Valles Caldera and Bandalier NM. This arrea is inundated with user created trails and it already has the designation of "A" no cross country travel permitted). Please remove the actual "Ridge trail" and its connection to FR 268 from the proposed action as a motorized trail and try to restore this area for the animals and quiet recreationists.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 567
Comment#

1 Many roads such as FR 142 that leads to Dome Wilderness area and FR 223 that dead ends at the Iron Gate in the Pecos should be open only to highway legal vehicles and should have seasonal restrictions.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Many roads such as FR 142 that leads to Dome Wilderness area and FR 223 that dead ends at the Iron Gate in the Pecos should be open only to highway legal vehicles and should have seasonal restrictions.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 568
Comment#

1 the current proposed action, in my opinion does not go far enough to remove damaging roads and trails from the map and forecast the impact on areas that are neighboring the roads and trails that were left on for motorized travel.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 569
Comment#

1 The idea that an area might actually have MORE trail building is hard to imagine and justify since there is clearly not enough money for the maintenance of the existing trails. An example of this unacceptable trail building is in the Proposed action where the un-built but proposed connection from the "Crosstown" trail leads to FR 36. The "Crosstown" trail itself is bad enough with its high density impacts but allowing more trail building to occur is completely unacceptable.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 570
Comment#

Letter# 570
Comment#

1 The TM Proposed action should do everything possible to plan road and trail closures that would restrict access to these types of areas and also plan for regular evaluation of the se "hot spots" to determine if the closures that do happen are working to reduce or eliminate illegal traffic.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 571
Comment#

1 Please remove any user-created trails that fall within a previously designated "A" or "D" (sections on the forest service map that have already prohibited cross country travel or are "roadless") from the proposed action maps. These areas have already had lots of tax payers money invested into the original designation and these trails should be considered illegal.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 572
Comment#

1 It is clear that FT 113 is a major "hot spot" for user conflict and that the trail itself is in disrepair and will need money for repair and enforcement.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The southern aspect of the trail itself and it's connection to FR 89 actually run through a section designated “D” where all public motorized vehicle use is prohibited (accroding to my 1990 SFNF map).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Please remove the rest of FT113 (east half) from the proposed action and do not allow motorized traffic in that area as it is unsustainable and contributing to resource damage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 573
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 574

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 574
Comment#

1 Please consider making the southern stretch of FR 291 off of FR 156 over Johnson Mesa closed to motorized vehicle use due to the pre-existing Forest Service "A" designation and the ongoing increase of multiple, user-created spur trails and other abuses of the natural resources in this area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 575
Comment#

Letter# 575
Comment#
1 Closing the road/trail completely 268 near Bland is a travesty. This is a public road that is no longer maintained but frequently [used] by many 4 wheelers and motorcycle. Even though it passes through private property the access through that is very long tem and I am sure that that is not a public road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 576
Comment#
1 It is unbelievable that the USFS is attempting to close roads, trails, and areas to ORV use when the research clearly shows that no one type of activity is any worse or better than any other.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 577
Comment#
1 We need areas for Trials. The proposed areas are entirely inadequate. We are going from the whole forest to 40 acres. This is entirely unacceptable.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 578
Comment#
1 The negative effects of habitat fragmentation described in the literature nearly always refers to the effects of roads on whildlife. Roads and trails have significantly different effects.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 579
Comment#
1 Do not close the trails. I request that all the trails in Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance be kept open, along with all other trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 580
Comment#
0 Duplicate of 581

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 581
Comment#
1 I request that all the trails in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance be kept open. Along with all trails currently open now.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 582
Comment#

Letter# 582
Comment#

1 Claims that OHV cause more resource damage needs to be validated. Modern science shows that motorized impacts are not significantly greater than non-motorized.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 583
Comment#

1 Areas that are prohibited for motorized use in "sensitive" areas in the proposed plan need to be prohibited to all users (hikers, photographers, bird watchers, campers, etc.) not just OHV vehicles because they all contribute to resource damage and groups shouldn't be discriminated against based on usage.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 584
Comment#

1 I feel that this would be a tragic situation. Closing this would just be a very sad situation for our community.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 585
Comment#

1 I don't understand how the areas for dispersed camping can be compress into smaller area. As you force folks to camp together, the overall impact in those areas will be greatly increased.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

1 I don't uinderstand how the areas for dispersed camping can be compress into smaller area. As you force folks to camp together, the overall impact in those areas will be breatly increased.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 586
Comment#

1 By concentrating the parked the opportunity for the vehicles being broken into, stolen and vaandalized is gretly increased.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Also the impact on the forest by parking the vehicles in smaller areas will be increased.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 587
Comment#

Letter# 587
Comment#
0 Duplicate of Letter #586
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 588
Comment#
1 Connect Road 376 to fd 656 via the Guadalupe Crossing.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

1 Connect Rd 376 to Rd 656 via the Guadalupe Crossing.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 589
Comment#
1 Include south end of the hill and dale loop near Crow Springs roads in the DEIS full analysis.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 590
Comment#
1 Include Caja Del Rio routes tha loop around the Blowhole in the DEIS full analysis.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 591
Comment#
1 Include Church Canyon roads in the DEIS full analysis.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 592
Comment#
1 Evaluate the maximum use of volunteers to address road maintenance issues to keep roads open that FS maintenance issues, e.g., manpower, etc are an issue.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Include Rito Del Indio Area inner loop raods in the DEIS ful analysis.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 593
Comment#
1 Include all the motorized routes/roads in the DEIS full analysis.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 594
Comment#

1 Identify and publish exactly what standards that are/were being used to identify and analyzed roads/trails.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 595
Comment#

1 FS do a full analysis if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern. Document the analysis with a full range of options to address the concern. Closing the recreation resources should be the last resort.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 FS do a full analysis if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern. Document the analysis with a full range of options to address the concern. Closing the recreation resource should be the last resort.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 596
Comment#

1 The condition of the "non-system" routes submitted by the OHV users must be evaluated.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The condition of the [user provided] routes should be compared/analyzed against the condition of the system routes the government agencies maintains.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 597
Comment#

1 I an concerned that the designated system will not be properly designed to serve the recreational needs of all motorized users. The focus so far seems to be with two wheel and ATVs, not much on full sized 4x4s. Also loop type roads and trails are not beings addressed.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Experience across the country has shown that a well designed motorized motorized recreational system is primarily based a network of interconnected loops. User compliance and ease of enforcement increases when the system is well designed and meets user needs. Also impact on the fores is spread out instead of being concentrated.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 598
Comment#

1 Include Virgin Canyon roads in the DEIS full analysis

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 599
Comment#

1 Focus on as many as possible loop roads in the DEIS full analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 Focus on as many as possible loop roads in the DEIS full analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 600
Comment#

1 Evaluate the maximum use of volunteers to address road maintneance issues to keep roads open that FS maintenance issues, e.g. $, manpower, etc. are an issue.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 601
Comment#

1 To enable the public to make meaningful timely comments, data must be timely and complete. All documentation that supports the DEIS analysis and its conclusions should be available as soon as the DEIS is published. Maps have to be published with complete information on the FS website the same day as the DEIS is published.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 602
Comment#

1 Please re-evaluate the citizens proposal that NM4W submitted. This proposal addresses the 4x4 (full width) existing roads/trails that have in use for up to 50 years.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 Please re-evaluate the citizens proposal that NM4W submitted.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 603
Comment#

1 The question of how the FS will handle an ever increasing number of OHV users, the FS has said it has no plans.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 604
Comment#

1 The SFNF has 5 miles of designated OHV trails. Five Miles! How many years has OHV recreation been going on in the Jemez? It's quite obvious the SFNF has not given the OHV community much of anything.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 604
Comment#

2 I surely hope the DEIS will reflect a new interest in meeting the needs of the OHV community. For far it looks like "in search of reasons to deny access."

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 605
Comment#

1 I have been informed the eastern side, near HWY4, of the Blue Diamod Cross Country Ski trails is considered a riparian area. This trail could easily be moved to the edge of the surrounding hills and by-pass the area in question. I want this to be considereduin your plan

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 This trail could easily be moved to the edge of the surrounding hills and bye-pass the area in question. I want this to considered in your plan.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 606
Comment#

1 I would hope the FS show analysis that harm is acutally done to a species rather than stating "potential harm." Also if there is harm by OHV's I would expect proof of such harm.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 607
Comment#

1 Motorized trail use should not be banned when other forms of recreation (ie horses) do equal or more damage to the trails and are allowed continued use of the trail.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 608
Comment#

1 If part of a trail has problems the FS should try to correct the problem rather than close the whole trail. Closing trails should be a last resort.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 609
Comment#

1 The proposed action of the SFNF travel management plan creates a major safety issue by rerouting OHV traffic onto FS roads adjacent to Paliza Canyon which are heavily used by full-sized vehicles..

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

1 Provides access for OHV's to the existing trails on both sided of Paliza Canyon while avoiding the heavy vehicle traffic on FS Roads 10, 270, and 266.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 609
Comment#

2 FS Road 271 provides access for Ohvs to the existing trails on both sides of Paliza Canyon while avoiding the heavy vehicle traffic on FS roads 10, 270 and 266. I request that the decision to close FS Road 271 to OHV use be reconsidered or an alternatvie route be proposed to allow ohv access to the existing trails connecting to Paliza canyon from the Ponderosa area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 610
Comment#

1 I do not see a need for more roads but I do not understand why half or more of the forest roads need to be closed.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 If more enforcement is needed, incorporate some of the user groups, i.e., motorcycle clubs, hunting organizations, four-wheel drive clubs and others.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 611
Comment#

1 I tried to follow your links to the proposed OHV use map and could find nothing for New Mexico.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 I would like to urge you to be conservative in your initial closures, allowing the public to continue to have as much freedom as possible to access these public lands.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 612
Comment#

1 More than the proposed 50 out of the already existing 250,400 acres of open areas need to be in the proposal.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 613
Comment#

1 Want to know what specifically what the Forest Service is doing about education.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 Kevin wanted to know specifically what we were going to be doing.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 614
Comment#

Letter# 614
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 In other words, a route will not beconsidered based on soil concerns merely because it lies within a mapped"sensitive soil" area and not because of any site-specific analysis regarding the route's impacts on soils or other natural resources.Such "planning by polygon" is not consistent with Forest Service planningregulations and does not comply with requirements of the NationalEnvironmental Policy Act (NEPA).
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 not consistency with Forest Service planning regulations
Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I request that the SFNF take a site-specific hard look and meaningfully consider the potential environmental impacts of specific routes and alternatives presented to the agency by those who are directly affected by the decision.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation efforts as an alternative to closure.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 Is being presented with a "range" of mangment alternatives where all of the alternatives represent a significant reductjion in OHV opportunity
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives. What the OHV community does not support is being presented with a "range" of management alternatives where all of the alternatives represent a significant reduction in OHV opportunity.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

8 In order to facilitate the formulation of a true range of Alternatives, I formally request that you adopt the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand-alone Alternative or as the basis for an Alternative that attempts to meet the documented increase in OHV recreation.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Formally request that you adopt the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand-alone Alternative or as the basis for an Alternative that attempts to meet the documented increase in OHV recreation. Cumulative loss of motorized and mechanized reacreational opportunity.
There is a documented need to provide motorized trail-based opportunity. Trail experience distinct from road experience.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 614
Comment#

10 The cumulative loss of motorized recreational opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incorporated into the decision making process. Closures are being proposed via other Forest Plan revisions and Travel Management Plans across Region 3. The Bureau of Land Management is also proposing significant closures. The amount of closures has reached a critical mass. Every single mile of motorized route that is open today is extremely important. Further closures will have a larger impact than those in the past.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 There is a documented need to provide motorized trail-based opportunity. Conversely, designated Wilderness and other non-motorized recreation opportunities are plentiful. Alternatives should be developed to meet the need for a motorized trail experience and all alternatives should consider its impacts on motorized recreation opportunities across the entire forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

12 Trail experience distinct from road experience. It is important to recognize the distinction between "trails" and "roads" during this planning process. A true trail experience is highly valued by the recreating public. Providing an arguably adequate road system does not in any way begin to address the demand for motorized single track and ATV trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 615
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 616
Comment#

1 We are aware that some of the user proposed trails have sections that may go through various habitats for threatened or endangered species. I want the Forest to include all those trails in the Draft EIS for analysis. The maps should show specifically what portion(s) of trail overlap habitat areas.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

2 The Forest should calculate the surface area of each trail (length times width) and convert that to acres. The Forest must calculate how much of the surface area of the trail is in the habitat. The amount of surface occupied by a trail should be considered in the decision since it is such a tiny fraction of the habitat areas

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The Forest must also consider that the new policy restricts motorized users to the designated routes, which also protects the habitat from motorized use.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 616
Comment#

4 The Forest must explain why motorized users on 1/2 acre of trail in a 5000 acre habitat are more of a threat then non-motorized users who will still be allowed to use 100% of the habitat. The 1/2 acre of trail represents a fraction of one percent of the habitat. All human uses have impacts, including impacts on habitat and species. The Forest must consider these 'order of magnitude' issues in its decision making.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 I want the Forest to include all those trails in the Draft EIS for analysis

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 617
Comment#

1 I would like to emphasize that as a group we are interested in protecting the area from motorized vehicles so that there will be sustainable wildlife habitat and quiet places for outdorr enjoyment.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 They admitted that these issues were not fully explored and tush one can surmise that any number of redundant roads to in-holdings might be subject to closure. Some of the largest road densities in the proposed plan are in management units that contain these in-holdings.

Public Concern # 19 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Given this criterion I believe there is room for reductions of roads associated with in-holdings.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 The road densities that you have used appear to derive from guidance found in the 1985 SFNF Plan, which has not been subsequently amended.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Most of the management areas listed in your travel management draft show a maximum allowable road density, which is not justified by a study of what number of roads to that area would really meet the spirit of the Travel Rule. I would encourage you to have a closer look at these figures and not just quote them from the perspective of past considerations.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 There are some units in the B, G, M, and N management areas that show relatively high road densities when one considers the forest-wide density of 1.2 mi./sq/ mi. as a marker. Units B-2(2.7 mi. sq. mi.), B-10 (1.5 mi./sq. mi.), B-12 (1.4 mi./sq. mi.), G-34 (1.3 mi./sq. mi.), G-41 (1.4 mi./sq. mi.), M-88 (1.9 mi./sq. mi.) and N-93(1.7 mi./sq. mi) are on the high end of road use, particularly in view of their wildlife management designation. I would like to recommend that unit road densities such as therese be furthere reduced. Lastly, let me point out that special concern should be given to further reduce road densities in areas that contrain cultural resources, i.i. use areas I,P,Q,R,S. Many such cultural resources are fragile and excessive use could destroy their value.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 618
Comment#

Letter# 618
Comment#

1 I;m a horseback rider, hiker, mointain-biker. I can't even use most of the trails out west of Cochiti Mesa any more for several reasons- the trails are in such bad shape, so deep with terrible footing. Not only are the trails themselves treacherous, but the chances of encountering motorcyclists who don't even stop for a horse have increased. Additionally, it's extremely dangerous to meet up with motorcyclists on narrow single-track trails. Finally, being bombarded by the constant buzzinf of the motorcycles and ATVs is not the way I want to spend my "quiet" time out in the forest. If I'd wanted to hear motor vehicle noise, I'd live in the city. I don't ride during the day on weekends on these trails for these reasons. Motorcyclists ' enjoyment of these trails have had a direct and indirect negative impact on my own enjoyment of the mountains. My use of these trails have had absolutely no impact on the motorcyclists' enjoyment.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The FS should consider the density of trails as well as roads, as the motorized trails use also impact the wildlife

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 I also do not support creation of any new trails, e.g. the extension of Crosstown. There are several trails showing up on the map that do not meet the criteria for sustainable, managed use.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 All trails off of 282: 188JA is so eroded at the top with exposed roots and rocks. As the trail follows this narrow, wet canyon, erosion continues and makes it hazardous for other users. Is this really coded as an ATV trail? This is a beautiful canyon that has already been raped by motorized abuse.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Bruce Place-trails off of 188; this goes to Upper Horn Mesa and out the Tin Cup trail. Holy smoesk, this trail is absolutely eroded and unmaintainable. (By the way, last year some yahoo on an ATV cut down 2 beautiful free-standing ponderosas in the meadow near Bruce Place. These trees were left on the ground.)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 the trail that connects 281 with 270DA should not be there at all. It's a cut from 281 down a long, soft, steep hill. It's trenched the whole way thanks to the ATVs and dirt bikes. This "trail" is cut straight up and down.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 From 268 cattle guard to 268AB/188BB. Again the knobby tires have torn up this once pleasant trail to where it's gotten dangerous to ride on. This trail is too soft to be sustainable for motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Cochiti Mesa - 286F 286FA, 286FAD-- there are hundreds of miles of user-made trails accessible from this stretch that there's no way the dirt bikers will stay off them. Ths area is so badly eroded on pumice that it's hard to drive a law enforcement vehicle down that way to enforce this.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 618
Comment#

9 Forest Service roads showing up on the map should be removed becaue they are either redundant or lead right to private property. If you insist on keeping these roads open, the you must, must, must place signage and ENFORCE the no-trespassing. Our gates have been rorn down, fences cut, signs tossed.

Public Concern # 45 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

10 Where is the law enforcement?

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

11 We absolutely need egress for fire. If these roads were kept open, would the Forest Service keep these roads passable? Or would we still have to clear the trees as we've done in the past whether or not the roads are open or closed?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

12 Especially FR 268A does not need to be open. It parallels 268 and leads directly to private property. Legal and better road access to this particular piece of private property is provided from the south via 286.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 There is a spur road from private property along FS 268 that looks like it crosses Forest Service west to more private property. This road as shown on the map does not exist

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

14 The forest service has provided absolutely no signage of where private property is. I would like to see FS 268 closed, but available for fire egress.

Public Concern # 45 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 619
Comment#

1 In 2007 the Cibola national Forest reached an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office, concerning the Travel Management in the Sandia Ranger District. I request that the Santa Fe national Forest seek a similar agreement with SHPO concerning cultural resources on existing roads and trails.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 It is unlikely that there would be any cumulative effects on heritage resources. Numerous past projects have taken place within the analysis area.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I request that where heritage sites are an issue in relation to roads and trails, that the analysis consider the availability of protective measures such as exclosures.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 620
Comment#

1 I request that the Santa Fe National Forest use the guidelines and recommendations for OHV recreation management from the National Off Highway Vehicle Conservation Council.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 NOHVCC has the 'best available science' for designing and managing OHV trail systems.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Our interaction with Santa Fe National Fores staff strongly indicate their lack of OHV recreation experience. They don't understand our requests for exactly those reatures which make a system successful; interconnected ('loop') trails, and plenty of miles and variety.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 In particular, they do not understand why we need 'so many' miles of trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Alternatives should include the goal of creating a ssytem that provides user satisfaction.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 We listen to the Forest staff say ' we can eliminate this trail because there are two routes going to the sme place', and we think 'They don't understand, it's not about getting to someplace.' Maybe the Forest doesn't know the two routes are two different skill levels, or that one provides a particular sort of experience because of topography. But they don’t ask, they just close.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Like non-motorized users, the great majority of our outings are day trips. But we can go farther in an hour than most hikers go in a whole day

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 Region 3 knows that compliance, enforcement and maintenance are going to be necessary for a successful system. None of those goals will be achieved unless there is 'buy-in' from the OHV public on the motorized system you designate.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 The intent of sering the public need should carry into the Range of Alternatives. The Range must be honest and complete, and not just variations on ' how little can we designate.'

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 620
Comment#

10 Until recently the Forest hasn't been aware of how much the OHV'ers have done for all the forest users over the past 30 years. The Media Dia trail provides a lesson in closing a trail to motorized use. Since the Forest did that, we no longer do our spring cleaning to clear the winter deadfall.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 621
Comment#

1 The FS has already eliminated over half the roads from consideration before doing the EIS analysis. It is called 'pre-analysis decision making' and it is not legal.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 All routes that have been submitted, and everything else all the motorized users have been using or ARE using must be considered in the DEIS analysis.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The Forest Service must carefully analyze alternate funding sources (like grants) and the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 The Caja Del Rio network is generally located on the broad mesas between the Rio Grande River and the City of Santa Fe. This network contains approximately 60 miles consisting of these routes: 1. Sage Brush Flats, 12.4 miles, 2. Caja del Rio, 16.2 miles, 3. Tank Trap, 5.7 miles, 4. La Bajada Hill, 15.0 miles. The Proposed Action suggests that the Caja Del Rio area is proposed to be open seasonally. The Sage Brush Flats route has been a traditional destination for the New Mexico 4-Wheelers on New Year's Day. By in large, this area is composed of volcanic rock and traveling these routes in the winter does not damage theses roads. In addition, The Proposed Action has omitted much of the user routes that were submitted to the FS. The entire Caja Del Rio network must be analyzed to be open year round in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 622
Comment#

1 ATV trail in Polvadera area: Concerned about old logging road being closed (map attached). Likes to hunt area…wants to get to the top of mt. on roads and trails that exist.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 623
Comment#

1 We own property that borders the south tip of the Santa Fe National Forest off of FR 74, 5 miles east of Lindrith, NM. Our only access is via FR74 to FR521 which leads to our gate. We understand from your proposal that those who need Forest Service roads to private property will continue to have access. Is there something that we need to do to ensure FR521 (FR74B) remains accessible to us?

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 624
Comment#

Letter# 624
Comment#

1 The SFNF maps are incomplete when the 45-day comment period has already started.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The method of understanding what and why you have closed or open roads/trails is VERY hard to understand.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 625
Comment#

1 Duplicate of 624

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 626
Comment#

1 A smaller number of trails will result in overcrowding and overuse.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 627
Comment#

1 The key recreational criteria is to have loops for different skill levels and variety to prevent overcrowding

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Where are the loops? I have been watching other forest plans and have a loop system

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 628
Comment#

1 Hotmail does NOT support Express Outlook therefore I had to create a Express Outlook acct. to make comments. NMIA informed me this fault is because the site webmaster has not created a link/bridge between the two. My second complaint would be that the margins aren't set for this form allowing you to type out of sight, not being able to read what you have written on both sides. I would like an answer to both of these technical problems from the SFNF webmaster ASAP. After all this is only a 45-day comment period.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 629
Comment#

1 I request that all single track trails defined in the Blackfeathers Trail Preservation Alliance Citizens Proposal be included for analysis in the SFNF Proposed Action

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 630
Comment#
1 The criteria for closing OHV routes must not be stricter than for non OHV routes… It seems to me that cows and horses do far more damage than mtorcycles.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 631
Comment#
1 I request that all single track trails defined in the Blackfeathers Trail Preservation Alliance Citizens Proposal be included for analysis in the SFNF Proposed Action

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 632
Comment#
1 This proposed action will result in fewer visits to the Jemez by motorized single track trail riders resulting in negative economic impacts on the surrounding communities.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 633
Comment#
1 It is quite apparent the maps are incomplete. There are NO maps of what you have closed.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 634
Comment#
1 Out of hundreds of single track trails presented you have already eliminated 90% of the trails! This is NOT in the spirit of the TMR…….FOUL! I demand these trails ALL be considered in the first part of Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 635
Comment#
1 Many other forest have recognized the value of a loop system. This Proposed Action is mostly a series of widely disconnedted single track trail sgments leading to nowhere. The FSNF apears not to have a plan for single track trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 636
Comment#

Letter# 636
Comment#
1 All category I or 2 decommissioned road scould be designated as signel track trails and will over time revert to narrow trails. The SFNF has a very narrow scope in mind for the Jemez Mountains. When in reality it's away from populated areas, meaning it's an hour from AlbQ. Or Santa Fe, with the cost of gasoline fewer people will come on moments notice.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 637
Comment#
1 The scope of this Proposed Action does not recognize that motorcycles require more miles of trails than hikers and severly limits single track trail riding in the Jemez Mountains.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 638
Comment#
1 The scope of your Proposed Action is to narrow to accommodate even present day usersConsidering the large amount of forest motorcycles "can't ride in" the argument that we lessen the motorized recreational experience is not compelling. If hikers don't want hear motorcylces they have roughly 75% of the rest of the forest to recreate in.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 639
Comment#
1 Everything I've been reading about road density makes NO reference to trails. I surely hope the SFNF isn't projecting road density calculating with single track trails. The two are VERY different and have little or no relation to one another.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 640
Comment#
1 I've been riding in the Jemez for twenty years and I have noticed a decline in hikers (except the Calderas). So back to my original statement why are so many trails being taken off the table? Why not use what's already there and build on it for the future?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 641
Comment#
1 This Proposed Action has NO plans for new trails that will be needed for the ever increasing number of people purchasing motorcycles and ATVs. Coupled with private land closures and BLM closures the scope of this plan does not include future users.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 642
Comment#

Letter# 642
Comment#
1 Referring to "user created" single track trails as "unauthorized routes" is deceptive and misleading.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 643
Comment#
1 I feel the SFNF is using the TMR as a tool to shut the public out of what belongs to them in the first place!
Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 644
Comment#
1 I'm confused as to why when so many great trails are already taken care of by volunteer motorcycle people you would want to throw that away?
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 645
Comment#
1 The existing trail network has evolved to meet the needs of the current riding community over the past thirty years. Every trail requested is ridden regularly and maintained by hundreds of volunteer man hours yearly. There are no superfluous trails. All should be considered in the NEPA process.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 646
Comment#
1 The proposed action presented by the SFNF has too many single track trail segments leading to roads which in turn make "trail riding" as I've known it boring. The single track trail riding experience is essentially LOST.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 647
Comment#
1 The roads shown (see map) as seasonally open, and we need to ensure that private inholding remain accessible year round.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 648
Comment#
1 I strongly disagree with the proposed solution for managing motorized travel, for the reasons given below.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I believe a better solution would be provided by a combination of permitting and stiff penalties for failures to comply with rules and regulations.
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 648
Comment#

3 The road closings in the proposed plan would seriously hinder these practices and exacerbate the current fuel overload condidionts

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 Specific small groups, such as ranchers and loggers, require use of all existing roads and trails and sometimes need to create new ones. The much more numerous recreational users do not and should be allowed access to all roads and trails. The proposed plan does not accommodate both groups and worse, by closing off so much of the forests to honest people, it invites dishonest people, into the forests and grasslands.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 Roads and trails, once in place, are essentially not able to be closed, especially to ATVs, without resorting to sever penalties for people who attempt to use them after the closures.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

6 Physical road "closures" always fail to close the existing road or trails, result in increased erosion and land damage, and stimulate the creation of new trails.

Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 Signs don't work because after years of USFS psoting temporary signs, such as for forest closures due to fire danger, and never taking them down when they expire, nobody pays attention to USFS signs.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 The only way to close a road or trail is to make the penalties for using them so severe that people are afraid to risk using them, even if it is unlikely they will be caught.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

9 It is ludicrous to for the USFS to expect the major funding increases and personnel expansion associated with the proposed plan. Even if such increases were possible, their increased off-highway presence would counteract any benefits resulting from reductions in public use.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 The USFS should institute a permitting system with very stiff penalties or failure to compl.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

11 Please don't try to make one set of rules for all users and be forced into unreasonable monitoring. It will not work. Please devise a system (for example, the permitting system I have proposed) that is flexible enough to accommodate the changing needs of different users in different areas and enfoce it by making it uneconomical and unreasonable for them not to comply.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 649
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 650
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 651
Comment#

1 I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed action for managing motorized travel by providing access to off road vehicles in the national forest.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

2 The blatant destruction that I have seen and have worked on has proven to me that the off road vehicles and atvs just don't belong there.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I am also not inclined to believe that the self-policing of off road and atv drivers is possible

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 652
Comment#

1 Map does not identify the proposed closed segments by name. The public cannot correlate between map and road table. These is no way for the public to identiy by name any closed segments which they way to keep open. This makes it difficult for the public to communicate its needs and desires to the agency

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

2 The map does not provide an accurate picture of the Existing Condidtion since it omits more than half of the existing routes inventoried in the Roads Table

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

3 Proposing to close roads without considering access to trails for motorcycles and ATVs restricts the analysis of those trails

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 653
Comment#

1 The access to the single track trail system in the jemez mountains which has been used by motorcyclists for over 30 years has been severely reduced by your proposed action. The access points to FR31, FR19, FR100 FR316, FR268, and FR289 in the north Jemez are all load in points to the trail system . This gives riders a new opportunity to ride different trails without over using any one trail. By selecting only two access points as currently proposed the trail heads will be severely impacted.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 654
Comment#

1 Please keep all single-track motorcycle trails open and do not allow ATVs to widen the motorcycle trails.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 654
Comment#

2 Having many miles of trails to choose from lessens each person's impact on any particular trail.Please keep them all open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 655
Comment#

1 The access to the single track trail system in the jemez mountains which has been used by motorcycles for over 30 years has been severely reduced by your proposed action. The access points to the FR31, FR19, FR100, FR316, FR268, and FR289 in the north Jemez are all load in points to the trail system. This gives riders a new opportunity to ride different trails without over using any one trail. By selecting only two access points as currently proposed the trail heads will be severely impacted.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 656
Comment#

1 If you don't want to maintain old logging roads, ok don't, but don't tell people they can't use them at their own risk. Keep roads, keep access to the forests open for all not just back packers and horsemen.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 657
Comment#

1 The FS has imitted a significant segment of the off-road riding public who do NOT ride trails or for distances, the Observed Trails rider. Usage of thse lightweight and quiet machines is completely benign and non-damaging, foccused largely in indestructible arroyo bottoms or nearby. The revised policy must allow the incidental use of Observed Trails motorcycles anywhere. Their design prevents them from being used on trails for very far and the lack of attention to the needs of this riding group makes the policy seriously flawed.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 658
Comment#

1 The policy should be discussing new riding areas and expansion of off-roading opportunities not the other way around. Quid pro quo is in order. Ignoring the recreational needs of the public willl lead to complete failure and disrespect regardless of whatever good intentions there might have been.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I would like to demand full access to ride on at least all the trails in The Blackfeathers Trail Preservation Alliance (BTPA) Citizens Proposal. Those who ride to go distances need at least 100 miles of new single-track trail per outing. There are about a dozen outings per year not including the outings that repeat the same trail. This means that the Forest Service should allow about 1200 to 2000 miles of single-track trail in the Santa Fe National Forest, complete with loops and connections.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 659
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 660
Comment#

1 I would like to endorse the BTPA Citizens Proposal

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I prefer to ride longer loops, sometimes as much as 90 miles, narrowing the riding area for some who only use 5-10 miles a day hinders others and makes congestion and safety concerns, with more land comes less chances for ingury due to overpacked trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 661
Comment#

1 Please consider severely limiting the ATV and motorcycle access into forest land.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Not only do these vehicles tear up the environment, there is a serious safety issue for people walking and horse back riding.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 662
Comment#

2 It is unfair to allow a larger group of voters to cut off the rights of a smaller group

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I suggest that the Policy consider alternatives like 'seasons' for individual types of activities so there are no conflicting overlaps.

Public Concern # 17 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I suggest that this Policy be altered to include all the trails in The Blackfeathers Trail Preservation Alliance (BTPA) Citizens Proposal and address the future increases in trails that will be necessary to accommodate the riding public.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 663
Comment#

1 Not a bad plan but no enforcement plan that is realistic.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 663
Comment#

2 Need to put up signs!!
Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 Need to have gates.
Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 664
Comment#

1 Motorized vehicles do irrepaable damage to unpaved paths, trails, roads.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I believe the off road industry should create, own and developed private tracts for the use of motorcycles, AtVs, etc.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 665
Comment#

1 We need to keep more trails open to spread uasage out or you will overuse trail systems.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We need loop trail systems langer than 10 miles for motorcycles.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I support the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 666
Comment#

0 No comment, mailing list request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 667
Comment#

1 Your current proposal shutts down more than three quarters of the area I use in the Santa Fe National Forest. The Pecos area and Jemez are my greatest concerns. To be more specific in the Pecos area around Barillas Peak to Elk Mountain. To many roads around Elk Mountain are all ready shut.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 The numbers at your meetings really shouldn't affect your decisions. As one person I really don't feel that I can make a difference in this situation, is that right?
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 667
Comment#

2 The condition of the routes should be compared/analyzed to the condition of system routes the agency maintains, both in and outside the Wilderness areas. The criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringet for OHV routes than for non-OHV routes.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 668
Comment#

1 I am writing today to request that all trails in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation be kept open!!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 669
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 670
Comment#

1 I would like to thank the USFS for their efforts to develop a pan to end the conflicts and rangeland dstruction that now are happening as a result of rampant OHV recreation on Glorieta Mesa and elsewhere

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 I support the proposal to enlist assistance from the State Game and Fish Dept. I addition, I suggest that a broader "Joint Powers Agreement " be executed with the entier state gonverment and with the various counties ,to bring into the effort of the State Foresty Dept, and the various county sheriff depts in the planning/comment stage and vest them with appropriate police powers on federal lands.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 In lieu of chasing in vehicles, I would propose, as I did at the aforesaid meeting, that methods be instituted to intercept the violates at the entracnes to the NF.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Ultra-light aircraft - I would suggest that these aircraft be adopted as a primary enforcement device, and existing USFS personnel be cross-trained to fly them. This is nothing that isn't routinely done elsewhere in the world, and done safely.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I think a similar penalty, on the state level, could be enacted, and ORV violators would lose their vehicles on the spot, and have to either walk home or pay a law officer a fee to drive him/her home

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 I would like to be on record as supporting the alternative put forth by State Senator Phil Griego, following his consultation with local residents, esp grazing permitees

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 671
Comment#

1 I support the current proposal to limit motorized vehicle use in the Forest Road 79 area only to FR 79 and the Garcia Ranch road. Given the nature of the local terrain, the soil types, and the residential aspect of this area, this is a fiar balance of use for the various types of recreation that national forest land is used for.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

1 I support the current proposal to limit motorized vehicle use in the Forest Road 79 area only to Forest Road 79 and the Garcia Ranch Road. Given the nature of the local terrain, the soil types, and the residential aspect of this area, this is a fair balance of use for the various types of recreation the National Forest land is used for.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 672
Comment#

1 The small number of trails included in the proposal is completely unacceptable to the single track motorcycle community. The trails included are a disconnected assortment that require long connecting stretches on major forest roads to combine into any kind of reasonable loop.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We insist that all single trails submitted by the Black-feather Trail Preservatioin Alliance be included in the EIS analysis phase.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The small number of trails included in the proposal is completely unacceptable to the single track motorcycle community. The trails included are a disconnected assortment that require long connecting stretches on major forest roads to combine into any kind of reasonable loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We insist that all single trails submitted by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance be included in the EIS analysis phase. We will resubmit our proposal as an alternate and resubmit our GPS tracks.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 673
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 674
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 675
Comment#

Letter# 675
Comment#
0 Not A Comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 676
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 677
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 678
Comment#
0 Attachment duplicate of the Blackfeather Citizen's proposal. Analyzed elsewhere.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 679
Comment#
0 not a comment/ documentation of an OHV incident
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

1 I just wanted to pass along the attached reports of OHV trespass or illegal activity to the Santa Fe's law enforcement officer, but I see that the position is vacant. I hope that you can pass these along to the appropriate person. Also this website may be of interest to you: http://flickr.com/groups/721484@N20/
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 680
Comment#
1 The small number of trails included in the propsal is completely unacceptable to the single-track motorcycle community. The trails included are a disconnected assrotment that require long connecting stretches on major forest roads to combine into any kind of reasonable loop.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We insist that all single trails submitted by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance be included in the EIS analysis phase. We will resubmit our proposal as an alternate and resubmit our GPS tracks.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 681
Comment#

Letter# 681
Comment#

1 I am writing to ask for strong laws and adequete budgets to manage motorized recreation on public lands.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 682
Comment#

1 I request that all trails in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance "Citizens Proposal" be kept open.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 683
Comment#

1 With all the motorized vehicles limited to only Forest Road 79 and Garcia Ranch Road, I feel that this is a good plan that you have developed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I support you plan fully.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 684
Comment#

1 The Forest Service doesn't have the funding or the manpower to maintain the tail system.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 the dispersed camping restrictions are unrealistic and will again restrict our use of the forest.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 you have missed the mark on the dispersed camping issue and need to allow dispersed camping in more areas and further distance from the roadway
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 685
Comment#

1 Observed Trials (note trials, not trails) is almost completely left out. We are provided only a small area in lakefork canyon.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The trails that are listed are very limited.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The trails reccommended in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance citizen proposal would much more closely meet your stated goals.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 the mandate from the federal government was to document the uses, not to eliminate them and the current plan eliminates far too many.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 686
Comment#

1 Could you have volunteers as they do for sherriff's who are deputies.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 It would be great in the beginning of enforcement use to see that laws are there and signs designated which explain who can use them especially on main forest roads entrances.
Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 Fines could be implemented too so you have monies to develop programs.
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 687
Comment#

1 This route (263b) should continue to be Non-system, private access, access for administrative use by the Forest Service and use of any fire, military, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle for emergency purposes.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 688
Comment#

1 I am writing to urge that all existing trails in the Jemez Mountains continue to remain opoen to public usage via off road motorcycles.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

Letter# 689
Comment#

0 Not a Comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 690
Comment#

0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 691
Comment#

1 Mr. Romero owns property in section 6 on the attahced map. He needs a FS road open to the public for legal access to his property. He uses the road that we mistakenly did not designate to keep, shown on the attached map as a black road. We apparently believed he uses road 326u, as shown. He does not need that road, but does need the other road, along with road 612D, to access his property.
Ms. Eva Woods informed me this AM that she does not need continuation of road 326U as it turns southwest and enters her private property in sec 17, so apparently 326U could come off
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 692
Comment#

0 not a comment. Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 693
Comment#

1 Please keep forest road 106 from Thompson Ridge to forest road 144 open as it is an important link.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Forest road 106 from Thompson Ridge to forest road 144 Please keep forest road 106 from Thompson Ridge to forest road 144 open as it is an important link.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 694
Comment#

1 I want the FS TO CONSIDER 'No Action" on pursuing this Travel policy because it will not accomplish the intended result nor will it provide a baseline.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The FS should do a study of how to obtain novel sources of resources and take no action on the policy until this is done. When the FS finds better resources, all trails will be able to stay open.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 695
Comment#

1 The proposed plan does not adequately allow for the sport of Observed Trials. Each district must have areas or corridors set aside where Trials riding may be practiced or organized events held.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 696
Comment#

1 For all these reasons I would recommend removing Trail 375G and 53 from the map, closing it to the public, and putting up a gate.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 In general, I an very encouraged by the plan. I appreciate the care and attention that have been given, and I understand it is difficult to balance all the different needs.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 697
Comment#

1 I suggest that under the new policy, the permitting procces for OHV use outside of previously approved areas and trails be streamlined so that users are able to obtain same day permits for incidental one day use. This could work for allowing OHV retrieval of big game as well as insignificant OHV usage by a family visiting the forest for day use.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 698
Comment#

1 The road pointed to on the map is not needed for access to the private parcel in section 17- they access their land from the west via County Road 51D. The other road shown as open to street legal vehicles to the west of the road pointed to is also not needed for access. Both roads should not be shown.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Ms Woods also comments that the FS has the right to close the Forest to ATVs any time when they are damaging resources. She's concerned about noise and traffic harrasing wildlife and causing displacement of wildlife. She asked what penalties will be imposed for violations of the designation. She also asked how many new staff people we will have for enforcement.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 699
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that the DEIS fully and thoroughly analyze ALL of the existing routes on the SFNF. This includes both the entire Forest Service road system and all user created routes and trails. Literally thosands of miles of existing system roads and a significant portion of the user crated route and trails have apparently already been excluded fron full analysis by pre- DEIS decision aking. This does not meet the needs of CEQ 40.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 A No Action Alternative in the case of the SFNF Travel Management would, by dafinition, have to include ALL of the current FS system roads and ALL of the other routes that are currently being used by the entire population of the users.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 700
Comment#

0 Not a comment/ correspondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 701
Comment#

0 Not a comment / correspondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 701
Comment#

1 I respectfully insist that the FS do a full anlysis of options if a road/rout/trail is identified as a resource concern. Please provide documented analysis of a full range of options on rorrecting the concern. Closure of the recreation resource should be the LAST resort.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 702
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Cover email for Comment form letter number 178

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 703
Comment#

1 the ability to enjoy and camp in the National Forests should be readily accessable to all without undue and onerous restrictions on what roads one can travel and where one can responsibly camp.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Severely restricting camping locations will excessively concentrate existing campers into small areas leading to increased camping problems such as waste management, noise management, an inabilty to obtain privacy and seclusion for enjoyment of the National Forests. Furthermore, the excessive road closures will impact legitimate access for hunting, cattle management and wood gathering.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Furthermore, the excessive road closures will impact legitimate access for hunting, cattle management and wood gathering.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Although I do not own or utilize a motorcycle, this is the group of users that do the most trail maintenance of any group.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 Although I recognize the scarring that takes place with true "off road" useage, the multitude of existing routes in the forest provide ample opportunity for all without creating major erosion problems and excessive scarring of the lands and while still allowing access to properly equipped and driven vehicles by responsible operators.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 who exactly is going to enforce these proposed arcane restrictions and rules. I have spent a large amount of time in the forests primarily hiking, mountain biking and camping. It already is extremely unusual to see people in the backcountry routes in any motorized vehicle, much less a bona fide Forest Service ranger.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 704
Comment#

Letter# 704
Comment#
0 Not a comment, correspondence .
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 705
Comment#
1 I would like to make a rquest to leave Forest rd 106 open from Thompson Ridge to Forst rd 144
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 706
Comment#
1 I request that you take the No Action alternative for the Sante Fe National Forest.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 707
Comment#
0 Not a comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 708
Comment#
1 FR 310 would be closed at the gate- camping would be alowed, but for only one car length- this would not fit into how Mr. Grzegorek explained to me how he currently camps.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 709
Comment#
1 I would like to request that all existing singletrack trails are included in the scoping study. Please refer to the Blackfeather proposal for a list fo trails.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 710
Comment#
1 it is essential to have interconnected singletrack loops to ride. The loops should be 15-60 miles long, depending on rider ability.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 711
Comment#
1 Short singletrack trail segments connected by roads do not allow for a positive riding experience, please consider giving us loops of singletrack trails.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 712
Comment#
1 We need a large singletrack trail network in order to keep user density and therefoe erosion to a minimum.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 713
Comment#
1 Please consider opening Media Dia trail for motorizd singletrack usage, at least seasonally.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 714
Comment#
1 with some guidance and federal trail fund resources we could and will take the volunteer effort to the next level with much more erosion control, build bridges for stream crossings, putting up signs, etc.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 717
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Currespondence with FS
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 718
Comment#
1 Is it possible to obtain the specialist reports that were used to develop the TAP for the Santa Fe?
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 719
Comment#
1 We respectfully request that the DEIS fully and toroughly analyze every single one of the existing routes that have been identified and submitted for consideration by the user community. To exclude any of them does not meet the requirements of CEQ 40.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The SFNF must include a range of alternatives. The range of alternatives must consider the whole range of resonable alternatives. Certainly a single-track trail network utilized by motorcyclists for 30 years qualifies as 'reasonable'. If it wasn't for reasonable, the FS would not have let it happen for those thirty years and let it continue to this day!
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 719
Comment#

3 In order to provide the whole range of alternativs, at lease one of the alternatives MUST include the ENTIRE trail and road network proposed. Eliminating a portion of the roads and trails from consideration via pre-EIS decision making makes it impossible for the FS to meet the requirements of the CEQ.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 Again, eliminating a portion of the proads and trails from consideration via pre-EIS decision making makes it impossible for the FS to meet the requirements of the CEQ.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 720
Comment#

1 Maintain your goal of preserving forest areas for future generations by keeping motorized off-road vehicles out of the forest, period Motorized off-road vehicles drivers do not stay on roads.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

Letter# 721
Comment#

1 My recent comments have not had a returned email confirming that they were received.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 722
Comment#

1 I am concerned that all motorized routes on the SFNF are not included in the analysis. I am writing to insist that all routes, including those screened out by the Travel Analysis Process (TPA), be included in the full EIS analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 723
Comment#

1 I would like to comment on the proposed ATV/ORV ecreation site west and just north of Aspen Ranch off of Pacheco Canyon Road. I strongly oppose the use of any motor driven vehicles in this, or any other part of our National Forest with the exceptiion of Forest Service and emergency vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 724
Comment#

1 We respectfully equest that the analysis within the EIS inclukde a full definitiion of exactly what standards are being applied for analyzing roads, trails and aareas for inclusion as part of the MVUM.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 724
Comment#

2 Alternative identification, analysis and subsequent decisions making must be based on actual conditions and data, not generalized overlay maps, general opinions by staff, or anticipated potential impacts unless they are aactively applying those saame filters to all other uses on the forest. Applying a higher standard to motorized use than other uses is arbitrary and capricious.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 725
Comment#

1 Closing forest roads 10 from legal licensed OHV's as in the proposed action will greatly reduce access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Also restricting forest roads near residential areas also restricts access for those having OHV's that can legally ride any where else in the state.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 726
Comment#

1 Forest Rd 10 and Forest Rd 266. On Forest Rd 10 to maake bout 30 mile loop.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 727
Comment#

1 Please keep Forest Road 106 open from Thompsen ridge to Forest Road 144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 728
Comment#

1 With heavy emphasis on regulation and administrative control you antagonize members of the public instead of enlisting them to help you.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

2 Instead of solely relying on closure how about regulations and fees at the source of purchase.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 729
Comment#

1 I support the proposed trail network put forth by the Blackfeathers Trail Preservation Alliance

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 729
Comment#

2 Those of us that ride these trails also work very hard to maintain them.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 730
Comment#

1 I suggest that a visual inspection of every mile of trail is required for proper assessment of condition… I do not think you are arriving at the correct solution unless you travel each mile of trail in question and I believe this is a correct observation for both the retention and removal of trails.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 731
Comment#

1 In the resulting EIS, the analysis should include a detailed explanation on how closing nearly 5,000 miles of existing Forest Service system roads meets or supports the Forest Service's task of meeting the threat of "unmanaged recreation, including the effects of unmanaged off-highway vehicles".

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 There is nothing in the Proposed Action which addresses the public's recreation needs, either quantitatively or qualitatively, for now or in the future. To the contray, the Proposed Action appears to contradict the wording in the Foret Plan.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 It is entierely counter-intuitive how eliminating roads and trails withing the forest help to meet the TMR's intent of tackling the issue of unmanaged off-highway vehicles.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 732
Comment#

1 Roads 435 and 435G are both needed for access into both parcels of property. The Forest Service only will give access to property through one road 435G which is unfair because of the terrain is very hilly and would cost my family money considerable amount to re-due another road to other parcel of property. I would appreciate it very much if the FS would give us access to Road 435 and proposed road 435G.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 733
Comment#

1 I have received no confirmation for comments that I submitted regarding the TMP Scoping and am concerned that they are not being received and read.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 734
Comment#

Letter# 734
Comment#

1 I am a supporter of the Black Feather Trail Preservation Alliance Citizens Proposal. I am very disappointed with the Proposed action… It has ignored the entire Black freather proposals request for amount of milage, single track trail and loops, leaving a trail system that is not appealing in any way.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 735
Comment#

1 How can the Forest Service say that it needs to be reduced to 142 mi? Not fair!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 736
Comment#

1 With more people using the SFNF the plan is to reduce access? The Travel Management Plan does not make sense.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 737
Comment#

1 The agency proposed action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

2 The SFNF must develop a true range of alternatives

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

3 Proposed Planning Issue A: Cumulative loss of motorized and mechanized recreational opportunity. The cumulative loss of motorized recreation opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incorporated into the decision making process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 There is a documented need to provide motorized trail-based opportunity.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Trail experience distinct from road experience. It is important to recognize the distinction between trails and roads during the planning process. A true trail experience is highly valued by the recreating public.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 738
Comment#

1 With more people using the S.F.N.F. the plan is to reduce access?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 739
Comment#

1 2. When you design the travel management system for the SFNF, please be aware that trail riding is highly dependent on loops orroutes that start in one rea and make a loop back to that area. It's even better if thes loops are "one-way" so that travel by everyone is in the same direction.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

2 Please analze your trail maintenance program carefully. The trail riders do much of the trail maintenane for you and if you close too many of the esisting trails, people will lose interest and the trails will not get maintained. This means that emergency response teams will not be able to access the area after only a few years .

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

3 Somethin as simple as odd numbered days for motorized travel and even numbered days for horses and hikers would go a long way toward compatible rules. And in the truth were told, the travel of motorcycles over these trails leaves ther trail itself in far better shape for biclycles, hikers and horses.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 740
Comment#

1 Julie Bain's comment at the meeting in Albuquerque thqt the Proposed Action 'balances' what the OHV'ers want and what the environmentalists want. Political demands should not be a criteria used to eliminate roads and tails. And doing that before the NEPA process starts (before the Notice of Intent was issued) is 'pre-analysis decision making and it not legal.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 741
Comment#

1 My concern is that the Forest Service has declined to include all USFS marked roads and trails within its boundaries in its count for motorized travel recuction.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

2 There are currently sufficient designated wilderness areas in New Mexico, without hikers and horseback riders reducing the quality of even more areas currently used for motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 It is my felling that having insufficient Forest Service enforcement personnel to patrol this large area as the reason for such massive closures is akin to closing Intertate 40 because several Highway patrol officers are on vacation or sick leave,.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 Please stop the reduction of quality motorized recreatin in the Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 741
Comment#

5 There are many of us who enjoy the use of off highway vehicles, who for various reasons cannot hike or ride horses to the remote locations we have loved over the years.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 742
Comment#

1 I want to request that the following trail remain open and accessible to motorized recreation: Forest Road 271N connecting Paliza Canyon Road 271 and Forest Road 280 to the Channel 2 towers.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 743
Comment#

1 FR 270D between the Paliza Canyon road (FR271) and FR270 to Cerro Pelado.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 744
Comment#

1 Leave the entire length of Paliza Canyon road (FR271) open to motorized recreation because it is the gateway to areas that OHV users have enjoyed and maintained for decades.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 745
Comment#

1 Leave open: FR270D between the Paliza Canyon road (FR271) and FR270 to Cerro Pelado; the entire length of Paliza Canyon Road (FR271) open to motorized recreation because it is a gateway to ares that OHV users have enjoyed and maintained for decades; Forest Road 106 between Thompson Ridge and the Rio San Antonio creek crossing is a beautiful OHV trail and I request that it be preserved for future motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

1 Please include ATVs along with snowmobiles as allowable motorized recreation in the forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 746
Comment#

1 Forest Road 106 between Thompson Ridge and the Rio San Antonio creek crossing is a beautiful OHV trail and I request that it be preserved for future motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 747
Comment#

Letter# 747
Comment#

1 Please include ATVs along with snowmobiles as allowable motorized recreation in the forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 748
Comment#

1 The proposed closures would negatively impact OHV and other motorized use on the Santa Fe National Forest, and these closures have been proposed without sufficient site specific data to justify the closures.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 749
Comment#

1 As an avid OHV enthusiast I am extremely concerned about the Santa Fe National Forest's (SFNF) Travel Plan and the process it used to formulate the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The SFNF must develop a true range of alternatives.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I request that you adopt the following Planning Issues. Cumulative loss of motorized and mechanized recreational opportunity.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Alternatives should be developed to meet the need for motorized trail experience and all alternatives should consider its impacts on motorized recreation opportunities across the entire forest.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Trail experience [is] distinct from road experience.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 750
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 I request that the SFNF take a site specific hard look and meaningfully consider the potential environmental impacts of specific routes and alternatives presented to the agency by those who are directly affected by the decision.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 I also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation efforts as an alternative to closure.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

4 The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives. The off-highway vehicle community generally supports designating roads and trails for motorized use.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives. The off-highway vehicle community generally supports designating roads and trails for motorized use.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 We also support thorough environmental review and analysis in route designation process, as well as ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the OHV infrastructure.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

7 What the OHV community does not support is being presented with a “range” of management alternatives where all of the alternatives represent a significant reduction in OHV opportunity.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

8 I formally request that you adopt the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand-alone Alternative or as the basis for an Alternative that attempts to meet the documented increase in OHV recreation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Cumulative loss of motorized and mechanized recreational opportunity. The cumulative loss of motorized recreational opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incorporated into the decision making process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 Alternatives should be developed to meet the need for a motorized trail experience and all alternatives should consider its impacts on motorized recreation opportunities across the entire forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 Trail experience distinct from road experience It is important to recognize the distinction between “trails” and “roads” during this planning process. A true trail experience is highly valued by the recreating public. Providing an arguably adequate road system does not in any way begin to address the demand for motorized single track and ATV trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 751
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 752
Comment#
1 In the interest of preserving a loop road, please consider keeping open FR268C between the Media Dia Canyon road (FR268) and FR188A.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 753
Comment#
1 The suspended sediments in our rivers abd streams that occur as a result of erosion from roads have a terrible impact on the health of riverine ecosystems
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I am all for shutting down as many roads as possible, and rigorously enforcing appropriate restrictions.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 754
Comment#
1 I am very interested in having Forest Roads 188F and 188FD, from 188 to private property above the upper pond in Media Dia Canyon, remain open to access the pond and the old pack trail cabin.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 755
Comment#
1 Leave the following road/trail open: Forest Rd 268 from above the Bland gate north to the private property line, in the interest of preserving a loop road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 756
Comment#
1 In the interest of preserving a loop road, please consider keeping open FR 268BC between the Media Dia Canyon road (FR 268) and FR 188A. Although the road crosses private property
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 757
Comment#

Letter# 757
Comment#

1 I am very interested in having Forest Roads 188F and 188FD, and FR 188 to the private property above the pond in upper Media Dia Canyon, remain open to access the pond and the old pack trail cabin.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 758
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that you give consideration to leaving the following road/trail open; Forest Road 268 from above the Bland gate north to the private property line, in the interest of preserving a loop road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 759
Comment#

1 Allowing increased recreational off road traffic in our national forests is a disgrace.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 At best these vehicles are unsafe.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The noise, pollution and increased wear and tear on the already fragile system should not be considered.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 I've been around them hiking Pacheco Canyon and one 10 year-old on a dirt bike ruined it for approximately ten hikers and more than a few mountain bike riders.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 760
Comment#

1 Leave the following road/trail open: Forest Rd 268 from above the Bland gate north to the private property line, in the interest of preserving a loop road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 761
Comment#

0 Cover letter to comments. See letter number 1069 for comments

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 762
Comment#

Letter# 762
Comment#
0 not a comment. Info Request.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 763
Comment#
1 Road 990 close permanently
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 764
Comment#
0 See comment 655 for comments.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 765
Comment#
1 FR 270 There are only a few connector routes to other trails that would form a loop. The area between FR 270 and FR 268 needs to be reevaluated and some loops for ATVs put in place.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 There is a definite shortage of designated routes or connector routes between Paliza Canyon and Peralta Canyon. We would like to see some nice routes between Fr 10 and Fr206 and 271 in the Paliza and Peralta Canyon area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 This area already has user-made routes there, it offers some very satisfying rides with varying degrees of difficulty.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Establish connector routes between 271 JB and 266NA in order to make a loop. The designation from MC only to Atv mc should be made. Would be a nice loop.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 By adding 371L and 271 from 270 DA to s71JB would also make for a nice loop ride that is currently designated mc only. By making these few changes you can make some nice loops for ATVs. Most routes for ATVs are turn around routes, up and back. Which is doubling up the traffic, wear and tear on trail. Loops offer a much more satisfying ride and are easier on the trail evironment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 766
Comment#
1 Kevin said that after talking to several of his neighbors in Cochiti Canyon, they have reached a consensus among their group that the Forest Service needs to remove several roads designated on the propsed action.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 766
Comment#

2 There are at least two separate roads leading to the north end of Del Norte Estates inholding. We should also remove from the proposal the routes that go from Del Norte Estates south to the Seligman property and should force the Seligmans to access their property through Bland Canyon so that the public doesn't use roads on Cochiti Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 I explained that we went over this several times and the reason those roads were deisignated was because of our discussions with landowners in that area who requested wildfire egress from those routes to the Peralta Canyon Road as this is a somewhat fire prone area. Kevin did recall this but said we were opening up an ATV super highway directly to this guy's property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 767
Comment#

0 Duplicate of letter # 522

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 768
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that all standards which are to be applied for the purpose of identifying and analyzing trails included in the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal be precisely defined and published in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 769
Comment#

1 I want the trail known as "Broken Arrow" (Lat/Long: 35.02851,106.56130) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 770
Comment#

1 Would you leave FR286F/FA open to jeeps for another half mile or so?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 771
Comment#

1 Thank you for leaving open FR378 down Barley Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 772
Comment#

Letter# 772
Comment#

1 Thank you for leaving open FR31 in Rio del Oso.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 773
Comment#

1 I do not agree with the philosophy of closing roads and opening single track trails for motorized use.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 While I agree that the single-track trail users should have some trails, I think that you have gone too far in restricting jeeps on old roads, yet allowing single-track usage.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 774
Comment#

1 The damage caused by these users is heinous, obnoxious, destructive, dangerous, and careless.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 my personal opposition to any further erosion of quiet recreational use of the forest by giving in to motorized and non-motorized mechanical transport by ORV's, bikers, and their drivers, young and old.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

3 to listen to quiet, it's a powerful sound, but increasingly rare to find. Let's keep our national forests as a sanctuary and preserve from the din and noise of everything except nature and our enjoyment of it in peace and quiet.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 775
Comment#

1 Regarding recreational ORV use on Glorieta / Rowe Mesa -- oil and water do not mix, never will, no matter how much you stir. By the same token, ranching and recreational ORV use do not and never will mix.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 In addition, an unnecessary amount of land is being set aside for camping. It needs to be cut WAY down.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 776
Comment#

1 There is a route from Porter Landing, which follows Bales Canyon until it turns up the ridge and goes to the top of San Miguel Canyon where it intersects FS 535. At the intersection the route in question has a sign reading 535B
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 777
Comment#

1 As you inventory routes for inclusion in the transportation plan, it is important that all routes be considered

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 If a route has been used as a motorized trail, does not closely duplicate another route, and does not badly degrade the environment, it should be left open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 778
Comment#

1 A road along the east side of the Guadalupe River. This is a good example of a route which is redundant (with respect to FS 376 along the west side of the river) My point is that during times of high water in the Guadalupe, it would be nice to be able to go by way of Porter Landing when accessing one of the grades to Holiday Mesa or Stable Mesa..

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 779
Comment#

1 I would like to request that Paliza Canyon Trail (Forest Road 271) remain open, along its entire length. This trail gives access to an amazing rock formation known as the Goblin Rocks.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Many of those who enjoy the forest are old, handicapped, or otherwise debilitated to some extent, making long hikes prohibitive - in such cases an ATV or 4WD vehicle offer the only close access to such spots.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 780
Comment#

1 I am very concerned about the lack of enforcement or available enforcement proposed for Gloretta Mesa and other National Forests in the Santa Fe Area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 How are there going to be controls on activities with only one officer for the entire National Forest complex. I just don't get it.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 781
Comment#

1 I would like to urge you to carefully limit the trails for motorized vehicles, specifically AATV recreational ones, on the Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

2 there are not the policing resources to insure against damage and misuse of this area.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 782
Comment#

1 Please maintain the restrictions on off-road vehicles which were contained in your original plan.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 783
Comment#

1 regarding Proposed Clsure of Forest Roads or Vehicle Use, Forest Road 656M (From FR376 @ Porter to FR565 on Holiday Mesa). I and many concerned local off road enthusiasts would like to request this connecting trail remain open to vehicle access.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 784
Comment#

1 I am against its use by ORV in areas also used by hunters, hikers, fishing and horsetrails. The ORVs inherent noise, speed and aggressive wheel treads threaten the natural wildlife and appearance of the forets.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I can only suggest the creation of a special ORV section for their exclusive use. A separate area chosen for its challenging topography and consistent with motorized users needs but that also can be sacrifised for their specific activity.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 785
Comment#

1 Forest Road 650 and associated subtrails. I would like to protest the proposed closure of this FR, which gives motorized access to the unusual rock formations of Vanado and Joaquin Mesa in the Deer Creek Prospect area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I regularly bring my disable father here to camp, he would be unable to hike to this place.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 786
Comment#

1 I remain adamantly opposed to ORV being allowed in the SFNF… especially the land near/surrounding Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I believe the new Proposed Action plan is relatively fair

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 I strongly request you not increase the number of miles for dirt bikers.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 787
Comment#

1 Off-road vehicles have no place in our Nationa Forests.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 All they do is destoy the prestine habitat and upset all the natural residents of the forest, the wildlife that lives there.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 788
Comment#

1 I like trail 424 in lower Medio Dia Canyon for hiking.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I see that about 2 miles of FR 268 is lated to be closed. Closing this portion of the road is fine, but I would like to be assured that non-motorized access will be maintained through the private parcel along FR 268 so that I can access the lower Medio Dia, and other trails and areas, by using FR268 from the north.
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 I would like to see FR268D (or 268DD - I can't tell) closed at the top of the ridge and not allow motorized use into Colle Canyon and Albermarle.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 789
Comment#

1 Thank you for allowing keep access into upper Medio Dia Canyon.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I would be happy to see the road closed at the bottom of the canyon; it does not need to continue to the private property.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 790
Comment#

1 Thank you for leaving FR 282 open to jeeps as far as the trailhead for the Bearhead Ridge trail.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 791
Comment#

1 I would like to see FR 280 open to where the trail does down into Peralta Canyon. I believe that you have motorcycle access to this point but no jeep access. I would like to have jeeping access to this trailhead.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 792
Comment#

Letter# 792
Comment#

1 You are proposing to close all of lower Polvadera to motorized use. Would you pleave leave open perhaps 1/4 mile or so, to jeeps, since there is no possible parking in the private property?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 793
Comment#

1 As you consider types of trails in the transportation plan, please note that the 'conflicts' one hears about are mostly an excuse to deny the use of the trail to all but themselves.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 794
Comment#

1 There are three routes connection FS 376 along the Guadelupe River with FS 558 along the ridge to the west. There are Peggy Mesa RD, Deer Creek Rd.. And FS 488 in Joaquin Canyon. Each of thse should be kepy open as at least motorizxed trails for full-sized vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 795
Comment#

1 A route crosses the Guadelupe River at the mouth of Coblita Canyon, climbs to Holiday Mesa, goes north to the head of Cebollita Canyon, crosses to Stable Mesa, and goes south to the end of Stable Mesa where it intersects the road on the east side of Guadelupe River. If it is necessary to periodically close the road on the east side of Guadelupe River, the gate should be to the south of the descending grade.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 796
Comment#

1 My wife and I are in our mid-seventies, and. we enjoy using our full-size 4-wheel vehicle to access the lesser-traveled portions of the Forest. At our age hiking is out of the question, and the use of an ATV would be questionable. If users of full-sized 4-wheel vehicles are not included as one of the share-holders in the transportation plan, an important segment of the
population will be denied access to their public lands.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

1 My wife and I are in our mid seventies, and we enjoy ising our full size 4-wheel vehicle to access the lesser traveled portions of the forest. At our age hiking is out of the question and the use of an ATV would be questionable. If user of full sized 4-wheel vehicles are not included as one of the shaare-holders in the transportation plan, and important segment of the population will be denied access tok their public lands.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 797
Comment#

Letter# 797
Comment#

1 This will leave only 26% of the Forest for access by anyone who is unable to travel by horseback or hiking, for example some elderly, and the mobility challenged, ie. Wheelchairs or difficulty walking. According to the Proposed Action I can never take my wife of 76% of the SFNF, because no motor vehicle travel is allowed, and that is the ONLY way would ever be able to access these places.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 If these types of actions shutting out the handicapped continue, there will be no other resource than to involve national handicapped organizations in litigation against the USFS. This will result in loss of funds important to the USFS operationsm and will hurt us all.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Please reconsider these "Wilderness" type designations, as they do a disservice to the majority of the public.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 798
Comment#

1 We support the original intent of travel management to control off road vehicle use, to protect the forest, the wildlife and the local communities.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Traditional travel through the Jemez is via a series of connecting trails. Few of these trails are mapped by the Forest Service. Over the years, the Forest Service turned sections of this system into roads, and a few official trails, yet the majority remain unrecognized outside of local communities. These ancient routes were pioneered by the Anasazi, used by Spanish colonials, connected the homesteads and mining camps of the Old West, and formed the basis for modern foot & hoof travel across our Jemez. Now, the traditional method of travel is disappearing. The conflict created by dirt bikes and atvs on our trails has forced traditional travelers to either brave confrontation, or abandon these routes. Off road vehicles have elbowed hikers, campers, and back country hunters aside.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Local people also support the Forest Service for designating Bland Canyon Road, FR268, as open for highway legal vehicles only. Dirt bikers and atv'ers constantly drive over cultural, heritage and historical sites. They fill Bland Canyon with noxious pollution, overwhelming noise, and choking dust. They drive off our wildlife, and speed recklessly. Highway legal vehicles are far quieter, create fewer safety issues, and have license plates to identify them. Thank you Forest Service for another step forward.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Proposed motorized use will continue to damage habitat, historic places, and traditional travel in the area above the historic community of Bland, on Forest Trail 113, and in the Jemez National Recreation Area.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The proposed action offers several steps forward in the protection of Bland Canyon, map coordinates; R4E-T18N, and R5E-T17N. Local citizens strongly support the Forest Service's decision to remove motorized dispersed camping. It is our belief that motorized dispersed campers are a source for a significant amount of illegal activity, including property damage, vandalism, theft, trespass, and trash throwing. Prohibiting motorized dispersed camping should decrease all the above impacts.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 Motorized trails that originate from FR 280, FR282, FR187, FR188, FR286, FR89, FR289 exist in areas specifically prohibiting off road driving, or specifically prohibiting motorized vehicles. A majority of these routes cross critical water and wildlife areas. Many have historic significance, access cultural sites, and suffer conflict. Effective control of off road vehicles must begin with the areas the Forest Service has previously determined require a higher level of protection.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Lake Fork Canyon, FR376, lies between Schoolhouse and Lake Fork Mesa. Map coordinates; R2E-T19N. This area was, until recently, designated closed to off road driving. Additionally, the zone near Cebolla Spring, reaching from FR376 to FR604 was designated non-motorized. Currently, the Forest Service has repealed all this protection, and is proposing the area from FR604, FR376, and FR377 as not only open to off road vehicle use, but open for cross country travel as well. Here and district wide, the Forest Service needs to continue protective designations. The Jemez Ranger District will have a much healthier, vibrant ecology by continuing previous management strategies.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Make an honest appraisal of true motorized route densities, include motorized trails in road density calculations

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Conflict, wildlife, and maintenance issues will continue unabated with seasonal motorized use. Motorized traffic has consistently ignored the protected, non-motorized status of the Cochiti Canyon leg of FT113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 The Forest Service is in denial about the damage on FT113. They claim its all due to water. Maybe they forgot how long that trail has been there, and how, until the off roaders arrived, the trail stayed narrow, winding, and in easily traversable condition. The claims that illegal motor use didn't do the damage are simply baseless. The erosion of FT113 occurs through high speed vehicles with aggressive tires digging into the trail bed. During dry conditions, they turn the surface of the trail into powder, and further compact and harden the base course. When the rains arrive, this powder is washed down trail. The hardened base course cannot assimilate enough moisture to prevent arroyo cutting. Motor vehicles destroy water bars and diversions that would slow the water and get it off the trail. Driving during wet conditions compounds the problem of down cutting, loosening rock, and exposing tree roots. When comparing the two sections of 113 in the area, one taken over by dirt bikes, and the other motor-free, the motor-free section looks narrow and wild as a trail should-it is the dirt bike side that is the rutted out arroyo. Like it or not, the evidence points to motor vehicles as the purveyors of trail damage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

11 Remove all motorized trails in their entirety; FR286, FR286F, FR286FA, FR286FAD. Off road groups have cut miles of trails into this area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 The fact that off road clubs have constructed trails here calls into question the entire issue of trail maintenance, trail construction, and legality.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

13 FT113 must be fully restored to motor free use. FT113 continues on to Capulin and beyond, sections that are not currently proposed for motorized use, yet must be protected to preserve this unique historic trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 The headwaters of Paliza and Peralta Canyons, map coordinates; R4E-T18N, are designated as prohibiting off road travel. This includes motorized loops proposed from FR280 to FR281, and FR271L, FR270D through FR270DA, and through FR4A,with its occupied stand of Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat. We petition the Forest Service to uphold this prohibition here, and district wide.. The unnamed motorized trails from FR281,FR280, and FR4A all must be completely removed in order to protect headwaters, and provide habitat that allows Elk, Deer, Bear and Lion to travel without harassment across the Jemez.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 We finally arrive at a most contentious area being proposed for motorized trails, map coordinates; R4E-T18N, the zone bordered on the North by Sierra De Los Valles-the Valles Peaks, the east by Evans-Griffin and Medio Dia Canyon, the south by Bruce Place and Upper Bland Canyon, The west by FR282. The Forest Service designates a prohibition of off road driving, clearly marked on all maps, including the latest from the SFNF. Further, this area is designated as polygon "N", which the Forest Service describes as an area managed for the enhancement and protection of threatened and endangered species habitat. The area is home to large stands of threatened species, including the rare Jemez Mountain Salamander, Mexican Spotted Owl, and Northern Goshawk. It is home to the historic Bruce Place, to the wet meadow of Frazier Canyon, Elk and Mule Deer calving areas. This is the area upstream of the historic community of Bland. Bearhead Ridge, Woodard Ridge, and Bruce Ridge all converge right here, a critically important area for the movement and dispersal of all kinds of wildlife. Despite all these reasons for exclusion of off road vehicles, the proposal calls for seven motorized loops and extended trails in some 6 square miles, approximately 17 miles of motorized route for near 3 miles per square mile of motorized route density.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 Adding this proposed motorized trail density to the proposed road density of some 1.7 miles per square mile creates a real motorized route density of 4 + miles per square mile. It bears repeating that scientific analysis concludes that a density of more than 1 mi/sq. mi. has negative impacts on wildlife.***

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

17 Here, where wildlife protection is the intended goal of this management area, four times this density is being proposed. In anyone's estimation, this is not going to provide suitable habitat for threatened and endangered species, provide for pre existing motor free use, protect wet meadows, provide safe calving areas, reduce conflict, or protect historic sites.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 In fact, the section of FR142 between the trail head and the lookout makes for a pleasant and rewarding day hike of modest difficulty. The vista is expansive, the birds numerous, and the conditions warrant stopping and viewing. I propose for this section of Forest Road to be elevated to the status of Forest Trail, an effort that would improve the well being of the Fire Tower, the area land, and all who attempt the hike.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

19 All motorized loops off of Forest Road 282, and Forest Road 188 must be removed permanently. This includes the entire unnamed motorcycle loop off FR188, stretching to the shoulder of Medio Dia Canyon, and then back again to FR188. It includes the entire Frazier Canyon trail, FR188JA and the unnamed motorcycle loop that travels from FR188JA to FR282. It includes all of proposed FR188. It includes the three redundant loops on FR282 which stretches from Woodard Ridge to FR280.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 798
Comment#

20 Section 1 of Executive order 11644 states the travel rule...” will ensure that the use of off road vehicles...will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users...and to minimize conflict...”****

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

21 In conclusion, the Forest Service is to be commended for its work to improve the situation in Bland Canyon. Local people are hopeful that the designations prohibiting motorized dispersed camping, and open to highway legal vehicles alone will stand, and that these designations will be continued in any alternative proposal.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

22 No purpose is served by leaving the Fire Tower vulnerable to continued damage. FR 142 should end at the parking area for FT427, leading into Bandelier. Further protection should be extended by designating FR142 for highway legal vehicles only.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

23 In fact, the section of FR142 between the trail head and the lookout makes for a pleasant and rewarding day hike of modest difficulty. The vista is expansive, the birds numerous, and the conditions warrant stopping and viewing. I propose for this section of Forest Road to be elevated to the status of Forest Trail, an effort that would improve the well being of the Fire Tower, the area land, and all who attempt the hike.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

24 The very short spur road, FR142G, serves no purpose in accessing any area, and must be removed from the proposed action permanently.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

25 I would remind the Forest Service of the many alcohol related incidents that used to happen on the Dome Road, FR289, and on the Bland Road, FR268, before new gates were installed and employed. Opening Roads through the Holidays will exacerbate the DWI problem. Further, poaching, a serious problem in the Jemez will also increase as vulnerable species disperse following high mountain snows. Roads opened in mid April are suffering damage from heavy motorized traffic while still wet. Return to closing Forest Roads on December 22, and opening them on May1. This is the traditional schedule, it is expected by the public, it preserves wildlife, improves safety, and provides plenty of Forest access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

26 I would remind the Forest Service of the many alcohol related incidents that used to happen on the Dome Road, FR289, and on the Bland Road, FR268, before new gates were installed and employed. Opening Roads through the Holidays will exacerbate the DWI problem. Further, poaching, a serious problem in the Jemez will also increase as vulnerable species disperse following high mountain snows. Roads opened in mid April are suffering damage from heavy motorized traffic while still wet. Return to closing Forest Roads on December 22, and opening them on May1. This is the traditional schedule, it is expected by the public, it preserves wildlife, improves safety, and provides plenty of Forest access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

27 Section 1 of Executive order 11644 states the travel rule...” will ensure that the use of off road vehicles...will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users...and to minimize conflict...”****

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 799
Comment#

Letter# 799
Comment#

1 Who is being fooled that off-road vehiclesdon't pollute our environments, endanger natural habitats and wildlife?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Off road sport is really just about riding fast and wild and not taking the time to protect or enjoy the beaauty of the environment. They can do that in a paark similar to a skate board park.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 800
Comment#

1 I am writing to express my concern about the designation of National Forest for the use of off-road vehicles. I believe that the damage and the danger of these motorized vehicles is extreme and long lasting.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 801
Comment#

1 Please stop the systemactic rape of our forest and trails by ORV's. Limit the use of ORV's to aa very few specific areas far awayfrom the sight and "ear shot" of homes and where you can control and police their use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Everyone who uses an ORV's on state and federal land should wear a helmet (adults included) and no drinking and fires should be allowed. If someone gets injured they should pay for their own evacuation and medical expenses.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 802
Comment#

1 The presentation at the meetings did not specifically address wildlife considerations

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Glorieta Mesa is particularly sensitive and is being considered as a key wildlife habitat and linkage area. Please work with State, County, and community groups that are planning in the Galisteo Basin Wildlife Corridor to carefully review all USFS routes, especially those around the 326 complex on Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 The key issue is management, so as part of the Rule, please implement a quality assurance plan based on clear performance measures. If, under those measures, an area is not being adequately managed, that area or those routes need to be closed to motorized travel until the Forest Service can manage them.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 802
Comment#

4 The current Proposed Action is too complex and requires simplification. Reduce the number of route types, simplify the route system, and develop a plan that can be more easily understood by the public and better managed by the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 The maps for the Proposed Action for Managing Motorized Travel are confusing and are not usable. Once you have a final plan, develop a usable mapping, color coding and symbology scheme.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 803
Comment#

1 ATV's should be banned from public lands, once and for all. They simply do not belong there, as their use is almost always violating.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 804
Comment#

1 These peope don't need pristine lands to ride on, they need places that aare set aside specifically for that purpose and that purpose only because NOTHING ELSE CAN HAPPEN WHERE THEY RIDE. The foliage is destroyed. The wilflife is chased off. No other recrreational users can safely and quietly use those areas. I know they aren't going aaway and so am all in favor of setting aside areas just for their use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Giving them almost free rein to ride all over our public lands won't benefit anyone in the short or long run, except perhaps for a handful of ATV riders who get a moment's satisfaction in conquering nature and destroying it.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 Regarding law enforcement, his anwer was: HOW MANY? Same answer from him. I said, "I know how many. One. He lives next door to me, and as the literal Lone Ranger, cannot effectively patrol the whole mesa by himself".

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 Regarding fire danger: Joe says, "The forest on the mesa is so healthy it would be very difficult to start a fire."

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Please don't give away our last clean and healthy places to a very small percentage of citizens who don't care about the health of the forests. They don't deserve to deatroy that which belongs to all of us, and by continuing with your Travel Management Plans as they stand, it is a certainty that the destruction will happen.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 805
Comment#

Letter# 805
Comment#

1 Please keep FR106 open to San Antonio Creek and 376R open from San Antonio Creek to FR144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 806
Comment#

1 I recommend that you do not adopt the Alternative presented bu Blackfeather ORV group.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Using the existing road system that you have in place and designating some roads as ORV routes is preferable.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Keeping routes away from sensitive plant areas, wildlife habitat zones, cultural resources, wilderness areas and wilderness study areas will only enhance the SFNF reputation for quite recreation

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The majority of users, 85-90%, on the SFNF lands are not ORVers. Respect our desires for quite recreation. ORV recreation is unhealthy, unsafe, and unsustainable. Be stewards of the land and don't let these small groups, funded by the ORV industry, control any decision making on the SFNF.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 807
Comment#

1 Your aim to open the forest - home to countless animals - trees and plant life - to mindless entertainment of a few careless people on their destructive vehicles - using up irreplaceable resources - paid by every taxpayer - you forest officials who are paid by taxpayers money to protect forest life - and not big corporate interest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I had attended some of the meetings around this OHV issue and found it a big misleading hoax. I must say it made me very angry - all the evasive answers and talk of your officials -- and all this paid by every taxpayer -- what a waste of money -- I sincerely hope there is an awakening happening among your officials that lets you see the short life of this money oriented thrill entertainment - and the long term disruption and destruction of life this causes.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 808
Comment#

1 I strongly recommend that you DO NOT adopt the alternative presented by Blackfeather ORV group. Many of the proposed routes by this and other ORV groups are not engineered for sustainability and fall within ecologically sensitive area. Erosion and degradation around these trails is inevitable and will only worsen with time.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 808
Comment#

2 You can barely afford to properly patrol and manage your forest as it current stands. Given the CERTAINTY of Federal budget cuts in the near future, you are preparing to unleash a monster you will not be able to control.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I strongly advise you to deny access to ORVs permanently

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 If you must admit these fuel wasters into the forest, allow them to use the existing road system only and force on them user-fees that will help you bear the financial burden they will place on your operations.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 ORV recreation is unhealthy, unsightly, unsafe, and unsustainable. Please, act as responsible stewards of the land and don't let these small groups, funded by the ORV industry, control your decisions or limit your responsibilities to properly manage the SFNF.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 809
Comment#

1 ATVs and dirt bike riders have big parties in the backcountry hauling beer and trash in with atvs, and leave huge messes. Opening the mountains to further vehcile traffic is just going to destroy them.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 810
Comment#

1 I agree with proposed action in having making 270 D "which the Sierra Riders have mitigation on and adopted", 4A "Which Sierra Riders and others have done work on" and 270BDA as ATV trails. Also, agree with adding of 271, 270B and 270BDA opportunities for others all to ride.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 I support the dispersed camping on forest road 270

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

3 I would like the lower areas of 270 to be added for dispersed camping also

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Please add 271 and 271L as ATV trails from 270D and 270BDA which Sierra riders rides this and are willing adopt this as an ATV trail. This will allow for a good size loop for all to enjoy.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 There are 2 roads- 271JA and 271JC that do connect and loop off of 271. Sierra Riders ride this and are willing to adopt this small loop as an ATV trail. This provides a really nice little loop.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 810
Comment#

6 Paliza canyon needs to be opened up from the intersection of Forest Road 10 and 266 for ATV riding. There is a trail head at the intersection of Forest Road 10 and 266 and here others drop off and ride from the area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Forest Road 10 should be completely opened up or at least up to Los Pinos community for dispersed camping and opened up for access to all vehicles. There are those that camp along forest road 10 and use it as camping and a riding launching point without having to travel along ways down forest road 10.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 811
Comment#

1 i am very disturbed to hear of any increase in roads, diry biker, or orv's access to our national forests

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I am upset that cows are allowed to polute the streams and wetlands as well.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 812
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 811

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 813
Comment#

1 In review the TAP for this area your maps do not include all the existing roads and single tracks that were submitted. These need to be included in your EIS of this area.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 814
Comment#

1 As a resident of La Cueva Road, my partner and I would like to make our voices heard and say that we opposed to more forest land being offered up to recreational vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 815
Comment#

Letter# 815
Comment#

1 As a landowner and resident of Glorieta Mesa, I wish to express my very strong feelings concerning the land use of the National Forest, particularily on Glorieta Mesa, New Mexico. Once a trail is made the track remains for centuries. Please restrict vehicles to areas a minimum of three miles from private property, and minimize to a reasonable extent, where any type motor vehicles are allowed to travel. Thank you for your kind consideration to my views.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 816
Comment#

1 The proposed closure dates were decided before the Nepa process ever began

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The proposed seasonal closures are not consistent with similar nationa forests.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 There was no public involvement in determining what the dates should be or how it would impact the motorized users.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 Please consider doing away with the seasonal closures in the proposed action. The forest should be available year-round for all users to enjoy, just as it has been for so many years.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 817
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 816

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 818
Comment#

1 It should be important to evaluate some areas that are currently managed for non-motorized use to see if perhaps motorized single track trails might be an approved use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Specifically, There is a trail that crosses the Polvadera IRA. This is a short section of trail and if designated as single track motorized use, could provide for a quality loop. The loop would include the trail called "Seven Mile/Seven Meadow." There would be one crossing of the Polvadera Creek required. Also, This area is extremely remote area and user conflict would be low.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 819
Comment#

Letter# 819
Comment#

1 Almost evey trail we submitted wias removed from the Proposed action by the Coyote Ranger District. In a meeting with the Ranger and his staff, we (the Black Feather Club) asked why the trails were removed and we were told that it was becayse " they did not want us there"

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 I request that the trails submitted by the Black Feather Club be evaluated and considered for TMR use by a non-partial committeee.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 820
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action Map shows a road #173 providing access to Canones Creek (this proposed road is currently a trail!) I would like to request that the proposed road/trail shown as #173 be extended all the way to where it connects to FR449 (as single track only) This trail would provide a crucial link in a motorcycle trail loop system.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 821
Comment#

1 Motown trail located in the Jemez Ranger District of the SFNF is a designated motocycle trail and is defined as such in the Dome Diversity Unit Decision Notice August 5, 1991, signed Alan S. Defler - Forest Supervisor. Under federal law, the NEPA process is requited to change the status of any designated trail. Since your proposed action does not include Motown Trail, it will not go through the NEPA process before getting close. As a reminder, Motown trail was created to settle an appeal (#2125). Please include Motown trail in TMR proposed routes.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

Letter# 822
Comment#

1 I submitted comments prior to the NEPa process and never received notification from the Forest Service that the proposed action was out and available.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

2 If you close the roads to dirt bikes and ATVs, you are creating a haven for ranchers and the people of glorieatmesa.org. Glorieta Mesa is not Moab where there are hundreds of miles of trail. It never will be.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 I am very opposed to your proposed action which would force me to trailer my motorcycle in to Glorieta Mesa to ride legally. Currently I am able to ride my dirtbike from my home, right onto the mesa and ride for many miles. Your plan would make it a huge affair for me to load up my bike, drive at least an hour and many miles to the legal area, unload, ride the few miles (about 15) that would be legal (might take ½ hour at most), load back up, drive back home, and unload. That is two hours of driving and another hour or so to load and unload twice for a half hour of riding a road. It turns my recreation experience into an all-day, pre-planned, not so enjoyable thing.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 We are all supposed to be "thinking green" and conserving energy. Is it green to force me to drive my truck which gets 15 miles per gallon (and less when it is hauling a trailer and dirtbike), rather than just ride my dirtbike (which gets about 50 miles per gallon)? Have you taken fuel use into consideration?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 Your proposed action will mean that I have to think seriously if I want to ride my dirtbike because it will cost me a lot of money (and time) to haul my bike over to the far side of the mesa to have a short ride. If you were to leave the roads up there open, I could take a longer, more enjoyable ride, for a whole lot less money. Your proposed action limits my recreation experience because of economics and time.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 At the very minimum you should keep all the roads up there open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles. To me, it feels like discrimination that you only
allow highway legal vehicles. What about the kids who are not old enough for a driver's license so they can't operate highway legal vehicles?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

7 In looking at maps on google earth, there are no houses even close to the road on the County Road 51 side of the Glorieta Mesa. The closest house to the road is about ¼ to ½ mile away. That is the only house that is even visible in the entire area I ride from where you turn off CR51 and then proceed to the Forest boundary, and around the Santa Fe County side of Glorieta Mesa. Most of the people from Glorieatamesa.org do not even live close to this area. Most of them live past the turn off or off behind their own locked gates. The noise of the OHV traffic is not bothering them. There never was a problem at all up there until you proposed opening the whole thing up and leaving it in its current state of cross country travel. That is what made these people react so strongly. Now you have flip-flopped and closed everything down to the group that uses it the most. I understand that they have more money, more organizational skills, and more time to whine than the OHV community that actually uses Glorieta Mesa does, but that doesn't mean they have more right to use the roads and trails than anyone else. By looking at your proposed action I feel that maybe you are feeling they do have more rights. I also feel like you have your minds made up about Glorieta mesa and I feel like you won't take me seriously.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 If you proceed with your proposed action as it is, the ranchers (who in my opinion do the most damage to the mesa) will be allowed to ride their OHVs. They do ride them up there to herd their cows (that do even more damage than OHVs). I would like to know why you think that my two wheeled dirtbike does more damage to an open road than their four-wheeler does?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

9 Also, my two wheels on an open road or trail do a lot less damage than their four wheels that leave the road and run across fields to chase cows.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

10 And most of all, their over-full sized dually pickups that they use to take hay to the cows on the muddy roads all winter long do a whole lot more damage than any other vehicle out there.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

11 Glorietmesa.org people say that it would be OK for the ranchers to use ATVs because this is a traditional use. Well, using ATVs is not a very traditional way to herd cattle. What difference does it make if there is a rancher or a kid on the ATV to the resources?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 The "Traditional Users" of the mesa were allowed by the Forest Service to chain the mesa to make more grass and room for their cows not too very long ago, now you are telling me that I can't ride on a road that will be open for other vehicles?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

13 The cows still do not have enough grass; the ranchers have to bring food in for them (whether that is legal or not – I have seen it many times).

Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 The cows cause a whole lot more damage than my two dirt bike tires on an existing road or trail do.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

15 Glorietamesa.org says they want to close the mesa to motorcycles and ATVs, but leave it open for their own recreational driving in their SUVs. This is not fair. If the roads are going to be left open at all, they should be left open to all vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

16 If the fear is that OHVs will go off of the road, you really should not base your plan on what the law breakers will do; you should base it on the greatest majority of the users who will not break the laws. It is not reasonable to believe that the Range Rovers and BMW SUVs will not leave the road to gather pinon or firewood when they want to.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

17 I think that there is some stereo-typing going on by your group (FS Travel Management Team and Glorieatamesa.org) that all off-road recreational riders are tearing things up, cutting fences, harassing cows, shooting windmills and leaving trash on the Mesa. This is just not true.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

18 The trash being dumped on Glorieta Mesa is being dumped by locals out here, but not by the dirt bikers and ATV users.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

19 we like to ride for a lot of miles. We don't want to be confined to one little track. The point of riding on this mesa is the many roads and trails that are up there and the time we can spend exploring. I understand that cutting down on the roads and trails is probably a good thing, but cutting down on the kind of people who can use what is left is discrimination

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

20 I like to ride on one specific trail up there. It was not included in the proposed action. I would request that it be put back in. It is the trail that Henry Lanman submitted to you pre-NEPA. I know that Henry was meeting with James Munoz a couple of weeks ago to go over that area again.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

21 if you close the roads on the Forest that link to County Road 51, you effectively cut our recreation out.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

22 I think you should leave all access roads CR51, SR34, and Forest Road 612 open so people can get to their riding areas by the routes they have been using already.
The glorietamesa

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

23 There is definitely a time and place for the motorized recreation, and one of the best places is Glorieta Mesa. It is perfect for this activity. There are plenty of roads and trails, my tires are not causing any more damage than anyone else's.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

24 There would be no more resource damage up there from ATVs or dirt bikes than from highway legal vehicles. If cows aren't dropping dead of heart attacks when they see vehicles now, I don't think this is something to worry about in the future. Actually, when the cows see us, they sometimes come running toward us because they think we are bringing them food like the ranchers do.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

25 Right now the mesa is completely open to all use for vehicles. Right now there are roads and a few trails that people use up there. It is not an OHV playground. I really do not think that it will ever become and OHV playground, especially when it gets restricted even more. I think that people are just panicking about this. If it starts to become something that we don't want it to become, then your plan says you can change it in the future. I also don't want to see it become a destination riding area, which would ruin my experience as well. I just don't see this happening. This is the propaganda that people hear and blow up into something it is not. I also think that if you start developing parking areas and trail heads for this activity, you are more likely to draw in more ATV traffic.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

26 I heard at a public meeting that it will be hard to put a road or trail back on the map once it has been removed from the motorized system. It would be easier to take it off if it needed to be removed. Then, doesn't it make sense to start with a more open system and remove problem roads and trails than to restrict it so much and try to open others later because you will need them?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

27 Why not start out allowing all motorized use on the designated roads of Glorieta mesa and then remove certain vehicles if there are problems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

28 The wildlife are not harassed by me, they already have heard dirtbikes and they are still present up there. There is some study that says that foot traffic is more stressful to wildlife because it is present with the animal for a longer period of time than a dirtbike zipping by. Also, does an SUV have less impact on wildlife than an OHV?

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

29 Please do not try and save me from myself. There is enough of that going on already. I personally wear all my safety gear and obey all the state laws that are in place for that purpose. It is not glorietamesa.org's place to decide that I should or should not participate in dangerous activities. Ski areas are open on national forests for people (like me) that take risks on snow. There are rock climbing areas where people might fall. River rafting, where people might drown, is an acceptable thing. Even hikers might become lost and die or twist an ankle. Sports are dangerous.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

30 This land is for all of us to use. It is to benefit everyone, not just one part of the population. People who live near the National Forest have absolutely no more right than anyone else to use the fores

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

31 I think that listening to one group who is trying to decide what happens on Glorieta Mesa is wrong

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

32 If they are afraid of fire, maybe they should put fire lines in around their land, or thin trees to make their own property safe from fire. When people live next to the forest they need to realize that it comes with some drawbacks as well as advantages. Part of the drawback is that the entire United States population is allowed to be on their back fence and wildfires may be a threat. If we want to prevent people from starting fires, we would have to close the entire forest. Also, shut down any road where someone might throw a cigarette out and start a fire.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

33 I think that the Forest Service needs to make sure and keep my interests in mind as well as glorieatamesa.org's.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

34 I see what I perceive to be a privatization of public land going on throughout this process. I see people saying what they want to see near their private land because it is what makes them happy, not what is good for the land or the people, and the Forest Service seems to respond to almost all of these requests. Glorieta Mesa is the ultimate example of this, but there are others, especially around the Pecos District

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

35 The Pecos National Monument and the Park Service in general, are trying to open up more of their land for recreation. Fishing will be allowed starting September 5th in areas where the public was not even allowed to go before, a new trail is being built to allow access to areas the public has been kept out of. They are opening trails and streams that have been closed to everybody. The US Forest Service is trying to close down areas to people for recreation. The Forest Service is heading to preservation while the Park Service heads toward multiple-use? This is not the way I think this was set up to be.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

36 One more thing I would like you to consider is: what experience do the motorized users want to have while riding on the national forest? According to the Forest service itself, motorized use is a legitimate use of the national forest. I enjoy riding my dirtbike through beautiful areas and seeing the wildlife and enjoying the scenery. I do not want to be stuck on a 15 mile track with all the other OHV traffic on the mesa. This is not the opportunity I am looking for on my public lands. I think you need to keep in mind the experience for the motorized users as well as the non-motorized users.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

37 I am not asking for the whole mesa to be left open. I am simply asking you to leave the roads that you designate open, open to all of us.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

38 Please do not listen only to a group of people who does not look at the whole, listen to all groups, even if they are not as loud as the whiney ones. Some groups are still not represented at your table yet, and may never be, but don't forget that they exist too.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 822

Comment#

39 FR 123 – this road should be open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

40 FR 123 and 123a should have a dispersed camping buffer the entire length.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

41 375, 375 G, and 53 should be open to a dispersed camping buffer and all vehicles, not just highway legal ones the entire length.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

42 FR 79 should be open to all vehicles, not just for highway legal vehicles (this are is just like mine – local youth ride there). Also, there are two miles of road that go from the trailhead at FR 79 to private land. This should be opened up to the public and used as exclusive use land for the landowner.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

43 386a- I am glad to see this left open.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

44 Glorieta Mesa Area – Roads that should be left open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles: 326, 326pga, 326326pe, 326wa, 326 w, 326u, 326v, 612d, 612, 87, 87j, 326jd, 326ad,326a, 326ak,327n,326j, 326ea, 326eb, 326ad, 326ej, 124de, 124h, 124hf, 325m,324hh, 594, 324,325db, 325k,325kd, 325k, 525f,124w, 330, 330g,324hf,325,330f,330e

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 823

Comment#

1 I have seen the increase of dirt bikes and 4-wheeler activity in the Jemez over the last 2 decades. I am very concerned with the amount of destruction that they have done to FS system trails and what they have done to the land with user created trails. They trespass on areas closed to motor vehicles and posted private property and argue with landowners when called on it. They have proven time and time again that they have no respect for the law, land, wildlife, property owners and quiet recreationists. They have taken over our public lands for themselves and do not concern themselves with the fact that they are ruining the outdoor experience of hikers, mtn bikers, horseback riders, hunters, fishermen, wildlife watchers and anyone who enjoys the outdoors for the beauty and tranquility that is found nowhere else on our planet.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I believe that motorized use is a legitimate use of the forest. But only motorized use in the form of passenger cars and trucks heading to a particular destination. Driving around the forest on a dirt bike or 4-wheeler, for the sole purpose of driving around, and leaving a trail of destruction behind, should not be encouraged. The FS is legitimizing resource damage by allowing ohv's in our forests.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 I don't understand how the rule will be implemented with no funding and not enough manpower, but we do have to start somewhere.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 Enforcement is a huge concern. Who is going to check them all for spark arresters, speed limits, mufflers or registration? Who is going to chase them through the woods when they are riding on a closed trail?

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 What about repairing the damage these people have already caused? You do not have the funding to maintain the trails you have now. How do you propose to take on a bigger workload? I also think that the current proposed action does not do enough in stopping conflict between motorized users and everyone else. Machines are not compatible with any other form of outdoor recreation.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 There are still several wildlife concerns that have not been adequately addressed. Our wildlife has no where else to move to. They are stuck here and are steadily losing ground to these inherently destructive machines.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 I support the removal of the trails already taken off the proposed action and do not want to see them considered for any alternative map.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 I do not support the addition of any new trails for motorized use as the FS can not afford to maintain the system trails they have now. The current budget in the Jemez Ranger District is enough to work on two miles of trail annually. There are about 50 miles of trail. That means it is 25 years in between maintenance intervals. The addition of even 30 miles of motorized trails means 40 years in between maintenance. This is completely unacceptable.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 The FS should include motorized trails along with roads in their density count. Motorized damage and wildlife impact occurs on trails as well as roads.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 User created trails within a previously restricted area (sections labeled A or D on the SFNF map - cross country travel prohibited, or a roadless area) should be prohibited and removed from the proposed action.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 Trails that are not yet built should not be considered, such as an addition to cross town trail that is proposed to be built north of FR 36 in the Jemez District.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 FR 142 that leads to the Dome Wilderness should be open to only street legal vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 The short spur road that takes off to the north off of FR 142 should be taken off the map as it does not exist.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 FR 188B, 188D and 268AB need to be removed along with the user created trail that connects FR 268 with FR 268AB since they lead ohv users to private property and will increase conflict between land owners and ohv users. There is all ready a problem with ohv users trespassing, tearing up private property with their machines and tearing down gates, fences and signs. Landowners do not use these roads to access their properties. These roads and trails also go through essential habitat for Jemez Mountain Salamanders

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 FR 188B, 188D and 268AB need to be removed along with the user created trail that connects FR 268 with FR 268AB since they lead ohv users to private property and will increase conflict between land owners and ohv users. There is all ready a problem with ohv users trespassing, tearing up private property with their machines and tearing down gates, fences and signs. Landowners do not use these roads to access their properties.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 FR 188B, 188D and 268AB need to be removed along with the user created trail that connects FR 268 with FR 268AB since they lead ohv users to private property and will increase conflict between land owners and ohv users. There is all ready a problem with ohv users trespassing, tearing up private property with their machines and tearing down gates, fences and signs. Landowners do not use these roads to access their properties. These roads and trails also go through essential habitat for Jemez Mountain Salamanders

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

17 FR 288 should be closed at the junction with FR 289. FR 288 parallels 289 and is a redundant route. It also leads to the Los Utes Special closure area. This area is closed to motorized vehicles over 40” and is being abused by ohv users as the FS refuses to enforce their own laws.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

18 Fr 289D should be closed as it is another redundant route in a high road density area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

19 FR 500 should be closed as it already has been closed once but again the FS does not enforce the closure. It is a redundant route in an area where the road density is too high already.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

20 The user created trail (tin cup trail) that makes a loop off of FR 188 should be removed as it was created illegally in an area that is designated non motorized, is on highly erodible soil and is already severely eroded.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

21 All sections of FR 268A in Del Norte and Medio Dia canyons need to be closed as it will only encourage people to trespass on private property. This is another route that is travelled by ohv users on a regular basis to trespass on private property

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

22 All sections of FR 268A in Del Norte and Medio Dia canyons need to be closed as it will only encourage people to trespass on private property. This is another route that is travelled by ohv users on a regular basis to trespass on private property. There is no public easement on this road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 823

Comment#

23 All sections of FR 268A in Del Norte and Medio Dia canyons need to be closed as it will only encourage people to trespass on private property. This is another route that is travelled by ohv users on a regular basis to trespass on private property. There is no public easement on this road. The road is severely eroded and can not even be called a road anymore. On the 2004 FS map it is designated as a trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

24 FR 268D needs to be removed as it is another route that leads to private property but is not needed for access. Legal access is off of FR 286.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

25 Trail 113 should be non motorized as it is partially in Mexican Spotted Owl habitat. It is also in an area that was designated as "D", non motorized, until it mysteriously disappeared off the FS map. It is also eroded badly enough that sections of it were recommended to be re routed as the damage was too bad to repair.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

26 FR 286F, 286FA and 286 FAD should be removed since almost the whole surface of Cochiti Mesa is highly erodible pumice soil and can not stand up to motorized abuse. The road is eroded so badly now that no one will be able to go down there for enforcement purposes and there are hundreds of miles of unauthorized trails that will be accessible to dirt bikers by these roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

27 FR 268 and FR 289 are closed seasonally for resource protection. This has been in effect for almost 20 years. The proposed action shows that these roads will be open all year. They need to be changed to show that they are only open seasonally.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 824

Comment#

1 you are conducting a survey to establish areas for motorized travel. Looking at the open road density map for the Western side of the SFNF, it exceeds the maximum open road density standards. We applaud that effort to get all the designations nailed down

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 standards. We applaud that effort to get all the designations nailed down, and hope that results from the decisions will follow the NMGF rule of one mile of road/trail per square mile.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 In the fall of 2006 we enjoyed the improvements that had been made to dispersed camping on the road along Rio Cebolla / Lake Fork Canyon and how vehicles were not allowed access to the creek. That suited our family just fine and we appreciated that the ground wasn't as trampled as in years past when cars could pull right up to the river. We wonder why there is a repeal of no off road driving in this area. It is our opinion that this area not be open to cross-country travel.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 824
Comment#

4 When we take hikes, sometimes we hear/experience the off road motorized vehicles. In past years we never heard these and loved to experience the quiet peace of the canyons and forest. When we hear these and experience the dust sometimes it is much more than hearing a chain saw being used intermittently. It really disrupts our experience when we hear these vehicles, off road. It gets our hearts racing, pumping fear and thus takes away the feeling of connection with the land. It makes us realize that wildlife will be having the same if not more reaction to the vehicles

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 And that is of concern to us, since we know that the fragile balance of the wild areas is dependent upon a healthy participation of predators and prey - the balance of life. We fear that when motorized travel continues that there won't be enough room for the big mammals to coexist with their loud motor-using humans. Where will the big mammals go? Will their breeding be disrupted? Under the current administration, aren't most areas open to off-road vehicles with motors? We encourage careful planning to allow for the existence of our wildlife alongside human use of the forests.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 We like the current timeline of a December 22nd to late April early May closure on all forest roads because it gives the ecosystem time to rest from human intervention. We think that keeping them open through the new year and into January is not necessary.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 825
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 825

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 826
Comment#

1 the proposed acion is still far too expansive for OHV use management.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 375 LBB - this route travels into the PAC and should be removed and decomissioned. This route is not neccessay for motorized travel as it is only .79 mile, not too far to walk, and goes nowhere except in to the PAC to a deadend. The route continues on the ground a short distance beyond the route length pictured on the proposed action map, travelling further into the PAC with no on-the-ground indicator of where the designated route ends, thus encouraging expanded use and disturbance to the PAC

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 375LBB is adjacent to 375M, is unneccessary, and will encourage cross-country travel between upper Dalton Canyon, the PAC and La Cueva Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 375LBB is designated for dispersed camping of 150' on each side of the road (There is a discrepancy between the proposed action and the TAP, which indicates 100' for camping.) There should be no dispersed camping in the PAC nor is it necessary. There are many good camping sites on nearby routes outside the PAC

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 The current condition of the route is very light use. It will receive increased use as a designated motorized route, causing increased noise, air pollution, habitat damage and disturbance to the Mexican Spotted Owl and the Protected Activity Center

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 377LBB is listed as a level 1 Maintenance road (closed) in the Forest Plan; and in the TAP as a non-system road. The proposed action upgrades it to "open to vehicles legal on paved highways seasonally." This higher level will require increased maintenance by the Forest Service, despite the fact that the Santa Fe National Forest is able to maintain only 8% of existing Maintenance level 3 and 4 routes, according to the TAP.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

7 OHV routes should not be designated in ESA designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered species.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 Dispersed camping should be limited to 1 vehicle length from the road rather than the proposed 150' on each side of the road. This alternative does not represent a hazard on these remote roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 We do not object to 375 as a motorized route.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 375 is is designated for camping at the upper end of La Cueva Canyon where the creek runs, beyind 375M. This is a spectacular riaprian area, and the head of the watershed for La Cueva Canyon. Dispersed motorized camping should be eliminated on the lefthand side of the road near the creek.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 According to Forest Service representatives, this route (375G and 53) was added to the Proposed Action map in order to access private inholdings, and the Forest service can be sued if they do not provide "reasonable access." NOTE: The requirement is for "reasonable access" not motorized access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 increased OHV use has recently eroded the single hiking/horseback riding trail into an ATV 2-track.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

13 I understand that the Forest Service is short-staffed, and in all 3 of the public meetings I attended the Forest Service publically acknowledged that theroute work on access to inholdings was inadequate. However, it is not acceptable for the Forest service to act contrary to the mandate of the Executive Order because of administrative problems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

14 375G is severly eroded and dangerous on the steep hill down into the canyon, and near the mines. It is impassable by vehicles other than ATVs ormotorcycles. (photos attached). It is irresponsible for the Forest service to encourage motorized use of this route

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

15 (375G) provides motorized access to a fragile riparian area with a gorge and creek, wich will be devastated by OHV use. OHV routes should not be designated in wetlands, wet meadows, or other wet areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

16 Motorized vehicles crossing the creek would drop oil and pollute the creek, the riparian area and ultimately the water wells in La Cueva valley. It is the responsibility of the Forest service to avoid adversely affecting beneficial uses of water, such as for wells.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

17 This area is traditionally used for quiet recreation including hiking, horseback riding, birdwatching, and picknicking. By encouraging OHV use, the Forest service is creating user conflict, which is contrary to the mandate that "Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recaretional uses of the same or neghboring public lands.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

18 357G is a maintenance level 1 road (closed) in the Forest Plan; 53 is designated as a maintenance level 2 road. This in itself is questionable, since 375G, the closed section, provides the only access to 53. The Proposed Action upgrades these routes to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways seasonally." This higher level will require increased maintenance by the Forest Service, despite the Santa Fe National Forest's ability to currently maintain only 8% of existing level 3 qnd 4 routes, according to the TAP

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

19 #53 would need major workin order to be passable by motorized vehicles other than motorcycles. It is not possible for a full-sized veicle to cross the creek without cutting down trees; and the route becomes impassable before it reaches the first inholding.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

20 #53 deadends adjacent to a Jemez Archaeological site which is a cave with petroglyphs.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

21 Dispersed camping should be eliminated in the meadow by the creek. This is not a popular camping area for motorized vehicles; the area is only accessible by foot, horseback, ATV or motorcycle. The proposed action eliminates ATVs in the area; thus motorized dispersed camping in the meadow would only benefit motorcycles. There are a few very old fire rings; one newer one; no indication of recent use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

22 Opening this route (375G and 53) to motorized use is in direct conflict with the mandate of the executive order which states: Areas and Trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

23 The Forest Service should restrict the system of OHV trails to that which they can maintain and enforce

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 826
Comment#

24 Instead of upgrading Maintenance Level 1 and 2 routes, the Forest Service should concentrate on decomissioning unneeded routes and ensuring that closed ML1 roads that will not be decomissioned are gated. All proposed changes to the existing route system should be aimed at improving the control of OHV activity and not to increasing its impact on the forest. The Forest service should, therefore, refrain from designating new routes or upgrading ML1 and ML2 routes which they can not maintain or enforce.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

25 The proposed Action does not include an enforcement plan, budget, or education plan.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

26 The FS should include an enforcement plan which estimates the current and future # of Law Enforcement Officres, and the esimated # of officer visits to each area. The FS should enact sufficient penalties to deter abuse of Forest resources.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

27 Motorized vehicles hsould be allowed to park no more than 1 vehicle length from the road's edge, in a limited number of designated popular dispersed camping areas. The proposed 150' or 300' on each side of the road is unneceessarily extensive and will result in damage to resources and habitat.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

28 The Forest Service Proposed Action should include a plan for effective long-term management. If a route is not included on the maps it still remains on the land and acts as a vector for impacts. What is the FS plan for undesignated routes that remain on the land and still contribute to the impacts? The TMP shoul include a timeline and priorities for decomissioning routes.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

29 The noise from OHVs travels up to 2 miles depending on landscape and vegetation

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

30 Routes for OHVs, specifically ATVs and motorcycles, should be kept a distance of 1/4 mile or greater from the boundary of any Wilderness area

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

31 Discourage OHV tresspass

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 827
Comment#

0 Duplicate of #822

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 828
Comment#

Letter# 828
Comment#
0 Duplicate of 823
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 829
Comment#
0 Duplicate of 824
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 830
Comment#
0 Duplicate/Form Letter
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 831
Comment#
1 In general, though, I applaud the Forest Service's proposal fo the Eastside, and I ask that th Forest sevice not cave in to the pressure by recreational ORV voices
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Please, DO NO designate more motorized routes for recreational purposes.
Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The Westside map (#5) - in my assessment, the Proposed Action clearly fials to live up to the above criteria and contraints in proposing motorized routes.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Density exceeds guidelines. There are many sections in the Westside that exceed the density guidelines of the Forest Plan. Also, the Forest Service does not include motorized trails in computing the density of motorized routes. And, instead of reducing the motorized route density to FIT the plan, the Forest Service has chosen to REVISE the plan to allow higher densities. I find that choice alarming. The Travel Management Rule stipulates mixed use, it does not say the Forest Service should revise (i.e. “violate”) any existing rule they see fit in order to accommodate motorized recreationists. Oddly, the decision to change the density standard directly contradicts an important statement in the Proposed Action:
Page 17: The proposed action strives to provide motorized use where it is appropriate from a resource standpoint and meets Forest Plan standards and guidelines.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 High-Challenge / High-Thrill designations and usage. There are two special provisions of the Westside map that are designated for what amounts to “single user” use for high-challenge recreation. One is the 40 acre “Trials Motorcycle” area. The other is the 142 miles of single-track designations for dirt bikers, most of which has been created or groomed for high-performance by dirt riders. While perhaps not technically illegal, the actions of these people are clearly, CLEARLY, in violation of the spirit of the law that roads and trails cannot be created without Forest Service approval and the NEPA process.
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

6 I can tell you from personal experience that this trail is banked for a purpose, and that purpose is SPEED. Please note the V-shape of the trail. Now, good multiuse trails should, like a road, have a slight crown so that water runs to the side and does not collect in the middle causing ruts and holes. Yet, a good high-performance motorcycle trail, as above, does not fit that profile. Not only will the Vshape cause accelerated erosion, it makes the trail suitable for single use only.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

7 I don't go on trails that they ride on anymore. They have chased me off. I have seen them come by my house at speeds up to 50 miles an hour or so. They have their dirt bikes punched out and are going through their gears. One of my neighbors who rides a dirt bike hit a fence at 50 miles an hour while riding his dirt bike on an old logging road. Part of thrill for them is going as fast as they can -Kevin Stillman, personal email, 8-20-2008

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 These motorcycle routes are by their nature single-use and therefore in violation of the multiuse mandate of the TMR. The same is true with the Trials Area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

9 Not only is it single use for a short time, the intensity and density and "go anywhere" nature of trials riding will have sudden and substantial harassing and disrupting effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat, thus violating a key provision of the TMR: the responsible official shall consider effects on the following, with the objective of minimizing: (4) Harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitats;

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 Roads Dead-end at Wilderness Areas. There are three Wilderness Areas in the Westside –
Dome, San Pedro Parks and Chama River Canyon. These Wilderness Areas are most Important toquiet recreationists and yet the proposed network of roads gives ATVs and dirt bikes access to these dead-end roads, many of which have campsites and trailheads frequented by quiet recreationists. The same problem applies to the Pecos Wilderness Area in the Eastside

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 In order to reduce user conflict, I propose that the Forest Service change the designation of routes which dead-end at a Wilderness Area or campsites frequented by quiet recreationists (such as Iron Gate in the Pecos) to be for "pavement 6 legal vehicles only". This would eliminate the high-performance, thrill-seeking riders of ATVs and dirt bikes, while permitting cars, trucks, jeeps, SUVs, and street legal (not generally high performance) motorcycles.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 In addition to the issue of user conflicts, keeping the sound of motorized vehicles out of Wilderness Areas is stated as an objective in FSM 2300 - RECREATION, WILDERNESS, AND RELATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT. (4) 2326 - USE OF MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT OR MECHANICAL TRANSPORT IN WILDERNESS 2326.02 - Objectives 2. Exclude the sight, sound, and other tangible evidence of motorized equipment or mechanical transport withinwilderness except where they are needed and justified.This means that the SOUND FOOTPRINT of ORVs ("mechanical transport") is to be excluded from Wilderness Areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

13 Since sound from loud ATVs and dirt bikes can travel for ½ mile and further, I propose that the Proposed Action be amended to keep this sound footprint outside of Wilderness Area borders. Either remove affected motorized routes from the maps or change the designation to "pavement legal vehicles only" to prevent the sound footprint from ATVs and dirt bikes from penetrating into Wilderness Areas. I recommend changing the designation, but in some cases closure may be better.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

14 There seems to be little or no consideration for the effects of motorized routes on the Jemez Mountain Salamander, the Spotted Owl, or Cutthroat Trout. The high road density in the Westside carves up the forest and fragments, or otherwise adversely affects, habitat

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

15 This compromises the health and habitats of all species, not just threatened or endangered ones. Such fragmentation, created by extraordinarily high density turns a blind eye to a key criteria in the TMR for designation: the responsible official shall consider effects on the following, with the objective of minimizing: (5) Harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitats; C.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

16 The Forest Service will be relying on the Motor Vehicle Use Map to inform ORV users where they can and cannot take their vehicles. This is insufficient information. People need on-the-ground signage so it is never ambiguous as to where they can take their machines. And existing roads and trails that are no longer legally accessible by ORVs need to have physical blockages of some sort that act as both a sign and a barrier to access. This will remove any uncertainty regarding designation, and will allow the road or trail to begin the slow process of recovery.

Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

17 There is near zero mention of monitoring or enforcement in the PA. This, despite the fact that the TMR specifically addresses monitoring: For each administrative unit of the National Forest System, the responsible official shall monitor the effects of motor vehicle use on designated roads and trails and in designated areas under the jurisdiction of that responsible official, consistent with the applicable land management plan, as appropriate and feasible. (36 CFR 212.57) There is a single reference to enforcement on page 27 of the PA: 7 For instance, if someone is driving on fictional Forest Road 100CJ, and Forest Road 100CJ is not on the map, then that person would be using the road illegally and subject to a fine and imprisonment. At public meetings regarding the PA, the Forest Service has stated there will be monitoring and an annual review of motorized routes. However, there are no details of any plans for that monitoring and review.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

18 There are also no plans the public can review for enforcement. The Forest Service seems to have the mindset that merely going from "unmanaged motorized recreation" to "managed motorized recreation" will somehow magically transform ORV users and solve the problem of keeping ORV users on designated roads and trails. Experiences elsewhere in the country have shown that mindset to be wrong. For example, consider what occurred in Nevada, in a protected species area, and even with clear signage: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found a near universal disregard for motorized guidelines when the BLM experimented with a "voluntary off-road vehicle route system" in Nevada. The area in question serves as a refuge for the disappearing Sand Mountain Blue butterfly, a species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. The study found that half of the places where riders violated guidelines were near signs that discouraged them from proceeding into sensitive butterfly habitat. (1) The problem seems to be rooted in ORV users having it in their minds that they can and should be able to go anywhere they please. For example, this study of ORV user behavior in the neighboring state of Colorado: A 2001 Colorado study found that the majority of off-roaders understand that staying on designated routes is "fundamental trail etiquette" and that going off trail is not "correct" off-road vehicle behavior. The survey revealed, however, that regardless of this knowledge "as many as two-thirds of adult users go off the trail occasionally." A significant percentage of riders, 15-20%, admitted to frequently breaking the rules and riding off of legal routes often. Survey participants also stated that "others" ride off-route and cause most of the damage. (2) That same attitude and behavior pattern was found the neighboring state of Utah: A 2002 Utah report reveals that a high percentage of riders prefer to ride "off established trails" and did so on their last outing. Of the ATV riders surveyed, 49.4% prefer to ride off established trails, while 39% did so on their most recent excursion. Of the dirt bike riders surveyed, 38.1% prefer to ride off established trails, while 50% rode off established trails on their most recent excursion. (3) Why should New Mexico ORV users be more trustworthy or responsible than those in the neighboring states of Utah and Colorado and the nearby state of Nevada? Already the Black Feather Motorcycle Alliance seems to think that they own the Jemez forest and can do anything they please. I realize the FS does not have any extra money to apply to enforcement. That is why you need to at least act like you are serious about enforcement and totally committed to it, while also establishing painful fines and triggers for closure that are substantial enough to alter ORV user behavior. Sometimes a "neighborhood watch" sign can dissuade a would-be lawbreaker, even if no neighbors are around. The point is, the appearance of being tough is an asset. The map alone is not sufficient.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

19 The Proposed Action designates over 2,500 miles of roads and trails for motorized use. Managing those routes entails demarcation, monitoring, maintenance, enforcement, and sometimes closing and rerouting. The FS seems to have insufficient resources to provide even "poor" management in each area. The hope for good management in any of these areas seems just a dream.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

20 I realize that this 8 involves budgetary issues outside your control, but designation of motorized routes IS in your control, so why are you designating far beyond what you can manage? That seems very unwise.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

21 Table 2 on page 11 of the Proposed Action lists the existing condition of roads. The number of miles of roads that have sustained damage from the use of motor vehicles is nothing short of alarming. For example: 551 miles Damage to soil 1,247 miles Damage to watershed and/or water quality 76 miles Damage to riparian resource 708 miles Harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitats 89 miles Damage to cultural resources 75 miles Damage to other forest resource (natural or cultural) Given this devastating level of damage already done by off-road vehicles, which PROVES their damaging effects, it seems impossible that the FS can designate over 2,500 miles of roads and trailswhile fulfilling the key criteria and constraints as stated in the Travel Management Rule and the Proposed Action. The word 'sustainable' is repeated over and over in those constraints and I submit that Table 2 proves that sustainability has been essentially lost already. It seems quite impossible that the FS can designate over 2,500 miles of motorized routes, and with almost no on-the-ground signage, no blocking of closed routes, and no plans for vigorous enforcement without further sacrificing sustainability.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

22 Simply put, the daily damage created by ORV usage exceeds the Forest Service's ability to repair the damage, and a robust reparation budget does not exist. As Damage exceeds Recovery+Reparation, over time, the road or trail becomes unusable.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

23 I submit that the Proposed Action will result in further resource degradation and that this unsustainable direction and resource damage is in clear violation of key requirements of the Travel Management Rule, the Proposed Action, and the Mission of the Forest Service

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

24 Forest Road 223 -- at the point the road goes from open all year to open seasonally, to the Iron Gate Campground – this should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Yearlong" to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways, Seasonally".

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

25 This will reduce user conflict at this popular campground / day use area which dead-ends at the Pecos Wilderness Area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

26 Forest Road 645 -- at the point where 645 and 572 connect, to 645Q and 393 and their deadends -- should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Yearlong" to "Open to Vehicles Legalon Paved Highways, Seasonally".

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

27 This will reduce user conflict in this area and assist enforcement by restricting ATVs and dirt bikes access to extremely remote areas of the forest

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

28 Forest Roads 417, 417B, 417BA – these should be withdrawn from submission as "Open to Vehicles </=50", Seasonally". I visited this area today (8-29) and there are only foot paths leading to a set of old logging roads which have erosion/barrier berms every 100 feet or so. There are foot paths around the berms. ATVs would damage those berms and likely cause breakage and substantial erosion. ATVs would also force-widen the access trail, #163/150, which is a hiking trail, just 24" wide (and less) in some places, and this means ATV tires would be traveling over virgin soil, as you see in this photo. The path to the left goes to the old logging roads. Supposedly, this area is used for an annual 30-day turkey hunt, April-May. Why turkey hunters need ATVs to hunt in this very small area easily accessed by foot is a mystery at this point. But it's no mystery that ATVers seeing these routes on the Motor Vehicle Use Map will think that "open seasonally" means that it's open April-November and
not just during a 30-day period. They will see the ATV tracks leading into the 417 network and follow them, thinking they are allowed to do so. Even if signage clearly indicates the trails are currently closed to ATVs, that's unfair to the ATV user who may have trailered vehicles for many miles to access an area which the Motor Vehicle Use Map indicated should be open.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

29 Forest Road 435 – from just below the Borrego Mesa Campground to the dead-end at Rio Quemado, the designation for this road should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Seasonally" to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways, Seasonally". This will reduce user conflict at this popular campground / day use area that has easy access to the Pecos Wilderness Area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

30 This will reduce user conflict at this popular campground / day use area that has easy access to the Pecos Wilderness Area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

31 Forest Roads 326PE (eastern portion) and 326WA should be removed from motorized use.
These routes are redundant and there is a history of ORV damage and destructive behavior in
this area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

32 Dispersed camping on Glorieta Mesa – vehicles should be restricted to roadside parking only, not 300 feet or 150 feet from the road, unless there are existing campsites connected by defined lanes to the road. Vehicles should not be able to wonder around un-traveled ground looking for a place to camp. Otherwise, resource damage will occur.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

33 The Forest Service should NOT change the Forest Plan to allow higher densities until it has first removed all non-essential roads and trails from motorized designation. I realize people need access to private property, and those roads obviously need to remain, so there may be a legitimate reason for the density to exceed the guidelines in some areas. However, roads and trails purely for motorized recreation purposes should be removed in areas where the density per square mile is exceeding the current guidelines.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

34 The Forest Service should combine trails designated for motorized use with roads designated for motorized use in computing density. Single track trails, especially user-created trails, are often created without proper siting or proper engineering and are subject to: early degradation, creation of resource damage, wildlife harassment, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. The result can be more damage and disruption per mile than roads. To leave out motorized trails in computing density is to contradict the very reason density guidelines exist.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

35 Forest Roads 142, 142G – these dead-end at the Dome Wilderness Area. These roads should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Seasonally" to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways, Seasonally" in order to reduce user conflict.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

36 Forest Roads 109 (spur), 111, 76P, 76K, 199, 171, 171B, 171BB, 93G, 93HE, 91, 109 -- – these roads (or their spurs) dead-end at the San Pedro Parks Wilderness Area. These roads should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Seasonally" to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways, Seasonally" in order to reduce user conflict.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

37 Forest Roads 77, 77B1, 465, 465E, 471, 467A, 473, 169E, 169FD, 11, 8ZH, 6T, 6, 504 – these roads (or their spurs) dead-end at the Chama River Canyon Wilderness Area. These roads should be changed from "Open to All Vehicles, Seasonally" to "Open to Vehicles Legal on Paved Highways, Seasonally" in order to reduce user conflict.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

38 The 40 acre area for Trials Motorcycle riding should be removed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

39 As stated above, this intense/dense use of motorized vehicles in this area will cause significant disruption to wildlife and their habitat. Although this area may be used infrequently, that actually has a more disruptive effect. Animals will nest, burrow, feed, hunt, reproduce, raise young, and otherwise use the area a part of their habitat and then suddenly along come the machines en masse which will drive them out, causing young to be abandoned, food chain disruption, and these animals will essentially be homeless in the forest, driven out by the machines.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

40 The FS should not increase density standards to accommodate recreational (non-utilitarian) use. In addition to the density problem these trials create, and the habitat fragmentation they produce, these trails are designed for a single use, and single type of user. This violates the multiuse mandate of the Travel Management Rule. IN NO CASE SHOULD THE NUMBER OF SINGLE-TRACK ROUTES BE INCREASED FROM WHAT WAS STATED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION UNTIL THE FOREST SERVICE, AND THE SINGLE-TRACK USERS, DEMONSTRATE: THAT THESE TRAILS CAN BE ADEQUATELY MANAGED, USED IN A SUSTAINABLE MANNER, DO NOT CAUSE RESOURCE DAMAGE, THAT THE USERS OBEY THE DESIGNATIONS AND STAY ON-TRAIL, OBEY SPEED AND SOUND GUIDELINES, DO NOT MAKE NEW TRAILS, AND BE GOOD MULTIUSERS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST. Given the highly questionable manner in which many of these user-created single-track trails were created, I propose that the routes created and submitted by the Black Feather Motorcycle Alliance, some of which are in the Proposed Action, be given a "probation" status. The annual review should give particular attention to this set of trails and their usage. If there is continual resource degradation, user conflict, ongoing regulation violations, or other problems, these trails should be scaled back to what is manageable and sustainable. As an old "dirt rider" myself, and as a motorcycle aficionado, I am extremely disappointed by the behavior of my fellow motorcycle enthusiasts in the BFMA. I truly think they are unaware of the great damage they have done and are doing to the national forest, and oblivious to the long-term damage to the ecosystem their ambitious trail building will produce.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

41 As mentioned previously, routes which have been used by ORVs in the past but are no longer
approved for ORV use need to be physically marked and/or some type of obvious barrier put at the beginning of these routes, or where they branch off from approved routes, so ORV users have no 13 ambiguity about where they are permitted to take their vehicles. Good signage will help the responsible ORV user, especially those who come from out of the area or out of the state and are not familiar with our forests.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

42 I propose there be a 20mph speed limit on any unsurfaced Forest Service road, and a 15mph speed limit on all trails. In my recent outings to the Santa Fe National Forest on my dual-sport motorcycle, I have found that speed is very dangerous on multiuser routes. One day I came around a corner only to encounter a big flatbed pickup truck with side racks and loaded with wood. If I had been going too fast, there would have been a collision. Another time I came over a hill to encounter a grandfather and youngster on two ATVs. One plate was from Ohio, so these may well have been visitors. And this was on the same road where I encountered the truck later on. Having woodcutters, dirt bikes, SUVs, cars, and 10 year olds on ATVs on the same road is dangerous at any speed. Allowing people, no matter what the vehicle, to go fast enough to jeopardize their safety and that of others, is contraindicated. A 20 mph speed limit is quite reasonable, and used in other National Forests. Slower vehicles will also create (slightly) less resource damage, and have a lesser disruptive effect on wildlife. On my trip down from Rio Quamado, near the Pecos Wilderness Area, I was amazed at the number of times I came around a corner on my motorcycle only to cause various birds to go into sudden survival-flight mode. It was really disturbing. The disruptive effects of motor vehicles on wildlife were right there in front of my face, playing out like a well-crafted documentary. It became crystal clear to me that more speed means more disruption, and less speed means less disruption. But, beyond that, the safety issue is serious. Especially with 10 year olds on ATVs, 17 year old thrill seekers on high performance motorcycles, wood trucks, picnickers, bird watchers, pinon pickers, seniors, and nature-lovers all sharing the same roads which may have blind turns and other limitedvisibility issues. A 15 mph speed limit on trails also seems perfectly reasonable. Trails are supposed to be multi-use, and allowing motorized vehicles to obtain speeds in excess of 15mph when there might be equestrians, hikers or families out for a leisurely walk in nature around the corner is needlessly risky and a danger to all involved.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 831
Comment#

43 A functional monitoring plan needs to be created and shared with the public. Using sampling, and harnessing user reports, monitoring should be rather easy to accomplish.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

44 Enforcement will be harder. There are methods that can work such as -- irregular enforcement blitzes done several times a year, especially during high use times, such as holiday weekends. It should be fairly easy to set up officers at the main entrance/staging areas to popular routes, such as FR 326 off of county road 51C. Officers can check to make sure the vehicles are properly registered, that the registration number is prominently displayed, that underage users have the right equipment, that all ORV users have the proper education, and that their vehicles are within the New Mexico limit for audible sound (currently 96 decibels measured at 20 inches, 45 degrees from exhaust pipe). Note that acoustic meters are inexpensive, just $50 at Radio Shack. Since noise is one of the most, if not THE most, disruptive aspect of ORVs for both wildlife and quiet recreationists, making sure that ORVs are within the current standard may be the single most important act of enforcement the Forest Service can perform. The officers can then turn away any user whose vehicles or personal qualifications are inadequate. And everyone, turned away or not, gets an educational information packet so all know the rules. This can all be done in a friendly, fair, non-threatening manner. In addition, on blitz days, put a couple of officers out in the field with binoculars. Let their presence be known so that the ORV users know there 14 are rangers out in the field. Write a few tickets, and give a few warnings. Set some examples and expectations for the future. At specific locations where there are repeated violations, such as barrier/gate vandalism, trespass, and entry into closed and sensitive areas, the FS can use hidden surveillance cameras to photograph the offenders. As a champion of civil liberties, I do not come to this suggestion easily, but this is likely the only way to obtain knowledge about who is responsible for serious violations in remote areas, areas not otherwise easy to enforce.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

45 At public meetings for the PA, the Forest Service has repeatedly stated they will use education as a means to inform ORV users about the new rules and to assist compliance. I heartily agree with this approach. I also highly recommend that the Tread Lightly education materials be used as a part of this education so that ORV users are made aware of how easy it is to damage the ecosystem, disturb and harass wildlife, and create conflicts with other users. I took the online course – it was excellent.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

46 Successful management of motorized use in the national forest requires intelligent, creative, and flexible management that responds to new data and changing conditions. And “success” means upholding and fulfilling the Mission of the Forest Service, the key requirements of the Travel Management Rule, and the key constraints in the Proposed Action. If the Forest Service finds they cannot successfully manage the motorized routes they have designated, then the Forest Service needs to institute changes in the management – resource levels, strategies, methods, etc, including reducing or revising motorized routes in order to bring management of the forest with respect to off-road vehicles to a level which can be called “successful.” On that day, I will stand and applaud. Until then, I remain ever watchful.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

47 I support Senator Griego's Alternative for Glorieta Mesa. Our views on dispersed camping are slightly different (in my view dispersed camping up to 300 feet from the road is okay outside the living culture protection zone if there is an existing and defined route to a campsite) but I otherwise agree with the details of the alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 832
Comment#

Letter# 832
Comment#

1 I request that the Forest Service not treat 'multiple use' as an overriding mandate or to assume there are "two equivalent sides" (pro and anti ORVs)*, but instead consider all the science other mandates such as resource protection, saveguarding of SUSTAINABLE forest health and productivity, and reduction of user conflict.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I further request that the Forest Service consider all road and trail access for ORVs in the light of recent research suggesting that climate change and even potentially desertification will 1. have largescale impacts on our ecosystem, rendering them more fragile and thus more in need of protection; 2. require the health and sustainable productivity of our national forests to act as buffers against climate change and sinks for carbon sequestration.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Curtail all ORV use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

4 Cost to taxpayers for rescue and retrieval, hospitalization and fatalities. The cost to the state of Oregon from 2000-2005 was approximately 2.5 million a year for hospitalization costs coveing ATV traumas.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

5 Intensive damage to our forest ecosystem, our watersheds, our hilly slopes and mountains, our soil, our clean air. Pir wlikdlife and wildlife corridors, our endangered species, our habitats, our biodiversity, our aquifers.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Climate change impats. Every single effect and action of ORVs increases likely impacts of climate change on our forests and contriburtes to the climate change impacts that could destroy our entire way of life I the region of the Santa Fe national Forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Negative impact of residents next to the forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Effectively, elimintated 'multiple use' as required by the Forest Service mission. ORVs produce highly detrimental impact to all non-motorized recreational users in the forest. Whith noise traveling up to 2 miles in our mountain air, whith dust clouds… with the need to look for speeding, dangerous vehicles whether on or off the roads and trails- all these things effectively remove the reality of 'multiply use' in areas used by ORVers.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 Absolutely no enforcement money allocated to monitor use of ORVs in our national forests.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 Protection of endangers specises, their habitats, the existence of wildlife corridors, and the absolutely critical need of our watersheds to be protected fom erosion, pollution, sedimentation, and other damage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 Stressed forests are more susceptible to disears and insects. Stressed forests under attack by disease and insects are more susceptible to fire. Combining these realities with documented fire starts by ATVs and other ORVs provide an excellent reason to restrict ORV access to as much of the Santa Fe National Forest as possible.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

12 Please reconsider this proposed action, and close at least all trails and roads proposed by organizations and individuals interested in safeguarding the forests, its resources.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 How exactly Motorized off-road vehicles damage the forest. Please take the following documented impacts of ORVs on our national resources into account in amending the proposed action. Extensive references available on request.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

14 Please consider the following when assesssing road and trail openings. Riparian and upland vegetation are being damaged by tire tracks and repeated use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

15 Soil gets compacted by multiple OHVs driving over the same area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

16 When loose soil travels into streams, it can negatively affect habitat for fish.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

17 Soil gets compacted by multiple OHVs driving over the same area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 Noise and stress resulting from noise, have detrimental effects on mating, socialization, nesting foraging or any other normal life activity of wildlife in the area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

19 Climate change and ORVs: every impact of ATVs is a driver toward climate change, rather than reducing it. [They] use oil and gass, emissions, pollute water, impacts on wildlife, disrupt balance, loss of forest.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

20 Climate Change and ORVs. Every impact of ATVs is a driver toward climate change, rather than reducing it. Use of oil and gas, emissions, pollute water etc.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

21 Approximately 85% of wildfires on forest lands are caused by humans and a study of all California national forest reports that 75% of all fires occur within 10 feet of a road. This dierectly implies that we should reduce the road and trail density of our forests as much as possible. Having spark arrestors is not nearly sufficient, as there are multiple places on the exhaust which reach tempuratures capable of igniting forest fuels. In addtion to providing access for more users to remote venues where accidental fires are less accessible to discovery and to firefighters, off road vehicles can also directly ignite fires.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

22 Protection of endangered species, their habitats, the existence of wildlife corridors, and the absolutely critical need of our watersheds to be protected from erosion, pollution, sedimentation, and other damage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

23 The purposely destructive culture of ORVers.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

24 Please adhere to federally madated road densities. Currently the SFNF is still far above applicable road densities.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

25 Please insure that you only allow roads and trails that can adhere to trail maintenance standards.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Comment#

26 Please remove any and al trails that were user created.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

27 Adequately protect endangered speciest habitat (not done!) and wildlife corridores.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

28 -reduce trails and roads access near Wilderness areas so that noise and dust footprints are not interfering with Wilderness areas

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

29 -re-evaluate current roads and trails for those in or sufficiently near to, high fuel load areas, and reduce, restrict, or remove access to them.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

30 Be willing to close all trails used by ORVs during periods of High to Extreme fire danger.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

31 Please provide sinage plans and budget for signage per your mandate, a map is not enough.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

32 Please provide an enforcement plan and budget.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

33 Use innovative strategies for enforcement

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

34 Please show that the SFNF is officially requestiong additional monies for enforcement

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

35 Desertification leads to fragmented ecosystem structure and decrease carbon storage.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

35 Be a propotional use criteria, the Forest Service has the right to allocate only SIX PERCENT of the forest for ORV use. Anything further , given the conflicting nature of ORV use with all other non-motorized users, is unfaily constricting the rights of other users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

36 Noise and stress resulting from noise, have detrimental effects on mating, socialization, nesting foraging or any other normal life activity of wildlife in the area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

37 Wildlife distrubance: calving fawning, and nesting by wildlife is impacted by off-road vehicle use. This can also result in wildlife moving out of affected areas, depleting energy sources, and affecting wlidlife condition and health.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

37 Use adaptive management to design a complete set of triggers for temporary closure of roads. Triggers should include damage or disturbances to soils, water, habitat, wildlife, of sensitive areas;excessive noise and ustr levels or other resource damage.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

38 Enforcement should include first-time fines, second time irrevocable confiscation of the vehicles users

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

38 Riparian and upland vegetation are being damaged by tire tracks and repeated use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

39 The curent budget in the Jemez Ranger District is enough to work on two miles of trail annually. There are about 50 miles of trail. This means it is 25 years in between maintenance intervals.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

40 I support the removal of the trails already taken off the proposed action and do not want to see them considered for any alternative map.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

41 I do not support the addtion of any new trails for motorized use as the FS can not afford to maintain the system trails they have now.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

42 Remove all user created trails within the Agency's own designations of 'A' and 'D' prohibiting cross country travel

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

43 Maintain the removal of all roads and trails off FR79, Canada de Los Alamos, from OHV use, to protect Santa Fe watershed and the Glorieta wildlife corridor.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

44 Remove 375 LBB due to encroachment into PAC
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

45 Remove 375G and 53 due to encroachment into fragile riparian area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

46 Remove 375 G and 53 due to encroachment into fragile riparian area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

47 Remove many roads such as 142 and 223, leading to the Dome Wilderness, ending at Iron Date except to street legal, seasonal access.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

48 Trail 113 should be non motorized as it is partially in Mexican Spotted Owl habitat. It is also in an area designated as "d", non-motorized, until it mysteriously disappeared off the FS map. It is also eroded badly enough that sections of it were recommended to be re-routed as the damage was too bad to repair.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

49 Remove loop trails as they isolate land islands creating areas unusable by wildlife, and promote further erosion and water damage. Examples include: FT188D with FR282 and FR286F with 286FA and FAD near Cochiti Mesa. The current FR286F is already a widely used access point for unauthorized trails on Cochiti Mesa and should be closed to prevent further damage.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

50 •FR 268 and FR 289 are closed seasonally for resource protection. This has been in effect for almost 20 years. The proposed action shows that these roads will be open all year. They need to be changed to show that they are only open seasonally
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

51 Remove FR83 (between 83MB/203B and 66F) through La Cueva Spring Canyon area from Corrales Canyon to Commissary Canyon (T16N and R13E) due to redundancy and difficulty of enforcement.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

52 •FR 288 should be closed at the junction with FR 289. FR 288 parallels 289 and is a redundant route. It also leads to the Los Utes Special closure area. This area is closed to motorized vehicles over 40” and is being abused by ohv users as the FS refuses to enforce their own laws.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

53 •Trails that are not yet built should not be considered, such as an addition to cross town trail that is proposed to be built north of FR 36 in the Jemez District.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 832
Comment#

54 Remove any roads that conflict with wildlife corridor encroachment such as FR268 and 289 from the State Road 4 South junction. Enforce with closed gates. These roads specifically affect Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat and erosion damage of Rabbit Mountain.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

55 Remove any road traveling thru Roadless Areas such as Bearhead Peak (T17/R5E); Lower Medio Dia Canyon (T424);

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

56 The user created trail (tin cup trail) that makes a loop off of Fr 188 should be removed as it was created illegally in an area that is desigated non-motorized, is on highly erodible soil and and is already severely eroded.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

57 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads 'touching' these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

58 Remove the spur off FR 79, also known as Garcia Ranch Road (Canada de Los Alamos) because: • its only access is to private property and is not requested by such private individuals to be open • it has no turn around at the end and would be dangerous for a large vehicle to attempt such • it is currently used as a place for firearms practice and is in violation of the FS rule for no shooting within 100 feet of a road or trail

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

59 Be willing to close all trails used by ORVs during periods of High to Extreme fire danger.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 833
Comment#

1 One of the highlights of the Proposed Action is to “increase the miles of trails designated for motorized use.” However, the result of the Proposed Action will be a reduction from 591 miles to 247 miles.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Additionally, the trials in the Proposed Action or no longer the continuous loops that they were intended to be, they have been cut up into small sections joined by road effectively eliminating the “single-track loop” experience.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I am requesting an analysis to include all of the existing trails that were submitted by the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance and other groups to be included as alternatives to the current Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 834
Comment#
1 I am requesting an analysis of the possibility of adding additional miles of single track trail to the Glorieta Mesa/Rowe Mesa in such a way that it avoids areas of sensitivity. These trails might possibly parallel parts of Forest Rd. 326 to minimize impact, and they would preferably set up as a network of trail loops. Please include this request as an alternative to the proposed action
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 835
Comment#
1 I showed James Munoz approximately 12 miles of single-track trail in the Fangio Mesa area.
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I am requesting that the area containing these trails be analyzed to allow possible inclusion of these trails as and alternative.
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 836
Comment#
1 Fangio Mesa Area. I am requestng that the area containing thse trails be analyzed to allow possible inclusion of these trails as an alternative the proposed action. I am further requesting that these trails be managed to maintain a "loop" system of trails as was demonstrated to James Munoz on 08/18/1008/ and that they be designatted "For Motorcuycls Only" to maintain the sing;e-track experience.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 837
Comment#
1 I am requesting analysis to include existing trails in the Caja Del Rio area to be included as possible alternatives to the current Proposed acton
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 838
Comment#
1 Open a short section of trail that crosses the Polvadera IRA.
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 839
Comment#
1 Please keep all trails in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance 'Citizen's Proposal' open.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 840
Comment#
0 Duplicate of 839
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 841
Comment#
0 Reducing the miles and number of motorcycle/ATV trails will result in overcrowding. Motorcycles/ATVs need more miles of trail with loops and connections for a full day of recreation and multiple days of recreation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 842
Comment#
1 Please keep most dispersed camping spots and motorcycle/ATV trails (that aren't duplicates) open to vehicle/OHV use in the Jemez Ranger District along Forest Roads 376, 534, 539, 532 and other main connecting roads.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 843
Comment#
1 This comment form is to request to keep open FR287, Obsidian Ridge Road and FR 288 the road to Rabbit Hill.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 844
Comment#
1 This comment form is to request to keep open FR 106 to San Antonio Creek and 376R open from San Antonio Creek to FR144

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 845
Comment#
1 Closing thousands of miles of existing roads and trails will cause a significant increase of use on the ones left open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 846
Comment#
1 As I am a New Mexican native and have enjoyed the ability to freely travel the New Mexico national forests for nearly a half century by various modes of transportation I am greatly concerned to find that my ability to continue to do so is in great jeopardy. That my ability to share some of the great places within the forests with family and friends alike will no longer be possible I find greatly disturbing. Yes I know that there are abuses of the forests that occur and that some people do damaging activities. I do not see though, that the damages I am aware of, dictate that 90% of theforest access be restricted or that the public, who are common share holders of the forests, should be refused the right to enjoy them. Though not handicapped, not all people can hike or bike the long distances through the terrain required to access the areas that will now be restricted to vehicular travel.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 846
Comment#

2 I fear too that by vastly limiting vehicular travel that the allowed areas will become severely stressed due to the focus of activities in the limited areas.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 I feel it would be best to allow access to existing roads, educate the public about not making new roads and trails and how to properly enjoy the forests, and to prosecute those who abuse our forests.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I feel it would be best to allow access to existing roads, educate the public about not making new roads and trails and how to properly enjoy the forests, and to prosecute those who abuse our forests.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 847
Comment#

1 The analysis you are in the process of completing for trails and single track appears to be a desk bound activity that will not generate a valid assessment. I request you perform a mile by mile assessment of the trail net work submitted by the citizens group "Black feather trail preservation alliance"

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 our current proposal does not have sufficient loops or trails of varied degrees of difficulty.The experience of riding single track is not the same as riding an unimproved road.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 our current proposal does not have sufficient loops or trails of varied degrees of difficulty. The experience of riding single track is not the same as riding an unimproved road.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I frequently ride with young children and will not ride loops with segments of roads due to the increased danger from an encounter with a large vehicle.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 848
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 849. Truncated message

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 849
Comment#

Letter# 849
Comment#

1 I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed closure of single track trail in the Jemez District. The proposal closes man trails and loops. Without the loops you will have motorized, hiking, and mountain bikers traveling both ways on narrow trails, in addition there will be more traffic due to the reduction in the number of trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I ask that you use the proposed trail system of the Blackfeather Trail Presrvations Alliance.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I ask that you use the proposed trail system of the Blackfeather Trail Presrvations Alliance which will allow all to enjoy the trails and enhance safety.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 850
Comment#

1 I would like to request that Paliza Canyon trail (FR271_ remain open along its entire length.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Special access area/// Many of those who enjoy the forest are old, handicapped, or otherwixe debilitate to some exte. ATV of 4WD vehicles offer the only close access to such sposts.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Limited Damage - Paliza Canyon Trail follows a narrow single vehicle road with heavy brush and/or steep walls along most of the trail. The vast majority of the trail has no opportunity for abuse by vehicles going off the designated trail, and over a decade of personal use I have rarely seen any sign of this happening, and even then it was for a very short distance because of these limitations. Reduced Public Visibility - Because access to this area lies some distance away from Highway 4, it is subject to much less public activity than other places such as Forest Road 376, which sees heavy use by ATV's. In its currect condition, Paliza Canyon Trail (FR271) is unmarked and hard to find, which limits use by the general public. Minimal Riparian Areas - While this trail crosses small drainage areas such as are common throughout the forest, there are no perennial stream flows that are disturbed by this trail.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 851
Comment#

1 I support the closing of the maximum numer of off road ATV trails.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 852
Comment#

1 Just a few words to let you know our feelings on this proposed action the forest service is doing regarding the opng [sic] of forest land to more camp sites.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 852
Comment#

2 We are concernd of people dumping trash in the area [326AK] because of the run off after goes into the arroyo that crosses our property.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Another concern is people cutting our fences.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 This couldcause a problem with woodcutters or atv riders up there, we would not want people trespassing or running all through our properties.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 We understand it is impossible to have someone patroling the area 24-7. So we believe giving people more options would only create more problems.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 853
Comment#

1 I would like for the Forest Service to reconsider some of the existing roads and trails that form loops. Many of the existing routes can be traveled in one direction from start to finish, ending up basically in the same place where started. This type of travel has the ability to have less impact on the land simply because the option of continuing on VS turning around.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Two roads in particular are in the Los Alamos area. FR442 Guaje Canyon connection to FR57 Rendija Rd and R179 Pipeline Rd connecting to the Camp May Rd. This listed rods are two that I personally feel strongly about. However, I feel that there would be a great benefit for the Forest Service to loops in their decision process.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 854
Comment#

1 The agency must acknowledge and assess the positive effects on all resources of ending cross country travel.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The agency must acknowledge and account for the disturbances caused by non-motorized users who are not restricted to open areas.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The agency must use best available science which includes studies which compare the effects of motorized to non-motorized users. Open areas should not be closed to motorized use when the best available science shows that motorized impacts are not significantly greater than non-motorized
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 855
Comment#

Letter# 855
Comment#

1 Studies need to be done to prove that observed trails riding in "sensitive" areas hurt wildlife and not just hide behind unsubstantiated comments.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

1 Studies need to be done to prove that observed trails riding in "sensitive" areas hurt wildlife and not just hide behind unsubstantiated comments.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Allegations without scientific backing should not be considered valid unless quantifiable.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 856
Comment#

1 The agency must acknowledge that science proves that any outdoor recreation – bicycling, hiking, running, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, bird watching, and OHV travel cause impacts on the environment.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

1 Take no action, None required.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Cost of enforcement and sustainment not estimated/provided by the USFS
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The agency must be wary of unsubstantiated allegations regarding natural resource damage to justify the prioritization of different varying groups trail use.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 It's much easier to claim "resource damage" and hide behind a political entity than it is to gain empirical data and actually quantify said allegations.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 857
Comment#

1 I applaud the Forests plan to get a handle on the seemingly out of conrol road building in the Jemez District.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 857
Comment#

2 They (OHVs) should be confined to the same small areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Except for hunters and wood cutters I think you could close many more roads on Cat, Virgin, Schoolhouse, and Holiday Mesas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 I am a site steward and am greatly concerned about the impact on the numerous archaeological sites especially by those on OHVs.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 any motorcycle and OHV trails should be located far far away from hiking and SC ski trails.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 858
Comment#

1 Jemez Mtns (fr289, 287, 282, 286, 291 and associated single tracks) I use these trails in the summers to take my son dirt biking when he visits me. I am familiar with the dirt bike community and they are responsible and environmentally conscious people. The national forest belong to all the people and should no --- to any group to the special interests of another.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 859
Comment#

1 489 - The north end of 489 between 489B and 135 no longer exist. There are cairns marking a trail where it used to be. Without the cairns it would be difficult to follow. Ending the road to motorized travel at the point where 135 drops into the canyon may make sense. I'm sure there are many OHV drivers who would like to see it open all the way to Bridge Road. The road off the mesa is steep and very rocky in places. The last two miles in the bottom of the canyon, it is very sandy. Closing that part does make sense.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 135 The Proposed Action shows 135 open to street legal vehicles only. I feel it should be open to all vehicles. It is not suited for high speed travel or get significant travel, such that there would be any user conflicts. Also, not having the north end open to all vehicles isolates 135A and 135B from the other roads that are open.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 860
Comment#

1 534F, 534GH, 534GN, 534O Thanks for adding this route to the PA. It affords some nice loops.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 861
Comment#

1 17 is currently closed between 20 and 20I. It has several ponds behind berms. The upper part of 17 is currently being used primarily by ATVs. 17 gets very muddy when wet. It has some steep narrow sections. I would prefer to see this road continue to be closed, but if not, it may be best that it only be used for ATVs and motorcycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 862
Comment#

1 Thanks for closing 604J. That road has needed to be closed for years. It can be very wet in the spring and gets heavily rutted. The road is redundant. 605 goes to the same place.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 863
Comment#

1 These connections cannot presently be made as parts of these roads do not exist.532, 538JD, 539AF, 539J The connections shown in red on the attached map do not exist nor were roads there in the past. The roads shown in magenta do exist and are currently being used.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

2 539 J is in the bottom of McMillian Canyon and is susceptible to erosion. This road has only been reopened in the last few years.
532 does not connect to 535.
Part of the segment shown in green on the left side of the map is almost like a bog when it is wet. This section is not currently being used by motorized vehicles and should stay that way. The part of 532 shown in green is currently used as a single track and should not be open to motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 864
Comment#

1 I will be sending an html document with maps and substantiating photos.653 653EJ should be open to all vehicles. It is not a high speed road, it does not have any traffic, it completes a loop and it is used more than 653 to the south . This road is consitent with other roads used by all vehicles and not with those used for street legal vehicles only.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 558T should be open to all vehicles. It is in good condition and is the main continuation to 558.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 The connection between 653 and 558T is overgrown and no longer connects. ATVs have tried to push a road through this segment. Parts of this were open, other parts have deadfall. This segment should not be open to motorized vehicles. An alternative road is shown in the html document.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 865
Comment#

Letter# 865
Comment#

1 over the last two years, we in good faith GPSed all of our existing trails for the SFNF with the clear understanding that they would be incorporated into the new management plan. Now, it appears with the changing of the guard, that will not be the case with little or no valid explanation.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2) With the exception of hunting season (which we avoid out of common courtesy for the hunters), once we get further than 1 to 1-1/2 mile in from the trail head, there
is simply no one out there. 2) To imply that we have an adverse affect on the wildlife is absurd. We do observe a lot of wild life every season and they are clearly unmolested by our presence.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

3 I must recommend the NEPA "No Action" for the SFNF system.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 866
Comment#

1 FR 442 & FR 57, I would like for the forest service to reconsider some of the existing roads and trails that form loops. Many of the existing routs can be traveled in one direction from start to finish, ending up basically in the same place where started. This type of travel has the ability to have less impact on the land simply because the option of continuing on VS turning around.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 FR 442 & FR 57, Two roads in particular are in the Los Alamos area. FR442 Guaje Canyon connection to FR57 Rendija Rd and R179 Pipline Rd connecting to the Camp May Rd. The listed roads are two that I personally feel strongly about. However, I feel that there would be great benefit for the Forest Service to loops in their decision process.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 FR 442 & FR 57, Two roads in particular are in the Los Alamos area. FR442 Guaje Canyon connection to FR57 Rendija Rd and R179 Pipline Rd connecting to the Camp May Rd. The listed roads are two that I personally feel strongly about. However, I feel that there would be great benefit for the Forest Service to loops in their decision process.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 867
Comment#

1 A GPS file named "ForestService_MikeMedwin_505-294-0821.gpx" containing trails near FR 100 was submitted to Julie Luetzelschwab on 8/27/08. I would like to see these expert-level single-track loops kept open.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 868
Comment#

Letter# 868
Comment#

1 From what I saw at the scoping meeting thee current FS proposal had a lot of disconnected single track segments, and the remaining segments are connected by too many miles of road segments which remove the single-track riding experience.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The FS I think looses track of the fact that by just going to designated trials ONLY is inherently a very dramatic reduction without then in addition cutting out the trails specifically requested by 50%!!!! If all that is out there (trails) is included the reduction/cut is much greater, more like 80-90%. It feels like the OHV community is being penalized because of listing what we wanted to keep open, as it was only real "quantifying" of what is out there trail wise, so then half of them get closed so as to show that 50% of the trials have been shut down.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 What I heard was the FS is closing a trial by just by looking at some maps, and applying large scale categories (salamander area, etc.),, minimal field checking. Then we are told our process is if we can show spot by spot, we might keep some of them open. In other words the burden of proof is on the individuals, not the FS. The fact is clear that the FS is not applying a true NEPA process. Where has is been determined that only motorcycles, not mtn. bikes, hikers, etc. are harming salamanders in these locations (if any of us really are..., back to concentration....).

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We get tagged with too much being the cause of trail "erosion" , where fact is that these are simply trails, subject to the same issues any trail is relative to erosion. Some of the worst trail erosion I have seen is while hiking or backpacking where people cut switchbacks, or from houses, etc..

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I would like to see the FS work with the OHV groups to address the maintenance, possible rerouting, etc. instead of just closing them if in doubt or ignorance of the situation. We would like some additional meetings.

Public Concern # 40 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 869
Comment#

1 I was told that Forest System Road #52 would be closed under a proposal currently being investigated. I am also told that I would be the obligee in acquiring access to this road through the Forest Service, if this road is closed. At this time you are unaware of how much this will cost me to access my own property. I would like the road to remain open. It has been locked for years by the forest service, and they provide the combination to me so that I can access the property.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 FR 52H: I was told that Forest System Road #52 would be closed under a proposal currently being investigated.I am also told that I would be the obligee in acquiring access to this road through the Forest Service, if this road is closed. At this time you are unaware of how much this will cost me to access my own property. I would like the road to remain open. It has been locked for years by the forest service, and they provide the combination to me so that I can access the property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 870
Comment#

1 I would like to see the distance increase to 2 vehicle widths along roads (for parking). This would allow a better safety margin for parked vehicles.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Could provisions be made to allow camping (parking a vehicle) further from the road in areas not designated for dispersed camping
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 871
Comment#

1 604G (Lake Fork Canyon area) which parallels 604 is shown in the wrong location the attached map shows the correct location. [See webpage submitted 09/3/2008 on this road
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 872
Comment#

1 611 does not connect to 611GA as shown. There is a ledge between the two roads. An alternatvie route is shown on the attached map. [See webpage submitted 09/03/2008 on this road
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 873
Comment#

1 the first part of 608 is shown in the location of the original road which no longer exists. The attached map shows the correct location.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Since the dispersed camping has been eliminated along 606, the road shown in magenta (former 608) would be a good candidate for dispersed camping. An area of dispersed camping is needed in the middle of the mesa.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 874
Comment#

1 The road segment shown as 605 in the PA (show in red on the right in the attached map) as 605 joins 604, is not 605, but an old road that is no longer used. The segment in magenta is the correct location for 605 which is the route that should be used and not the red segment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 875
Comment#

1 thanks for closing 604J. That road has needed to be closed for years. It can be very wet in the spring and gets heavily ruttered. The road is redundant. 605 goes to the same place.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 876
Comment#
0 Duplicate of 875
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 877
Comment#
1 The south end of 605 from the junction of 605/608G to 608 should be closed. 608G should be used instead. This segment of 605 was bermed and closed years ago. It is only used occasionally, by those willing to go over or around the berms. Part of this road segment is very sandy. The south end had reverted and was not connected through to 608 until last year. 608G is a very good road. Part of it has been treated with crushed rock. Part of it is on bedrock (tuft).
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 878
Comment#
1 Stop taking our single track trails away
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 879
Comment#
1 recent movie shoots in the area have resulted in more damage than a hiker or ATV rider does.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 ATV riders and motorcycle riders mostly stick to established roads and do not travel over natural landscapes. I realize that there are exceptions to that statement, I am only stating this from my experience while riding in the woods. As a matter of fact, I have seen riders of both taking time and effort to fix areas that have been damaged.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 880
Comment#
1 How will the forest service ensure that all relevant regulations are presented to the public in clear and unambigous language without the usual obfuscation and references to CFRs as as an example
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 881
Comment#
1 I am concerned that all motorists are being treated as beer can tossing, irresponsible abusres of the national forest.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 882
Comment#

Letter# 882
Comment#

1 There should be no dispers camping along FR144 in Section30
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 FR 607A should be closed at its junction with FR607.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 The loop roads off FR 80,8s, and8sf should be closed for consistency with the updated wildlife maps. Aslo, the dispersed camping zon along the NE part of FR 11 in sections 5 and 32 should be eliminated.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

4 FR 88L and 88N should be eliminated entirely as OHV routes.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The number of OHV routes on Cuba Mesa in general and some routes in particular, especially those on the east side, contributes to erosion of the fine sandy soils there. OHV routes that cause erosion on Cuba mesa should be closed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 883
Comment#

0 Dublipcate of 882
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 884
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Notification of delivery failure.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 885
Comment#

1 The Travel Management Plan does not make sense
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 886
Comment#

1 I would like to ask that there be resticted stopping all recreational use.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 887
Comment#

Letter# 887
Comment#
0 Form Letter.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 888
Comment#
1 I support the proposed actions to prohibit cross-country vehicle use outside of some small areas specifically dedicated to that purpose.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 I am concerned about the number of miles of trail still open to motorized recreation
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Specifically, I hope that the GuajeRidge and Cabra trails in northern Los Alamos County will be closed to off-road vehicle use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

4 My major concern about the Proposed Travel Management Rule is the ability of the FS to enforce the closure of some roads and trails to motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

5 I would encourage the FS to seek funding for permanent barriers, more ranger patrols, community involvement activities, and other means of enforcing the designated closures.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 889
Comment#
1 Please do not allow the use of off-road vehicles in our beautiful forest! I want the use of OHVs to be restricted because I care about our forests and understand the negative effects that this will have to the environment.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 890
Comment#
1 I am writing to express my STRONG OPPOSITION to any change in rules which would allow OHVs into the National Forests. They destroy the landscape, as we all know, and destroy the peace and quiet that makes the National Forest so special and precious in modern times.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 891
Comment#
1 The destruction of land from ORV's I have seen escalating in the past ten years is alarming. No matter where I hike or camp within the Santa Fe national forest I have witnessed degradation of the land and outlaw behavior of ATV riders, not to mention noise, pollution and threatening conduct.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 891
Comment#

2 The destruction of land from I have witnessed degradation of the land and outlaw behavior of ATV riders, not to mention noise, pollution and threatening conduct.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The whole situation is glaringly out of control and the idea of proposing more trails where proper use is unsupervised is a setup for disaster. Please hear those of us who appreciate the sacred space of the forest,

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 892
Comment#

1 I am against opening up the SFNF to off-road vehicles of any kind. Such traffic is destructive of the forest ecosystem on many levels and I hope that you will decide that our forest is worth protecting.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 893
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action is flawed, with unreasonable estimations with respect to environmental impacts. Existing routes were excluded because they crossed an arbitrary polygon boundary, with no specific mapping to actual sensitive soil. Site-specific analysis is good reason for closing a trail -- speculative 'sensitive soil' areas that may or may not be near a trail... those are NOT good reasons for closing a trail, according to the National Environmental Policy Act.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Please re-create a new Proposed Action based on site-specific data, instead of meaningless and arbitrary map polygons. Consider the actual potential environmental impacts of specific routes and alternatives as presented by the route users themselves, w ith the potential mitigations that they also suggested... and remember that many forest users use motorized roads and trails to access non-motorized pursuits.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Consider a full range of alternatives… the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand-alone Alternative or as the basis for a new Alternative that attempts to meet the documented increase in OHV recreation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 894
Comment#

1 The relentless assualt upon our last national resources cannot be sustained. I am asking you to discontinue even the thought of allowing such vehicles in our forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 895
Comment#

1 Please restrict OHVs in national forests as much as possible.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 896
Comment#

1 Please give consideration to my plea to ban Off-Highway Vehichles from our national forests.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 897
Comment#

1 I hope that the Forest Service will continue to restrict access as much as possible and reduce the rist of the land being negatively effected by the vehicles.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I am also concerned about using tax payers' money to fund the creation and maintenance of thse roads.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 898
Comment#

1 I am writing to request that you protect the Glorieta Mesa from ATVS (specifically areas near county roads 51, 51D, etc).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Plans open up too much land to ATVs and I think they should not be able to use any public or national lands at all.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Keep them out , and reinforce this with actual guards and staff that will protect our forests.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 899
Comment#

1 I recently held an equestrian competition in the Caja. We removed 7 truck loads of trash before the ride on 8/23/2008, mainly at a site just off FR24 that is illegal for shooting.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 Other shooting and regular trash dumping is occurring east and north of the Headquarters well area and it is dangerous to ride or hike anywhere in the pipeline road/Buckman/dead dog well area. While I sincerely believe in multiple use, this area has become a hazard and needs to be closed to shooting.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 900
Comment#

1 I am writing on bhalf of my wife Maomi and myself to voice out concerns over the use of 4Wheelers and dirt bikes in and around the La Cueva canyon area. We have lived here for 14 years and are very concerned about the noise pollution and other errects on our residential area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 901
Comment#

0 duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 902
Comment#

1 •Establish NEPA-ready 'adaptive management' triggers for temporary closures of roads and trails.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 •restrict all trails so that their noise and dust footprint does not impact Wilderness areas, sensitive habitat, or residential areas;

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 •Remove all user created trails within the Agency's own designations of 'A' and 'D' prohibiting cross country travel.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 maintain the removal of all roads and trails off FR 79, Canada de Los Alamos, from OHV use, to protect the Santa Fe watershed and the Glorieta wildlife corridor.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Remove 375 LBB due to encroachment into PAC • Remove 375 G due to archeological and riparian encroachment • Remove 375 G and 53 due to encroachment into fragile riparian area • Remove many roads such as 142 and 223, leading to the Dome Wilderness, ending at Iron Gate except to street legal, seasonal access. Anything other will only encourage encroachment into the Wilderness.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 Remove loop trails as they isolate land islands creating areas unusable by wildlife, and promote further erosion and water damage. Examples include: FT188D with FR282 and FR286F with 286FA and FAD near Cochiti Mesa. The current FR286F is already a widely used access point for unauthorized trails on Cochiti Mesa and should be closed to prevent further damage.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 902

Comment#

7 Remove FR83 (between 83MB/203B and 66F) through La Cueva Spring Canyon area from Corrales Canyon to Commissary Canyon (T16N and R13E) due to redundancy and difficulty of enforcement.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 Remove any roads that conflict with wildlife corridor encroachment such as FR268 and 289 from the State Road 4 South junction. Enforce with closed gates. These roads specifically affect Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat and erosion damage of Rabbit Mountain.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Remove any road traveling thru Roadless Areas such as Bearhead Peak (T17/R5E); Lower Medio Dia Canyon (T424);

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads 'touching' these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 903

Comment#

1 I oppose open running of ATVs in the forest.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 These vehicles need to be controlled via licensing and required educational programs.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 How much monitoring is the FS providing?

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 It appears that the policing aspect is underfunded and there will be damage to our forest.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 904

Comment#

1 In regard to Senator Griegos Alternative Proposal, I have no argument against any of the first four specific modifications he is requestin. However I take exception to the fifth modification, the lack of including any motorized single tack in the area and his proposal for an " Historic Living Culture Protection Zone."

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 904
Comment#

2 Finally considering the "Historical Culture Protection Zone". This is a sham. The National Forest belongs to all US taxpayers and singling out privledged few who happen to own land abutting the National Forest allocating them special rights is outrageous and will set a precedent that will cause the Forest Service undue headache with lawsuites in the future.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 905
Comment#

1 I am opposed to opening more of the Santa Fe Nationa Forest to off-road access and support the closure of any routes that are in danger of suffereing ecological, archeological or wildlife damage.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 ORV users should pay annual permit fees to help pay for the restoriation work.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Also age limits should be considered for riders under 18 requiring an insured adult over 21 accompany them. I'm opposed to creating new routes, adding user created routes to the designated system, high route densities in critical salamander and spotted owl habitat and the extent of dispersed camping areas.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 906
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 905

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 907
Comment#

1 Please do all you can to stop expanded use of the Santa Fe National Forest to off-road vehicles

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 908
Comment#

1 In regard to Forest Road 286 on Cochiti Mesa, I would like to see the proposed limited access for motorcycle use only changed to include ATV use also on the existing road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 909
Comment#

Letter# 909
Comment#

1 Are the planners taking into account valid studies and actual use by average taxpaying citizens.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Are the SFNF planners likely to add well reasoned and balanced alternatives, or is reduction of OHV access and use in the SFNF a foregone conclusion?

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 910
Comment#

1 Being a home owner on Cochiti Mesa, I would like to have as much access to the roads and trails on my ATV as is being proposed for the motorcyclists.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Forest Road 500 which is across Pines canyon from my home, is a great place for both ATV riders and motorcyclists but is being proposed as open only to motorcycles seasonally. Forest Road 500 is more than just a two track motorcycle trail, it is large enough for an ATV without any kind of modificattion.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 If it is open for use by ATV users and motorcycle riders, there will be more people available for trail maintenance.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 ATV use as a form of recreation is family friendly and will not a negative environmental impact on roads and trails that are already in existence in the Santa Fe National Forest.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 911
Comment#

1 According to the map I looked at on your website, Forest Road 89 is the one that runs along the bottom of Pines Canyon and provides access to the private property in the Tent Rock Ranch area. I own property beyond Tent Rock Ranch which is currently only accessible by forest road 89. This is not a highly used road and is not maintained at this point but is still the only access to my property. This road needs to be marked on the Forest Service maps and needs to be part of the Travel Management plan. This issue needs to be addressed immediately so my private property does not become inaccessible and land locked by the Forest Service Travel Management Plan.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 912
Comment#

1 We are losing a huge amount of OHV trail all across the country. We all value these area and want them open and available to our children and grand children.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 913
Comment#

Letter# 913
Comment#

1 I am totally opposed to OHV use in the Santa Fe National Forest.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Just for the "fun of the few" important resrouces are destroyed and the forest is not longer a quiet sanctuary for the rest of use to enjoy. It is another form of pollution that we definitely do not need.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Just for the "fun of the few" important resrouces are destroyed and the forest is not longer a quiet sanctuary for the rest of use to enjoy. It is another form of pollution that we definitely do not need.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 But more imporant is the invasive and disturbing aspect of being in the wilderness and then hearing some ORV ruining the tranquility of the forest as well as potentially damaging the ecosystem.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 914
Comment#

1 Keep OHVs out of the National Forest.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 915
Comment#

1 I would like to support more ingress/egress to Cochiti Mesa. I would suggest that the FS additionally put some resources into improving alternative access.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 having options is the key to surviving a major catastrophic wildfire. If there is enough time for people to move out in this case, it would sure be a deadly scenario.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Some of the other options for ingress and egress to and from Cochiti Mesa are in such bad repair they are almost useless right now to help provide alternative exits.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 916
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts.
Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 916
Comment#

2 Existing routes identified by OHV users for incorporation in the travel system are not being considered simply because they cross a so-called “sensitive polygon.”

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

3 Existing routes identified by OHV users for incorporation in the travel system are not being considered simply because they cross a so-called “sensitive polygon.”

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Planning in this manner is not compliant with NEPA as it is arbitrary and does not use the "best science available".

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

5 Reducing OHV recreational opportunities in one place will cause a concentration of impacts in another.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 The time has come when reduction in OHV trail miles can no longer be allowed to occur. If miles must be given up due to sensitive areas, then they must be mitigated by an equal number of new miles being opened in another area. Decisions regarding access can no longer be made without proper scientific reasoning behind them. An area on a map indicating sensitive soils does not mean that there is a rational or scientific basis to end travel throughout that entire area. Each route must be individually examined PRIOR to closure so that it can be determined if it necessary that it be closed.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 917
Comment#

1 I would urge you to stop this, since they do so much damage to the land not so speak of the disturbing noise.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I would urge you to stop this, since they do so much damage to the land not so speak of the disturbing noise.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Our forests are a place of quiet and natural enjoyment there is no place for these destructive and disturbing vehicles.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 918
Comment#

Letter# 918
Comment#

1 THEY ARE POLLUTING, NOISY, SCARE WILDLIFE, SCAR TERRAIN, AND ARE OBNOXIOUS. MANY ENVIRONMENTS ARE FRAGILE RIPARIAN OR ARCHEOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS. WILDLIFE CORRIDORS ARE COMPROMISED, EROSION & WATER DAMAGE ARE EXACERBATED. ORV DESTROY THE ENVIRONMENT!

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE USE OF RECREATIONAL OFF ROAD VEHICLES IN OUR NATIONAL FOREST.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 919
Comment#

1 Forest Road 106 between Thompson Ridge and the Rio San Antonio Creek crossing is a beautiful Ohv trail and I request that it be preserved for future motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 920
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 919

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 921
Comment#

1 You have proposed closing most roads and trails to all motorized reacreation except snowmobiles in the winter. We have ridden in the snow on ATVs for years. We always travel in groups, we stay on developed roads, we have winches and shovels and there is no environmental damage whatsoever. Please include ATVS along with snowmobiles as allowable motorized recreation in the forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 922
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 919

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 923
Comment#

1 I am requestiong that you leave the entire length of the Paliza Canyon road (FR 271) open to motorized recreation because it is the gateway to areas that OHV users have enjoyed and maintained for decades.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 924
Comment#

Letter# 924
Comment#
1 I am requesting that the following road or trail remain open to motorized recreation: FR270 between the Paliza Canyon road (FR271) and FR270 to Cerro Pelado.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 925
Comment#
1 I want to request that the following trail remain open and accessible to motorized rectreation: FR 271N conncecting Paliza Canyon Road 271 and FR280 to the Channel 2 towers.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 926
Comment#
1 I am very interested in having FR 188F and 188FD, from FR188 to the private property above the pond in upper Medio Dai Canyon, remain open to access the pond and the old pack tral cabin. The private property owner has indicated to me he has no objection to OHVs parking at the fence line and riders walking across his land to the pond.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 927
Comment#
1 I respectfully request that you give consideration to leaving the following road/trail open. FR 268 from above the Bland gate north to the private property line, in the interest of preserving a loop road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 928
Comment#
1 I live on La Cueva Road (also known as Co. Rd. 63A)) in La Cueva Canyon, Glorieta,NM. My hiking plans were ruined by the noises, fumes, and tossed beer and soda cans and rood wrappers.containers. Please do not allow this ton continue. The ORVs create noise pollution, fuel pllution, trash. But most of all they ruin animal habitats. We are not allowed to drive our cars into the backwoods trails. The ORV;s should not be allot either.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 929
Comment#
0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 930
Comment#
1 There are few if any loops remaining in the proposed trail system which means more driving to get to trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 930
Comment#

2 Most of the trails on the Bland Canyon area are to be closed
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 The closure of the Ponderosa Canyon forest road, while primitive, is great for sightseeing up the canyon and the views from the top will only be accessible by driving all the way around Jemez towrads Los Alamos using more gas and creating more pollution.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 931
Comment#

1 The area identified as Barley Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trials Association was not included in the Proposed Action.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 the Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly “pre-filtered” and removed from consideration this, and other, existing routes and areas.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 It appears that the Forest Service is not considering existing routes and areas identified by OHV users for incorporation in the travel system simply because they coincide with a so-called "sensitive polygon.”
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I formally request that the SFNF consider on a site-specific basis the potential environmental impacts of specific routes, areas, and alternatives presented to the agency by those directly affected by the decision, including this one.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 I also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation measures as an alternative to closure.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 932
Comment#

1 •Establish NEPA-ready 'adaptive management' triggers for temporary closures of roads and trails.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 932
Comment#

2 Desertification: One can also say, fragmented ecosystem structure leads to desertification

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 933
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 934
Comment#

1 My primary joy in the forest is its peace, quiet and solitude. This quiet has been broken nearly every day this summer as swarms of dirt bikes and 4 wheelers roar up and down FR 268 (all endings)' on FR 286 (all endings) and on Cochiti Mesa. Good mufflers should be required for motorized vehicles of all kinds in the whole National Forest System.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I support the removal of the trails already taken off the proposed action and do not want to see them considered for any alternative map.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I do not support the addition of any new trails for motorized use as the FS can not afford to maintain the system trails they have now.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

4 The FS should include motorized trails along with roads in their density count.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 User created trails within a previously restricted area (sections labeled A or D on the SFNF map - cross country travel prohibited, or a roadless area) should be prohibited and removed from the proposed action.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 Trails that are not yet built should not be considered

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

7 FR 142 that leads to the Dome Wilderness should be open to only street legal vehicles. The short spur road that takes off to the north off of FR 142 should be taken off the map as it does not exist.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 934
Comment#

8 FR 188B, 188D and 268AB need to be removed along with the user created trail that connects FR 268 with FR 268AB since they lead ohv users to private property and will increase conflict between land owners and ohv users. There is all ready a problem with ohv users trespassing, tearing up private property with their machines and tearing down gates, fences and signs. Landowners do not use these roads to access their properties. These roads and trails also go through essential habitat for Jemez Mountain Salamanders

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 FR 288 should be closed at the junction with FR 289. FR 288 parallels 289 and is a redundant route. It also leads to the Los Utes Special closure area. This area is closed to motorized vehicles over 40" and is being abused by ohv users as the FS refuses to enforce their own laws.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 FR 289D should be closed as it is another redundant route in a high road density area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 FR 500 should be closed as it already has been closed once but again the FS does not enforce the closure. It is a redundant route in an area where the road density is too high already.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 The user created trail (tin cup trail) that makes a loop off of FR 188 should be removed as it was created illegally in an area that is designated non motorized, is on highly erodible soil and is already severely eroded.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 All sections of FR 268A in Del Norte and Medio Dia canyons need to be closed as it will only encourage people to trespass on private property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 FR 268D needs to be removed as it is another route that leads to private property but is not needed for access. Legal access is off of FR 286.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 Trail 113 should be non motorized as it is partially in Mexican Spotted Owl habitat.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 FR 286F, 286FA and 286 FAD should be removed since almost the whole surface of Cochiti Mesa is highly erodible pumice soil and can not stand up to motorized abuse. The road is eroded so badly now that no one will be able to go down there for enforcement purposes and there are hundreds of miles of unauthorized trails that will be accessible to dirt bikers by these roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

17 FR 268 and FR 289 are closed seasonally for resource protection. This has been in effect for almost 20 years. The proposed action shows that these roads will be open all year. They need to be changed to show that they are only open seasonally.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 935
Comment#

Letter# 935
Comment#

1 All dirt roads that are open to street legal vehicles on the Pecos District should be left open to all vehicles including OHVs, not just highway legal vehicles
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 FR123 this road should be open to all vehicles. FR 123 and 123a should have dispersed camping buffer the entire length. This is a heavily used area for dispersed camping. 375, 375G, and 53 should be open to a dispersed camping buffer and all vehicles not just highway legal ones the entire length.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Fr 79 should be open to all vehicles. There are two miles of road that go from the trailhead at FR79 to private land. This should be opened up to the public and used as exclusive use land for the landowner.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 386a- I am glad to see this left open
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 Glorieta Mesa Area – All roads should be left open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 936
Comment#

1 the planning process. 1. The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environmental impacts. It appears that existing routes identified by OHV users for incorporation in the travel system are not being considered simply because they cross a so-called "sensitive polygon." In other words, a route will not be considered based on soil concerns merely because it lies within a mapped "sensitive soil" area and not because of any site specific analysis regarding the route's impacts on soils or other natural resource.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 meaningfully consider the potential environmental impacts of specific routes and alternatives presented to the agency by those who are directly affected by the decision. I also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation efforts as an alternative to closure.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 2. The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives. The off-highway vehicle community generally supports designating roads and trails for motorized use. We also support thorough environmental review and analysis in route designation process, as well as ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the OHV infrastructure. What the OHV community does not support is being presented with a "range" of management alternatives where all of the alternatives represent a significant reduction in OHV opportunity.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 936
Comment#

4 I formally request that you adopt the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand-alone Alternative or as the basis for an alternative that attempts to mee the documented increase in OHV recreation.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The cumulative loss of motorized recreational opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incorporated into the decision making process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Alternatives should be developed to meet the need for a motorized trail experience and all alternatives should consider its impacts on motorized recreation opportunities across the entire forest.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Trail experience distinct from road experience. It is important to recognized the distinction between "trails" and "roads" during the planning process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 937
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 938
Comment#

1 Reduction in roads: We heartily support the reduction in roads open to motorized travel by 53 percent and we believe a further reduction should be made.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Reduction of trails: We also support the reduction in trails open to motorized use from 591 miles at present to 247 miles. A further reduction should be made by closing all unauthorized user-created routes except those few that meet a demonstrated public need and that meet applicable Forest Service standards.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Closure to cross-country travel : We favor the closure of the SFNF to cross-country motorized travel as proposed.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 There should be no use of ORVs in these areas [IRAs]

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 938
Comment#

5 In other national forest the Forest Service has been successful in attaining a wide speration between areas used by ORVs and those used by people seeking a quiet, wildland experience. The plan should aim to provide large areas of wild lands for quiet visitors without the intrusion of ORVs with their noise and their impacts against natural reatures.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 ORV numbers are irrelevant: ORV fans often complain that there should be no closures because more and more ORVs are being sold every year. We believe the number of ORVs sold is irrelevant to this planning project.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 939
Comment#

1 It is a dynamic force this landscape of La Cueva and I feel OHV use will prove to be destructive beyond repair in my lifetime.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 If there are not enough resources to properly manage the forest and its use we know that this will be regrettable story where a few destroy the forest for all. It is my understanding that OHV users represent a small percentage of users of the forest and yet account for 90% of damage.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The creek that runs through La Cueva sub stains an amazing amount of life for the flora and fauna. In my view it is unethical to not protect our riparian zones in the Southwest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 I strongly oppose the Proposed Action which still designates trails and dispersed camping in Critical Habitat, cultural and archeological sites and high-fire danger areas at the top of the LaCueva drainage and designates the addition of a motorized route which drops into the Canyon as it depends, crosses the creek and riparian area and designates camping in the meadow by the creek.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 also oppose the labyrinth of proposed routes in the Jemez Mountains, where similar problems with local Communities and similar historic uses would be impacted by OHV use and trails.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 La Cueva, the cave also has significant historical and archeological to native tribes and Hispanic communities here. It seems to me that a significant study has not been conducted to survey the cultural and biological significance of this area.

Public Concern # 32 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 940
Comment#

Letter# 940
Comment#

1 I was pleased to see the new restictions of FR 268 (Bland Canyon) and peripheral trails may of which were cut by off road users not ever designated for motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Removing these areas from off road use is an important step but will require vigilance to maintain.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

3 In contrast, I must object to and request reconsideration of the designation in several other areas that must also be protected. I note that sever areas in the plan greatly exceed the recognized allowable maximum density of 1 linear mile of motorized road per square mile of area.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Two areas in our area should be reconsidered in the master plan and removed from motorized usage designation: the motorized loop trails off of FR282 between Rt. 4, Bland Canyon, Bearhead Ridge, and Medio Dia Canyon; and the entire FT113 complex. Both areas should be protected from motorized use for the reasons stated above: namely they contrain extensive cultural heritage sites; they are important wild-life corridors and habitat niches' and they are critical hydrological resources for the health of the canyons and forests.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 I strongly urge you to retain this already protected area and to include the connected segments for non-motorized use only. That is; the entire corridor from Rt 4 to the lower canyons between Bearhead Ridge, and Dome Road (FR289) should be made off limits for motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 I understand the dates for closing the Fr 289, 268, and 89 will be shortened, i.e., the open dates will be increase. This seems a very poor idea and should be reconsidered. Closing these roads provides some relief and recovery for the biosphere during the winter months.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 941
Comment#

1 Please limit and restrict OHV use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 According to the most recent draft travel plan, propsed road density is too high in the Jemez District to allow reasonable non-motorized uses or high-quality wildlife habitat. Overall, the number of proposed roads and miles is excessive.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 the degree of motorized vehicle use in our forests is presently excessive.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 941
Comment#

4 Enforcement capabilities are too limited to enforce restrictions, yet the numver of open roads has increased.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

5 I am personally outraged that illegal roads cut by OHV users are now being considered as official FS roads. The disruptive and destructive effects of off-road vehicles are well-documented.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 942
Comment#

1 The publication of National Forest OHV (Off Highway Vehicle) trails will greatly increase the number of OHVs including ATV tours, manufacturer-sponsored events, off-road group rallies and racing. The density of OHV roads and trails in combination with camping allowed 100-300 feet from trail or road essentially means that the entire National Forest on Glorieta Mesa and Cañada de los Alamos (connects to Santa Fe watershed) will be open to OHVs.

Public Concern # 6 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 While currently OHV access is not planned for the Hyde Park Road area, increased presence of OHV groups, rallies and tourism in the area are likely to bring ATVs up Hyde Park Road in search of less used trails.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 OHVs create non-reversible ecological damage: soil erosion, wildlife habitat disruption, trampling of grasses and saplings. Destructive effects on streams and watersheds will result from an increase in OHV traffic in National Forests

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Unique and potentially significant archaeological sites will be exposed to vandalism, disturbed or desecrated.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The destructive presence of OHVs in the National Forest effectively excludes those who want to enjoy quiet and safe recreation.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 A published map and infrastructure supporting OHVs will invite non-locals into our National Forests, who don't have the sensitivity about our vulnerabilities especially fire and fragility of the land.

Public Concern # 54 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 The Forest Service plans will require a significant increase in enforcement by the Forest Service, an increase in the number of events requiring a response by the county Sheriff's, signage, and the removal of access to closed roads and trails.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 There is however, no extra funding for any of this additional enforcement.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 Establish NEPA-ready 'adaptive management' triggers for temporary closures of roads and trails.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 •restrict all trails so that their noise and dust footprint does not impact Wilderness areas, sensitive habitat, or residential areas;
Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

11 •Remove all user created trails within the Agency's own designations of 'A' and 'D' prohibiting cross country travel
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 maintain the removal of all roads and trails off FR 79, Canada de Los Alamos, from OHV use, to protect the Santa Fe watershed and the Glorieta wildlife corridor
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

13 Remove 375 LBB due to encroachment into PAC. Remove 375 G due to archeological and riparian encroachment. Remove 375 G and 53 due to encroachment into fragile riparian area
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

14 Remove many roads such as 142 and 223, leading to the Dome Wilderness, ending at Iron Gate except to street legal, seasonal access. Anything other will only encourage encroachment into the Wilderness
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

15 Remove loop trails as they isolate land islands creating areas unusable by wildlife, and promote further erosion and water damage. Examples include: FT188D with FR282 and FR286F with 286FA and FAD near Cochiti Mesa. The current FR286F is already a widely used access point for unauthorized trails on Cochiti Mesa and should be closed to prevent further damage.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 Remove FR83 (between 83MB/203B and 66F) through La Cueva Spring Canyon area from Corrales Canyon to Commissary Canyon (T16N and R13E) due to redundancy and difficulty of enforcement.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

17 Remove any roads that conflict with wildlife corridor encroachment such as FR268 and 289 from the State Road 4 South junction. Enforce with closed gates. These roads specifically affect Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat and erosion damage of Rabbit Mountain.• Remove any road traveling thru Roadless Areas such as Bearhead Peak (T17/R5E); Lower Medio Dia Canyon (T424);
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 942
Comment#

18 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads 'touching' these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

19 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads 'touching' these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

20 Remove the numerous roads ending in the already small Wilderness areas of the Chama River Canyon, the San Pedro Parks, the Bandelier and Dome Wilderness. The vast numbers of roads 'touching' these Wilderness areas such as in the fingers of Chama River Canyon are not only completely unnecessary but serve to only shrink the Wilderness and provide more challenges for enforcement.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 943
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 944
Comment#

1 FR 288 - at the junction of FR 289 (Dome Road). This road is supposedly closed already where it becomes FR2529.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 FR 500 should be closed as it used to be and this time the closure should be enforced. This road is over-used.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 FR442 should be closed. This is in desperate need of maintenance and deteriorates further with motorized usage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Trail 285 (Guaje Ridge) is very fragile, especially after the Cerro Grande Fire. This should be closed to OHVers and be preserved as much as possible for non-motorized activities.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

5 If I see it correctly, the purpose of opening FR 79 Pipeline Rd) would only be to access trail 285. Closing TR 285 should logically lead to closing 79.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

6 Trails 279 and 286 are both in such delicate condition that closing them is highly advisable.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 944
Comment#

7 FR 442S and FR 416V should be closed. They are roads in high need of maintenance and motorized vehicles can still reach the canyons to the north via other routes.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

8 The area north of FR 31 is closed. However, there is considerable motor vehicle traffic west of state road 84. This closure by the FS is a pathetic gesture because you do not enforce it at all. All you have to do is look at the breaches in the fence to see how this closure gets abused.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

9 Enforcing the proposed closures. I yet have to hear a solution that makes sense.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

10 Maintenance of trails. Every year I go into the SFNF or Wilderness, there seem to be less and less emphasis on and evidence of trail maintenance. More and more trails are closed now or are hardly passible because they are not cleared or are badly eroded. I understand that you may not have all the necessary resources, but I wonder if you could not better avail yourself of volunteers and modern equipment.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

11 Furthermore, if you were to arrange for more volunteers, organize them, and use them to your best advantage, I believe they can offset your shortage of manpower and be a valuable asset to the FS.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 945
Comment#

1 The Forest Plan's loose control of motorized traffic and its high permitted road densities were written when timber was king. Now ecosystem management is primary and wildlife protection is at least equal in importance to timber production (we would say much more important).

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Maximum road densities by management type are probably a good thing, but, as given, they are arbitrary and often inapplicable to particular Management Areas [MA]; they should never be used as an excuse to leave roads open.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We object to the road density proposed for Mesa Poleo

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

3 We object to the road density proposed for Virgin Mesa

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Especially to be praised: closures in the Anton Chico unit, on Glorieta/Rowe Mesa, east of Bull Creek, Macho Canyon to Indian Creek, Johnson Mesa, near Arroyo Hondo, and near Walker Flats

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

5 B-9 Tecolote. More of the closely parallel roads in the Viveash Burn should be closed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 Especially to be praised: Borrego Mesa, Caja del Rio Unit, and future quiet walks north of Hyde State Park

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

7 Especially to be praised: the southern Sierra Nacimiento and Borrego Dome areas. Leaving a single road west of Valles Caldera is just right. We appreciate elimination of the many non-system trails in Jemez Recreation Area and on San Juan Mesa.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

8 R-111 Virgin Mesa. The number of roads proposed to remain in this MA is alarming. "R" emphasis is on protection of cultural sites and of wildlife, yet you propose to leave more motorized ways than allowed in the Forest Plan? Probably more than half of these should go, with roadways for administrative access where necessary.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 Especially to be praised is treatment of the northernmost part of the Forest and also closures west of San Pedro Parks. Actual closure of all those logging roads in MA A-4 and A-5, as proposed, would be great!

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

10 Holding Canones at near zero and closing many routes on the two adjacent mesas is important.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

11 Most of the District including most of Jarosa and Cecilia are left with too many open roadways. Although the excuse of access to inholdings has been offered, that is not correct; the inholdings are to the east and north and access to them is from east and north, not through A-5 and A-6. In the west half of T22N R3E there are no relevant inholdings, yet a complex of roads is proposed for retention even though some are closely parallel. MA A-5 and A-6 should be carefully re-examined and road densities cut at least to 1.5 miles/sq. mile. A small number of "ways" open to permittees would meet most of these areas' motorized needs.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

12 French Mesa (MA A-7). Much the same comments as for Jarosa and Cecilia; not every one of those canyons and mesas needs a roadway.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

13 Mesa Poleo (E-32). This area is designated for recreation and there are many inholdings, but even so a road density of 3.5 miles/sq. mile (as allowed in the proposed Forest Plan amendment) seems excessive. Not all of the existing roadways are used for access.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 946
Comment#

1 First, this memorial is trying to get the state to take over management of the Santa Fe National Forest and Bureau of Land Management. This really is not a great idea. The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) have staffs of professionals in place that is experts in their management of federal lands. Although errors are made, because nobody is perfect, they know their jobs better than the state does.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 The Travel Management Plan that the Forest Service is working on right now and the similar BLM plan, is a step in the right direction to gaining control of a pretty much unmanaged recreational activity. Right now, mostly, vehicles can drive all over the national forest legally. What the Forest Service is trying to do is curb this and designate a system of roads and trails that would be legal (for all vehicles – not just Off-road vehicles) and put an end to having everything open.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 They have been holding a series of public meetings all around the forest (ten locations including Cuba, Coyote, Los Alamos, Espanola, Jemez Springs, Pecos, Mora, Las Vegas, Santa Fe, and Albuquerque)(I think they have held forty or more public meetings in the last year and a half) to inform the public of what is going to be coming their way with the travel management plan (a national effort taking place in every forest in the nation right now). I have seen newspaper ads and flyers posted at the grocery store, community boards, and the post office, and I know they posted them all over. They have encouraged all of the public to come to these meetings, not just the motorized groups. In the Memorial draft I saw wording saying that only motorized users were consulted. This is not true. I attended a few meetings and I know for a fact that there were ranchers, environmentalists, and motorized users at them.

Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

4 It is implied that vandalism is caused by OHV riders. There may be some of this. More vandalism is caused by people in bigger vehicles who have room to carry their tools (guns or fence cutters) in their trucks, not on the back of their dirt bikes or atvs.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 The memorial draft talks about "quiet recreationists" (a name that environmentalists gave themselves). Even these people drive vehicles into the forest. They drive to trailheads or just drive around for recreation.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

6 The dogs that many of them bring on to the forest and let run with leashes do a lot more damage to wildlife and cattle and cause more user conflicts than OHVs.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

7 When there is a law in place and the territory that is legal to ride in is reduced, they will have a much better chance of enforcing it.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

8 The statement that illegal OHV activity "is the biggest drain on ranger's resources and generates more law enforcement citations than all other criminal activity combined," is an outright lie used as propaganda for the purposes of the small group pushing this memorial.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 Archaeological resources will be protected by the Forest Service and the BLM, and all other federal agencies. It is ridiculous to think that they would ignore these things when they analyze effects in the NEPA process. There are laws in place that they have to abide by too. The Forest Service already consults with the State Historic Preservation Office when there is a threat to resources.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

10 In the memorial they say that ranchers and federal grazing permit holders have "proven themselves to be responsible, careful stewards of the forest." This might be true mostly but there are some obvious signs of the cows destroying the forest as well. Many years ago, northern New Mexico was primarily grassland, now it is covered by sagebrush. This sagebrush was created by overgrazing of cattle. That is not very responsible. Not too long ago (20 years?), Glorieta Mesa, mentioned so many times in the memorial draft was chained, removing all the native pinon and juniper trees and opening up the forest floor to make grass for cows to eat. Now, there are spots where there are no trees and no grass left because the cows have grazed it down to dirt. This is not very responsible or caring stewardship either. Some of the ranchers and federal permit holders have to take hay out to their cows on the forest. This is because there is no more food up there for the cows to eat and survive on their own. This is not great stewardship. What is left for the wildlife to live on when the cows have completely eaten all the grass? Also, the ranchers and federal permit holders will be able to travel in motor vehicles to the areas they need to go to regardless if it is open to the public.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

11 When someone owns land next to the forest, they have the same right as the rest of the public to use that land legally, but no right to claim the forest as their backyard for peace and quiet. We all own public land equally and each one of us has just as much right to every square inch of it, even if it is right out their front window. To put "buffers" around private land is completely unfair to the entire population of the United States.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

12 In the draft it says that ranchers and their families have been "shot at." If this is true, it was probably not by an OHV user. It is pretty difficult to carry a gun around while riding a motorcycle and pretty easy to carry one in a truck. People do target practice on the national forest, a pretty common and legal thing to do.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

13 The memorial says that the Forest Service has "done nothing to deter criminal activities" on forest land. This also is untrue. The Forest Service has full time Law Enforcement Officers who are given this specific task. They also have a program where other employees who do not carry guns can write tickets for federal crimes. The forests provide annual financial support to county and state law enforcement agencies to help enforce laws as well. According to Greg McReynolds, Public Land Coordinator for Trout Unlimited, in an article he wrote in the Winter 07/08 issue of Outdoor Reporter, the New Mexico Wildlife Federation newsletter, the state has an estimated over $1 million in funds that could be used to help with enforcement of OHV laws. Both Trout Unlimited and the Wildlife Federation support responsible use of OHVs on public lands.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 This memorial states that on "Glorieta Mesa, where there is no history of extensive recreational off highway vehicle activity," there is damage such as gates being left open, fences being cut, livestock being harassed, and the creation of unauthorized roads. There is no such thing as an unauthorized road being created up there because it is legal to drive anywhere you want, even cross-country.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 946

Comment#

15 The memorial says that access to the areas, such as County Road 51 that leads to Glorieta Mesa, are unsafe for vehicles to trailer OHVs in to use the areas. If they are unsafe for OHV trailers, they are also safe for horse trailers, stock trailers, building supply trailers, and even the trailers that residents of the Mesa use to haul trash and water with. If the road is unsafe, it should probably be fixed. I have hauled a trailer up that road many times and it is not unsafe for me. It is hard for me to believe that the county would have paved a road that is unsafe for trailers. This is just propaganda used to sway opinions

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

16 We support the Forest Service restricting routes and designating travel ways.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

17 It provides an opportunity for people who may not otherwise get to enjoy their national forests.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

18 It contributes to the state's economy in sales tax, licensing, and registration fee collections, as well as tourism

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 947

Comment#

1 The proposed action is designating trails that were chainsawed, non-sanctioned, biker built routes. Forest Service officials say it is illegal for these trails to be built. designating trails that were chainsawed, non-sanctioned, biker built routes. Forest Service officials say it is illegal for these trails to be built. They need to get rid of every motorized trail off of Forest Road 280, and Forest Road 282.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 All motorized routes must be included in road density

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 No more motors on our hiking trails, examples; Forest Trail 113, Forest Trail 132, and our network of old back country trails that have a long non-motorized history

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 These trails cross Spruce Mesa, above Spruce Canyon and cochiti mesa. They cross Medio Dia Canyon, and travel along Bruce Ridge, traverse Bland Canyon and , and on to frazier Canyon. They iclude the official part of Forest Trail 113. These routes are found in R4E and R5E, T18N.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Work within funding limitations by getting rid of these 50 miles or motorized trails and further pairing down needless loops. Example; FR282, T18N, R4E has three redundant loops.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 947
Comment#

6 The proposed action does do two good things, it removes motorized dispersed camping from Bland Canyon, FR268, and it designates FR286 for highway legal vehicles only.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 948
Comment#

1 We have long advocated that the Santa Fe Nationa Forest operate on a "closed unless marked open" basis and are pleased to see this as a feature of the Draft Proposed Action for Managing Motorized Travel, MB-R3-10-5 (Draft) Plan.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 Although we are pleased that the overall road density on the SFNF has been reduced by slightly more than half from 2.4 mi./sq. mi. to 1.2, we believe that this should be taken as a starting point for travel management and not an end

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The proposed action, bothi in not addressing the excess of roads accessing inholdings and in increasing the allowed road density as in the Mesa Poleo unit, does not meet the requirements of the Rule. We believe that the draft should acknowledge that the process is incomplete I these areas and deisgnate a future process to address excessive road densities in management units where they remain. It is not acceptable to change the objectives because meeting them is difficult. The Draft should include a commitment to reaching those objectives not yet met.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We therefore believe that the Draft, in relying on compliance with the 1985 Forest Plan, is only minimally compliant with the Rule. A modern understanding of ecosystem management should inform a full analysis of the guidance provided in the 1985 Forest Plan and lead to a subsequent round of travel management planning.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 We are concerned that the proposed amendments to the Forest Plan as presented in Appendix 3 serve to codify some problems with the Draft rather than addressing those problems directly. Further, the proposed amendments do not address needed guidance for travel management in a number of management areas where guidance is vague in the 1985 Forest Plan. Specifically in management areas F,I,J,M,N,O, and X, road densities are not specified, but guidance in the 1985 Forest Plan refers to goas of closing all unneccessary roads for quite specific resource protection reasons. These goals are not addressed adequately in the Draft and the goals of removing all unnecessary roads from these management areas should be made explicit in the amendments.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 In the proposed amendment the road density guidance for management areas A,C,D,E,P, and Q, there is indication or analysis to support the choice of 2.5 mi./sq. mi. In the proposed amendment to the road density guidance for management areas B, F, R, and S there is no indication or analysis to support the choice of 1.5 mi./ sq. mi.. In the proposed amendment to the road density guidance for management area K there is no indication or analysis to suppor the choice of 1.- mi./ sq. mi..

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Maximum allowable road densities should be specified for management areas K,J,M, and N and suitable proposed amendments should be included in the draft. Given the 1985 Forest Plan guidance to not build and close roads whenever possible in these areas, we suggest that the density be very small.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 There is no proosed amendment to the road density guidance for management area G. This oversight should be corrected. The document should demonstrate that the management need for a particular system of roads and develop a density for that system.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Units N-92 and N-97 exhibit an increase in road density from "existing conditions." The Draft should not sanction any increase at all in a management area where "Roads will not be constructed…" and with an objective of "closing all unnecessary roads where they currently exist." Roads are detrimental to wildlife in many ways and the goal for these areas should be substantially lower than that for the SFNF as a whole.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 In units A-5, A-6, and A-7, road densities are excessive for management need. This area is prime big-game habitat and road densities should be reduced. The management emphasis in these areas is for timber, and timber management needs can be accommodated by temporary roads should that need arise. These areas exhibit some of the highest road densities on the forest. Access to private inholdings can be accommodated by a much leaner road system. (see comments under Unit E-32)

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 Units B-8, B-10, B-12, G-34, G-36, G-39, G-41, M-88, and N-93, N-97 all exhibit proposed road densities that are considering the wildlife management emphasis for these areas. Roads are detrimental to wildlife in many ways and the goal for these areas should be substantially lower than that for the SFNF as a whole.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 In particular, the several parallel roads in area B-9 in the Viveash fire area should be reduced to the minimum required by management need.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

13 Units I-51, I-54, I-55, and I-57, exhibit an increase in road density from "existing conditions." The Draft should not sanction any increase at all in a management area where "Roads will not be constructed…" and with an objective of "closing all unnecessary roads where they currently exist."

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 948
Comment#

14 Units Q-102, Q-103, and R-109, exhibit an increase in road density from "existing conditions." Although the Forest Plan direction does not call for eliminating roads in these units, the Draft should not sanction increases in units that have high value for their cultural resources. This level of access to and disturbance of fragile cultural sites is excessive and puts these sites at risk of disturbance and destruction.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 Units I-50, I-51, I-52, I-53, I-57, I-59, I-61, Q-102, Q-103, Q-104, R-108, R-109, R-110, R-111, R-112, all exhibit road densities that are high considering the cultural resource management emphasis for these areas. Roads are detrimental to cultural resources in many ways and the goal for these areas should be substantially lower than that for the SFNF as a whole. Collectively, these areas have a road density of 1.3 mi./sq.mi. compared to the forest-wide Draft density of 1.2 mi./sq.mi.. This level of access to and disturbance of fragile cultural sites is excessive and puts these sites at risk of disturbance and destruction.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 The proposed road density in R-111, on Virgin and Holiday mesas, is particularly egregious. This area is very rich in cultural resources and should be protected more carefully. We believe that this road density cannot be justified by management need and should be reduced.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

17 Unit E-32 exhibits a very high road density (3.5 mi./sq.mi.) and this value is proposed to be sanctioned by a revision of the Forest Plan. As discussed above, a thorough analysis of these roads was not completed, the revision of the Plan is inappropriate, and the unit should be identified for future analysis with a goal of reducing road density to one no greater than needed for management.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 949
Comment#

1 I believe this road should be open to the Guaje Reservoir to provide citizens of Los Alamos and surrounding area with a local road open for all vehicles to enjoy . With the closure of road 442 east of trail 286 the recreational opportunities for all motorized vehicles is greatly diminished and I believe the Forest Service needs to provide more local motorized access for all vehicles to enjoy

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 I believe that this road should be open seasonally and open to all vehicles as proposed by the roads needs to remain open beyond the intersection of Trail 285/ Guaje Ridge Trail continuing on to the existing gate. I believe the road needs to remain open to provide motorized access to Upper Meadow on Road 179 and access to hiking trail in Upper Guaje Canyon. There are numerous areas beyond the proposed closure that are great for picnicking and camping. I have fond memories of driving up Pipeline Road with my dad and picnicking at the large meadows at the top of 179/Pipeline Road and would like to be able to share that with my own children.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 950
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Add to mailing list request.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 951
Comment#

1 Those concerns are 1) decimation of the traditional "loop" systems
and riders on main forest roads

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Those concerns are 2) increased risk of incidents involving vehicular (carltruck) traffic with motorcycle riders on main forest roads… I firmly believe consideration should be given to keeping motorcycles on single track trail and off main roads whenever and wherever possible.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

3 As an example, analysis using the Travel Management Draft Proposed Action and User Provided Routes map for the Tea Kettle loop shows an alarming propensity for the SFNF staff to eliminate connecting trails that form loop systems in favor of main roads. Besides severely reducing the experience that is sought by the motorcycle trail rider, the use of main roads sets a dangerous precedent that will likely result in increased incidents between motorcycles and large vehicles using these roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

4 I have met only one Forest Service employee that appears to have reasonable motorcycle experience and generally, all others appear to have no idea at all how a motorcycle performs on crowned, off camber, twisty, gravel covered dirt roads.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 While this correspondence used the Tea Kettle loop as an example, a full analysis of the Broken Arrow loop should also be conducted since the Proposed Action follows a similar philosophy of directing much of the motor cycle traffic onto main roads when trail systems are readily available.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 952
Comment#

1 Trail 79 must be posted and watched so ORV's do not run wild into fragile watershed, steep slopes, fragile wildlife areas.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design
critera and mitigation measures

2 I am actually opposed to any motorized use N. Of Canada on Trail 79

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I am opposed to ORVs in Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 953
Comment#

1 The proposed road closings do not addressthe needs of the I
people who use the forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted
by IDT

Letter# 953
Comment#

2 Mobility-Impaired Hunters depend upon wheeled vehicles, atv's to get to an from their hunting areas and to retreive animals. Proper use of atv cause little or no damage. Leaving it behind to get help would MOST likely result in a stolen elk.

Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 954
Comment#

1 Upper Guaje Road, from the cemetery to Guaje Canyon, has always been subject to erosion, especially after a rain storm. The Cerro Grande Fire has exacerbated this problem.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 955
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 956
Comment#

1 Remove motor vehicles from Trail 113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Respect the spirit of designation "A" and "N" and remove offensive morot use here as well.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Your manpower and budget cannot sustain your proposal

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 957
Comment#

1 T18N, R4E and T18N R5E, I protest the use of these areas as motorized trails. All of these trails need to be removed from the proposal.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 958
Comment#

1 This area (TN18R4E), provides water and habitat for much wildlife, including the endangered spotted owl, New Mexican Salamander, and Northern Goshawk. Motorized vehicles in this area would cause erosion, destruction of plant life, and pollution of the watershed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 958
Comment#

2 I puruse this country with my paints, burro and mule and running into an army of motorized vehicles would be life threatening. These trails cannot be multiple use. The Forest Services job is to protect our forest, not participate in its destruction.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 959
Comment#

1 We at Dixon's Apples are concerned with the volume of dirt bikes in our area. We have problems with them trespassing and also cutting fences. Other land owners in the area are having to fence extra to keep them out and to keep them honest!

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 960
Comment#

1 The department is attempting to do the correct thing

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 961
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 962
Comment#

1 According to maps of proposed trails for motorized vehicles < 50", CRB60 is to be opened for use by such vehicles. According to information reported by local ranger (Pecos) trailhead is closed and will remain closed! Is or is not CRB60 scheduled to be opened to motorized vehicles <05"? My sincere and urgent request that road remain barricaded [and closed to] aformentioned vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 My neighbors report reckless racing up and down CRB60 by ORVs--running others of the road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Please consider the potential devastation to the forest beyond the present barricade.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 963
Comment#

1 I want the Black Feather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Porcupine Trail" (Lat/Long: 35.82149,106.47600) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 964
Comment#

1 increase fines for littering and defacing our public lands and trails

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Please increase funding for public service education in an effort to preserve our open spaces and to increase awareness that these lands are our gift to future generations

Public Concern # 53 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 965
Comment#

1 It has been illustrated that scientific analysis concludes that motorized traffic has sever negative impact on soils, wildlife- not simply threatened and endangered species, and watersheds.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 It has been pointed our repeatedly by residents of local communities that noise, dust, and pollution limit resident's quality of life.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Why the Forest Service proposes motorized routes through areas currently managed to protect and enhance endangered and threatened species habitat.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The significance of defining the existing direction for the Jemez Ranger Distric, of the Santa Fe National Forest, lies in the fact that all proposed routes were previously defined as user-provided routes. Every route proposed for R5E T18n, and R4E T18N, appears previously on the User provided map., JRD of the SFNF.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Groups like Black Feather Motorcycles, and New Mexico $wd took every opportunity to go out and g.p.s. new routes. The result was a major increase in OHV activity, with traditional use being shoved aside for this chainsawing, g.p.s. free-for-all. The routes submitted did not represent areas where OHV use was taking place. Reather, it created a direction on the ground that resulted in a vast overexaggeration of OHV use. This scoping period resulted in the Forest Service accepting and publishing user routes through fenced and signed private property, through closed, and restricted areas. The strategy of silence toward Forest Service volunteers, local communities, and other stake holders provided the pretense that this type of activity had nothing to do with Forest Service actions, effectively removing an important voice for the scoping of actual off road vehicle routes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 965
Comment#

6 Following the advanced notice of the travel management plan, members of the Black Feather Motorcycles began to appear on FT242, FT132, FR113- which was designated as non-motorized Cochiti Mesa, Bruce Ridge, Upper Medio Dia, all private properties, or areas designated as restricting off road use. This area is R4E T18N, and as previously discussed, included significant habitat issues for a wide range of species, heritage sites and watershed issues. The travel rule guidelines of 06/12/06, in section B. 1. States that roads that meet any of the following criteria should not be included in the existing direction-road recorded in infra, but no corresponding road exists on the ground. This criteria includes all of the complex of trails slated for the zone from FR282 eas to Medio Dia, and from FR280 south to Upper Bland Canyon.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Travel management Rule Guidelines of 06/12/06, section C, 3. clearly states that motorized trails should not be included in the existing direction that are unauthorized trails incorrectly coded as system trails… after January 12, 2001. Thus all trails submitted by Black Feather Motorcycles in their map submitted to the JRD in 2002, and all subsequent trails described as user created should not be considered part of the existing transportation system, and should not be given weight as existing system trails. This included the so-called "cross-town" and "tin-cup" motorized trail systems.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 I exhort the Forest Service to uphold all these previous protective decisions in the Jemez ranger District, to create an even handed application of the Travel Rule, and to provide for the Traditional way of life here in new Mexico, a big part of which is motor-free travel in the National Forest.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 966
Comment#

1 Please consider the Secret Trail as an alternative route to FR376R so there is access to Thompson Firdge from FR144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 967
Comment#

1 I would make a general comment on the state of our forests and the current mindset that is leading us to make a TMP to begin with. I ask that one reference Edward Abbey's 1968 book, Desert Solitaire, the Chapter on Industrial Tourism. Mr. Abbey has concerns about the future of National Parks and Forests that are exactly what we are seeing today. He makes some suggestions such as no motorized vehicles in our forests. While this may seem impossible it may need to be the mindset that policy makers have to save our forests, wildlife, watersheds, and our children's opportunity to live as we have by being able to escape the noise and mentality of motorized vehicles.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Please reduce the OHV access even more than the TM P Action. Let them develop parks for their activities as we have for ours and wildlife. These two human activities do not mix at all.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 968
Comment#

Letter# 968
Comment#

1 The draft EIS needs to include an assessment of current and expected rates of erosion for trails selected to stay in the plan in order to define and fund future maintenance

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The TMP and EIS need to address specific roadhrail maintenance practices such as drainage feature types and spacings needed to maintain routes in a stable, non-eroding condition.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

3 I strongly recommend that no trail or road be included in the plan unless there is a site specific management plan for that route. It

Public Concern # 36 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 969
Comment#

1 NMG&F tries to prevent damage to this membrane by making it illegal to walk or otherwise venture onto this land. Constantly we see ATVs and motorcycles, even Jeeps crossing this land to access the SFNF

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 County Road B-52. Los Alamitos Canyon Road (aka Molino Rd) runs up through the El Molino Mines Reclamation Area which has a very fragile rubber impermeable membrane to prevent heavy metal contamination of the ground water.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 This road b-52, leads up to your Forest Road 50A that has no legal public access to the SFNF as it first goes through and gives access to private holdings within the SFNF. This is a gated road but the gate was recently and violently destroyed. This is incorrectly marked on your map as “open to traffic, seasonal”. B-52 leads directly to NMG&F easements to other private property adjacent to, or within the SFNF. There is no legitimate reason to include this road on your “Map”.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 Including Los Alamitos Canyon road /B-52 on your “map” will encourage more of the above.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 970
Comment#

1 Our first concern has to do with County Road 5 1 D. County Road 5 ID appears to be misrepresented on all of your maps.The public portion of that road is only four tenths of a mile long. It is highlighted in yellow on the attachments. However, your maps indicate that the public portion of this road is in excess of three miles long. The private portions are highlighted in blue on the attachments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 970

Comment#

2 Our first concern has to do with County Road 5 1 D. County Road 5 ID appears to be misrepresented on all of your maps.The public portion of that road is only four tenths of a mile long. It is highlighted in yellow on the attachments. However, your maps indicate that the public portion of this road is in excess of three miles long. The private portions are highlighted in blue on the attachments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 County Road 51D, formerly also known as County Road 51C, was created by a stipulated settlement, which was duly recorded in the Santa Fe County Records Office in book 774, pages 197-214. A copy of the settlement is attached. (Attachment 2) The paragraphs on the middle of page two of the settlement clearly identify the public portion of the road. It begins at the intersection with County Road 5 1 and ends at the intersection with a private road formerly identified as the Holloman Corridor, and now identified as Soaring Hawk Trail.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 By showing the public portion of County Road 51D to be far longer than it actually is, your maps will invite trespassing through private lands, on private roads, driveways, and trails. We have already experienced significant problems with trespassers; your maps are likely to aggravate those problems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 Our second concern has to do with a road identified on your maps as a spur off of Forest Road 61 2D, located in Section 8, T. 15 N., R. 11 E., NMPM. The spur in question is highlighted in orange on the attached maps. It was created by a series of agreements between the Forest Service and three families (Mares, Segura, and Valencia), who are our predecessors in interest. It was never the understanding of the landowners in the area that the spur would create a public thoroughfare. Because the road traverses private lands, much of which we now own, we are once again concerned that your maps will invite trespassing on our property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 Over the years our family has tried to behave in a neighborly fashion toward people that we have found on our property. We have encountered numerous pifion pickers, hikers, campers, horseback riders, and wood cutters on our property, who are apparently lost or confused despite the signs and fences. We have also begun to see increasing numbers of off-highway vehicle riders on our property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

7 Some of the intruders have been aggressive and unwilling to leave until law enforcement officers were called. Some of the intruders have also been destructive, cutting fences, felling trees, and leaving trash and debris. We would very much like to discourage this sort of activity.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 we strongly urge that you omit the private roads and trails discussed above from the maps and plans that your team ultimately publishes

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 971

Comment#

1 I support the proposal by State Senator Phil Griego. I am also proposing some additions to the Senator's proposal.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 971
Comment#

2 I can tell you that there are more than enough roads and single track trails on the draft proposed action map to keep me (and any other advanced rider) happy and busy for days.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 There is no reason to increase the density of trails. The only outcome of that is to ruin all of the above mentioned benefits, and to attract more "non-local" riders who have no connection to the community or the land, and who's main motivation is to tear into virgin land, regardless of what is on a map.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 My advice would be to plan for success by limiting the plan to what is enforcable by the Forest Service.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 Only licensed, street legal vehicles with observable plates with the exception of those used by local ranchers, licensed hunters and wood cutters.
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 Strict enforcement of the 80db or quieter noise limits, and spark arrestors on all machines. Make grass banks and any other areas used by local ranchers off limits to ATV's and Dirt bikes.
Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

7 No fixed camping Corridors. I would propose limited, small, well designed camp areas that would limit soil damage and ease enforcement efforts, and help limit fire danger. Only create areas that can be closely monitored by the local staff.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 Enforcement: Limit the trail area to an amount that can be strictly enforced by the current staff.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Enforcement: Publicly accessible records of trail monitoring and clear, understandable trigger points for closing of trails.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 Enforcement: Sizable fines for off road abuse.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 972
Comment#

1 We object to wholesale access to the Jemez and wilderness by ATV and motorcycles.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We object to wholesale access to the Jemez and wilderness by ATV and motorcycles.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 972
Comment#

3 These are not compatible with kiers/horses/and other non-motorized forms of trans portation.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 973
Comment#

1 I am in favor of removing all motorcycle trails between T18N R1E because it is detrimental to the environment, particularly since it is an area of historic significance.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I am in favor of removing all motorcycle trails between T18N R1E because it is detrimental to the environment, particularly since it is an area of historic significance.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 974
Comment#

1 I believe only highway-legal vehicles should be allowed on the mesa forest roads and license should be visible at all times.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Any receational ATV/ORV use/abuse of this area is unenforceable because of it's remoteness and the many number of poinits of access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Also, to introduce ATV's and other off-road vehicles into this area changes the historic use/intent of this area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 I do not support fixed corridors for dispersed camping for the entire Santa Fe National Forest

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The TMR guidelines are being put in place to curb cross-country travel and the erosion, fire hazard and disbursement of noxious weeks that it causes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 Given the sensitivity of the soil in the Southwest. It makes sene that sites for parking access should be assessed, determined and designated in particular chosen spots

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Not to exceed an area of 50 x 60 feet and not to exceed more than 1 parking lot per 2 linear miles of road

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 974
Comment#

8 I would like to see monitoring of and trigger points for the closure or routes as a result of abuse (deepening or widening of rutted trails or erosion caused by over use) through ouit the entirre Saanta Fe National Forrest I would like to see the Range Improvement Task Force involved in the monitoring of routes across or adjacent to all rangeland graazing allotment in the entire Santa Fe National Forest and the input of their coussel reflected in decisions thereof.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 975
Comment#

1 I am definitely oppossed to using Glorieta Mesa for ATV use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 ATV's disturb the serene environment and creat Noise pollution

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Disturb the wildlife.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 They also create problems for local ranchers and residents.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 976
Comment#

1 Glorieta Mesa is a traditional area with centuries of historical and agricultural heritage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Ranching agricultural uses, woodcutting and traditional & cultural uses based on nuevomexicano

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 977
Comment#

1 I endorse an alternative proposal for the travel management rule proposed action on Glorieta Mesa by senator Phil Griego.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 978
Comment#

Letter# 978
Comment#
1 on Glorieta Mesa I do support the proposal made by Senator Griego. (Remove FR-326wa and FR-326PE from your map and restrict camping to roadside parking only
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 979
Comment#
1 I endorse the proposal TMR proposed by Senator Griego
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 980
Comment#
1 FR - 326WA & FR-326PE (camping)
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 981
Comment#
1 FR-326 WA and FR 326PE. Having these two raods, you continue to enable public misuse and abuse of private residences and personal property. Please remove these two roads and restore them to their natural state.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 982
Comment#
1 I support the alternative proposal from the TMP proposed Action on Glorieta Mesa of Sen. Phil Griego.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 983
Comment#
1 I endorese the alternative proposal for TMR proposed action on Glorieta Mesa by Senator Phil Griego.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Please remove the above mentioned roads [FR326WA and FR326PE] from your maps because they will only encourage illegal use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 984
Comment#
1 Please close the roads FR 326 WA and FR326PE because OHV will want to use this road if shown on maps.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 984
Comment#

2 They are noise nuisant for adjacent property owners and distructive to the land.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 They are noise nuisant for adjacent property owners and distructive to the land.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 985
Comment#

1 I support the alternative TMR proposal by Sen. Griego.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 986
Comment#

1 I support the alternative proposal of Senator Griego's on the Glorieta Mesa.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 There should be a clear map that shows which roads are available other roads should be decommissioned.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 987
Comment#

1 lam out raged by your current proposal for forest management.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I request that the SFNF take a site-specific hard look and meaningfully consider the potential environmental impacts of specific routes and alternatives presented to the agency by those Who are directly affected by the decision .
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 l also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation efforts as an alternative to closure.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

4 The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 987
Comment#

5 What the OHV community does not support is being presented with a "range" of management alternatives where all of the alternatives represent a significant
reduction in OHV opportunity.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 I formally r.equest t hat you adopt the Alternative presented by the Blackfeather group either as a stand--alone Alternative or as the bas.i.s for an Alternative that attempts to meet the documented increase in OHV recreation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 The cumulative loss of motorized recreational opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incrporated into the decision making process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Alternatives should be developed to meet the need for a motorized trail experience and all alternatives should consider its impacts on motorized recreation opportunities across the entire forest.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 It is important to reconginze the distinction between 'trails' and 'roads' during this planning process. A true trail experience is highly valued by the recreating public. Providing an arguably adequate road system does not in any way begin to address the demand for motorized single track and ATV trails.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 988
Comment#

1 Please ban off-road vehicles in our National Forests.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 989
Comment#

1 I am writing to Support Senator Griego's proposal as an improvement over some Previous Proposals. I do believe that it would be even better if there were no ATV's allowed on the mesa for recreation and roadside camping only.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 990
Comment#

1 I fully support Senatro Griego's alternative proposal for SFNF TMR.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 No fixed corridor camping.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 990
Comment#
3 No ATV's at all on the mesa.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 991
Comment#
1 I think off road vehicles on public land for recreation should be banned becayse they are too destructive.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I support Senator Griego's proposal for the TMR on Glorieta Mesa.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 992
Comment#
1 I fully support Senator Phil Griego's proposal.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I believe there should only be roadside, no corridor camping.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 993
Comment#
1 I support Senator Phil Griego's Proposal.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I don't want any ATV at all on the [Glorieta] Mesa.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 994
Comment#
1 I don't support ARV recretion.
Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I support Senator Phil Griego's proposal
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 995
Comment#
1 I support Senator Griego's Prposal for the TMR for Glorieta Mesa, SFNF.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 995
Comment#

2 I don't want fixed corridors camping. I think vehicles should park on the road and then hike in to camp. 150-300 feet is not reasonable to drive your car off the road- it is destructive.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 996
Comment#

1 I do not support having any ATV traffic on the Measa at all.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I suppor Senator Griego's alternative proposal with the exception of any atv routes on the nation forest of the mesa.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 997
Comment#

1 The plan does not meet the US Forest Service's mission ofmultiple-use management -mainly the need for providing diverse and adequate recreational opportunities.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

2 The plan does not consider the current and future demand by the public for motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The Proposed plan fails to address this increasing demand, as the plan cuts the amount of current roads and trails allowed for motorized uses by over fifty (50) percent.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 It is obvious that in some Ranger Districts, namely the Cuba Ranger District, the objective is to reduce legal road densities to a level that will not meet the minimum needs of the public recreational needs, and will also not meet the Forest Service's administrative and fire suppression needs.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 the proposed plan will congregate current and future forest users in a much smaller available total area, thereby decreasing the value ofthe "forest experience" for everybody.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I support all designated roads currently included in the Proposed Action, and I have personally used almost all of them.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

6 I also support increasing the amount of designated roads and trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 I request that the existing dead-end road along Moon Canyon west of Forest Road 117 be added to the approved map.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 I question whether Forest Road 17 and Forest Road 201 connect Red Top to San Miquel Canyon. If so, please disregard my question. I support this roadway to be included in the plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

9 I question whether Forest Road 17 extends between Forest Road 201 and Forest Road 535. If so, please disregard my question. I support this roadway to be included in the plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

10 Why doesn't Forest Road 527 extend east of Forest Road 117 towards Calaveras Canyon?
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 I question whether the unnumbered road shown around the east side of the Chaparral Girl Scout Camp connecting the Rio de Las Vacas (FR 539) to Ojitos mesa (FR 531) exists. If so, please disregard my question. I support this roadway to be included in the plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

12 A few more roads are needed in the area of Mining Mountain to support recreational uses in this area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

13 I use and support designating the existing road up Barley Canyon (south of Wolf Canyon) east off of State Road 126.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

14 I use and support designating the existing road up Wolf Canyon along the power line from Barley Canyon to Forest Road 117.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

15 The roadway (FR 98A) currently shown going off the west side of Bluebird Mesa connecting to Forest Road 533 should be designated as an "under 50" roadway.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

16 It appears that similar roadways are shown differently (according to the legend) for different Ranger Districts. This shows a lack of quality control in the planning process. Please note the different legends being used for roads on Rowe Mesa vs. roads designated on the Jemez, Coyote, and Cuba Districts.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

17 Forest Road 117 should be improved with a graveled surface immediately for approximately the first one-mile north of State Road 126 to reduce environmental damage.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 997

Comment#

18 Many roadways that are being deleted due to "resource damage" (especially in the clay soil areas of the Naciemento mountains) need only a little bit of soil surfacing to make the roadbeds stable

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

19 Water bars used to close roads and divert water flows actually cause more environmental damage as roadway users go around the water bars. Such is the case now in Moon Canyon west ofForest Road 117

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

20 Most "open" roads are shown as "seasonal". When are the seasons for these roads to be open?

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

21 Without any of these roads being open for use, the actual allowed road system is diminished much further than the proclaimed "53 percent" reduction.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

22 The Travel Management Plan does not adequately address the traditional and cultural uses that require motorized travel. These activities include hunting, camping, fishing, and motorized travel itself.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

23 Why does motorcycle use get 50% more exclusively designated trails than "under 50" trails"? ATV use is certainly more prevalent than motorcycle use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

24 I support the recent closure of the area adjacent to the Rio de Las Vacas south of the private property boundary where the Telephone Canyon wetlands enter the Rio de Las Vacas. I support closing ofthe road leading to the corral inside this exclosure.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 998

Comment#

1 I would like to comment about the proposed motorized routes in T20N R14E Sections 10, 15, 16, and 22. The current proposal map shows opening approximately three miles of private closed Roads 635, 635A, and 635B off of County Road A005 in Section 15 (see enclosed SFNF Eastside Transportation Map). The proposal also shows access directly off of County Roads A005, A007, and A042 in Sections 15 and 22. The end points of these six proposed road openings are all within two miles of each other. I believe opening all of these roads would lead to excessive and unnecessary loss of open space.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 as a private land owner I do not believe these three roads (635, 635A, and 635B) are the best place for opening general public access to this part of SFNF

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 998
Comment#

3 The 635 Roads, as well as unlocked spur roads and trails, cross Santiago Creek in several places. According to Kirk Patten, fisheries biologist with the NM Dept of Game & Fish, and the NM State University Comparative Fish and Wildlife Unit, this stream contains near pure strain Rio Grande Cutthroat trout. The SFNF Management Indicator Species Assessment of June 2003 lists only 24 miles of total suspected Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout habitat in the entire Canadian River Drainage Geographic Management Unit. If 635 Roads are opened I believe bridges or at least culverts need to be placed at the two major stream crossings to prevent stream erosion and sedimentation of Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout spawning beds.

Public Concern # 19 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 the SFNF acquired the 1600+ acre Sawyer Land Tract via Senator Domenici's office and the Land & Water Conservancy Fund (LWCF). Access points to this land parcel are located within one-half mile to the south of the junction of Road 635 and A005. In the LWCF proposal to acquire this land it was stated that the main access to this parcel was from the Morphy Canyon Road (A042). Since that time the first two miles of Morphy Canyon Road from Ledoux, NM to the Morphy Lake State Park junction have been paved. The next two miles have historically been well maintained by the county to the junction with county maintained Road A008. Ungated County Roads A007 and A042 lead directly from this point to the newly acquired SFNF lands. Gates could be placed at either one or both of these roads where they enter fenced SFNF land. Since this land tract was privately owned for many years, the last one to two miles of these roads have not been well maintained by the county. However, they would require no more maintenance than the approximately three miles of the 635 Roads proposed to be opened. These two county roads are presently useable by high clearance vehicles directly up to forest service property boundaries.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 The endpoints of Roads A007 and A042 are at lower elevations (~8500') and leave a two to three mile buffer zone before unauthorized motorized vehicles could reach the wilderness boundary. A parking lot/trailhead could easily be established in open areas just inside forest service boundaries here with less impact on private land owners as well as wildlife and sensitive species habitat. The SFNF Dec 1, 2004 press release stated the public would be able to access the east side of the Pecos Wilderness through this land acquisition via the Gascon Point Trail (Forest Trail 239). This land parcel was logged just prior to its acquisition by SFNF and a good system of logging roads and trails exist here. The main trail to Enchanted Lake is directly accessed here at the junction of Road 636 with A007. A spur off this trail comes within a hundred yards of the Gascon Point Trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 999
Comment#

1 The SF County Farm and Livestock Bureau has reviewed the alternative plan submitted by Senator Griego and fully endorses this alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1000
Comment#

1 strongly oppose any expansion of these area

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 knowledge of the proposed areas that fixed distance corridor access is not an appropriate solution for the specific areas indicated and that minimizing negative resource impacts can best achieved through roadside parking.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Motorized vehicles be permitted to pull off the road a distance not to exceed 20' from the edge of the road for the purpose of camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 but would strongly oppose any expansion of these routes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Two specific routes, the eastern portion FR-326PE and FR-326WA (indicated by dashed line on exhibit B) within this zone are not necessary for the functioning of a healthy forest and have the potential to exasperate the negative conditions listed above.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 Providing two superfluous points of access to a rangeland improvement frequently vandalized is contrary to the intent of the rule to minimize potential user conflicts when designating routes.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Both routes are good candidates for decommissioning and we recommend that both be restored to natural conditions.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 The eastern portion FR-326PE and FR-326WA (indicated by dashed line on exhibit B) not be opened to the public for motorized access, that they be decommissioned and restored to natural conditions.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 The eastern portion FR-326PE and FR-326WA (indicated by dashed line on exhibit B) not be opened to the public for motorized access, that they be decommissioned and restored to natural conditions.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 No roadside parking for access to dispersed camping be allowed within the living culture protection zone as depicted in Exhibit A.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 The motorized camping access shown on the proposed action represents a significant departure from historical patterns of use and has the potential of increasing fire danger, disrupting wildlife, damaging natural resources and interfering with the livelihood of the traditional ranchers who graze on these allotments.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

12 The TMP for Glorieta Mesa contain a thorough, science-based monitoring plan with action-oriented management responses to address problem areas associated with ORV travel.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1000
Comment#

13 Include a provision requiring notification and involvement ofpermit holders, in-holders and adjacent property owners before modifying the plan in any way.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1001
Comment#

1 Now the traditional method of travel is disappearing. The conflict created by dirt bikes and ATV's on our trails has forced traditional travelers to either brave confrontation, or abandon these routes. Off road vehicles have elbowed hikers, campers and backcountry campers aside.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The proposed action offers several steps forward in the protection of Bland Canyon, map coordinates: R4E T18N and R5E T17N. Local citizens strongly support the Forest Service's decision to remove motorized dispersed camping.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Local people also support the Forest Service for designating Bland Canyon Road FR 268 as open for highway legal vehicles only.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Despite these advances several issues still remain. Proposed motorized use will continue to damage habitat, historic places, and traditional travel in the area above the historic community of Bland, on Forest Trail 113 and in the Jemez National Recreation Area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Lake Fork Canyon, FR 376, lies between Schoolhouse and Lake Fork Mesa. Map coordinates; R2E, T19N. This area was, until recently, designated closed to off road driving. Additionally, the zone near Cebolla Spring, reaching from FR 376 to FR 604 was designated non-motorized. Currently the Forest Service has repealed all this protection, and is proposing the area from FR604, FR376 and FR377 as not only open to off road vehicle use but open for cross country travel as well.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 Dirt bikers make up fairy tales about their use of FT113, yet it should be very clear that this trail existed before any motorized use. Section 212.55 B1, B2 and B3 of the travel rule apply to FT113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 The non-motorized status of the Cochiti Canyon leg of FT113 is important to local residents; We petition the Forest Service to return to protecting wildlife along this historic trail, and protecting traditional, low impact use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1001

Comment#

8 Remove all motorized trails in their entirety; FR286, FR286F, FR286FA, FR286FAD. FT113 must be fully restored to motor free use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 The unnamed motorized trails from FR 281, FR280, and FR4A all must be completely removed in order to protect headwaters, and provide habitat that allows Elk, Deer, Bear and Lion to travel without harrassment across the Jemez

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 All motorized loops off of FR 282, and FR 188 must be removed permanently. This includes the entire unnamed motorcycle loop off FR 188, stretching to the shoulder of Medio Dia Canyon, and then back again to FR 188. It includes the entire Frazier Canyon Trail, FR188JA, and the unnamed motorcycle loop that travels from FR188JA to FR282. It includes all of proposed FR188. It includes the three redundant loops on FR282 which stretches from Woodward Ridge to FR 280.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 The Forest Service wants to extend the driving season into January, a traditionally snowy month for the Jemez, and begin it even earlier, in mid-April, a date when ice and snow still cover the ground. This schedule leaves the roads open during the holiday season, and exposes Forest Roads to heavy traffic during peak spring runoff, with the result of creating greater maintenance needs on a stressed budget.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1002

Comment#

1 Our family and friends enjoy the Jemez every week and have seen more conflict with our ability to hike, hunt, ride in once a peaceful environment.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The FS can and should remove from the proposed action all the trails that were created by motorized users…. Remove…. Motorized trails in the area of T18N R4E.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The FS has one set of rules for hikers and another far easier set for off roaders. Its time to make the motorized trails equally accountable to FS regulations and the health of the land.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Motorized routes here occupy around 13 square miles, for a real route density of over 2 112 miles per square mile. In area "N", motorized routes account for over 18 miles in a 6 square mile zone, equating to a route density of more than 3 miles per square mile. Scientific study concludes that no more than 1 mile of road or trail per 1 square mile of land is allowed to have healthy habitats. This means that area "N" has more than three times the number of roads and trails to have healthy habitat!

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1002
Comment#

6 Motorized routes here occupy around 13 square miles, for a real route density of over 2 112 miles per square mile. In area "N", motorized routes account for over 18 miles in a 6 square mile zone, equating to a route density of more than 3 miles per square mile. Scientific study concludes that no more than 1 mile of road or trail per 1 square mile of land is allowed to have healthy habitats. This means that area "N" has more than three times the number of roads and trails to have healthy habitat!

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Open the corridors between the roadless area of Bearhead and the Dome Wilderness, give us back trail 113.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 The Jemez Ranger district covers less than 1/3 of the Jemez Mountains, yet is proposed for 58 miles of motorcycle trails. This is just shy of half of all proposed motorcycle trails for the entire Santa Fe National Forest. We protest this huge amount of trail designation, the travel management guidelines state that motorized areas are to be designated sparingly. The travel rule states that its purpose is to control off road vehicles, and protect resources, promote safety, and enhance recreation. This number of motor trails will harm resources, harm non-motorized use, all the while doing little to promote safety, or recreation.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 We thank the Forest Service for its proposal to protect the heritage resources in Bland Canyon We support designating the Bland Road, 268 for only highway legal vehicles. This will go far to protect the vital history in this special place, as will removing motorized dispersed camping. Hooray for the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 (The FS) need to remove motor vehicles from our trail 113. They need to get rid of motor trails in T18N R4E.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 The FS needs to come down to Earth with its road and trail system and start working within its funding instead of expanding its roads and trails.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1003
Comment#

1 Gentlemen: We are opposed to the establishment of Rd 635C. This road is on private land. The SFNF does not have an easement for the proposed road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Gentlemen: We are opposed to the establishment of Rd 635C. This road is on private land. The SFNF does not have an easement for the proposed road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 We are in favor of allowing motorized travel through our property only on Rd 635 to allow access to private owners having property west of our property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1003
Comment#

4 We are in favor of maintaining access to our property over approximately 300 ft of SFNF to maintain historic access to part of our property.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 We would like to know your assessment of the easement on Rd 635
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1004
Comment#

1 Map #6: Gascon, section 9 township 19: to put that road to their house on a map so people can drive on their PRIVATE property
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1005
Comment#

1 Map #6: Gascon, section 9 township 19: the road leading up to the house from the higway has been privately used and maintained by the Vigils. The gate has always been locked.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1006
Comment#

1 Map #6: Gascon, section 9 township 19: This private road has always been locked for our privacy. There has never been a public road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1007
Comment#

1 I have some serious concerns allowing motorized camping vehicles only on a few roads for camping. Please open more corridor roads for motorized camping.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I love camping in the Jemez where we do not have to be right next to several other campers.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1008
Comment#

0 not a comment. Requests to be added to mailing list
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1009
Comment#

Letter# 1009
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1010
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1011
Comment#
1 Paliza Canyon and Kitty Lake Trails: I am requesting that the trails in Paliza Canyon and Kitty Lake be kept open for ATV use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 These areas provide important connection points to other trails that you are more, I have MS and it is getting harder to get around as I get older.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1012
Comment#
0 Form letter See letter # 223 for comments
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1013
Comment#
1 FR 179 and Trail 285 (Guaje Ridge Trail and Pipeline Road): Keep these routes closed to motorized travel. The damage done by dirtbikes on the Pajarito Trail and others in north Los Alamos County is extensive… the soils can't handle it!
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 FR 179 and Trail 285 (Guaje Ridge Trail and Pipeline Road): Keep these routes closed to motorized travel. The damage done by dirtbikes on the Pajarito Trail and others in north Los Alamos County is extensive… the soils can't handle it!
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

3 Motorized users should be confined to roads with a few exceptions for dirt bikes.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Motorized users…. The disproportionate impact of this group is unacceptable.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1014
Comment#

Letter# 1014
Comment#

1 FR 144, 257, 103, Borrego Canyon Rd, 269, 10, 70, 422, 488, 20, 604, 608, 607, 266: Dispersed Camping: we need the corridors extended on these Forest Roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 FR 144, 257, 103, Borrego Canyon Rd, 269, 10, 70, 422, 488, 20, 604, 608, 607, 266: Dispersed Camping: we prefer ecluded solitary campsites off these main roads… the new maps show little if any dispersed camping except in a few crowded already popular areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1015
Comment#

0 Duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1016
Comment#

1 Cuba RD: Request that roads and trails within the Cuba RD be NO FURTHER RESTRICTED than shown on Map #7 seasonally open dates travel mgt proposed action plan…. Byways should remain accessible to our citizens.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1017
Comment#

1 Roads that become closed include an exception for "Game Retrieval Only."

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I understand overuse by vehicles including ATVs causes damage however intermittent use to gain access for retrieval of an elk or bear does not cause damage.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1018
Comment#

1 It is unbelieveable that the USFS is attempting to close roads, trails, and areas to ORV use when the research clearly shows that no one type of ativity is any worse or better than any other.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1019
Comment#

1 We need areas for Trials. The proposed areas are entirely inadequate.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1020
Comment#
1 Medio Dia Canyon: Closing the road/trail completely 268 near Bland is a travesty… road.. Frequented by many 4 4 wheelers and motorcycle.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1021
Comment#
1 Please increase the corridor forest roads for dispersed camping in all areas of the Jemez Mountains.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 there are far too few areas for solitary secluded camping away from other campers.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1022
Comment#
0 Form letter see letter #1021
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1023
Comment#
0 Form letter see letter #1021
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1024
Comment#
0 Form letter see letter #1021
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1025
Comment#
0 Form letter see letter #1021
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1026
Comment#
0 Form letter see letter #1021
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1027
Comment#

Letter# 1027
Comment#

1 Our organization sent you a letter detailing our concerns on June 10. That letter is attached. We note that our concerns were not addressed in your proposed action and that dirt bike trails go right up to the boundary of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and between the VCNP and Bandelier National Monument, another sensitive area.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We note that our concerns were not addressed in your proposed action and that dirt bike trails go right up to the boundary of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and between the VCNP and Bandelier National Monument, another sensitive area.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 these machines are noisy and their noise carries for miles disturbing the majority of the public who visits the VCNP, Bandelier or the Santa Fe National Forest for purposes other than riding a machine. The noise is a critical issue as it is annoying to the public and stressful to wildlife. The Forest Service can deal with noise by requiring strict noise control devices on the machines taken into the SFNF or they can close all roads and trails near sensitive areas like the VCNP and Bandelier to these machines.

Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 The noise is a critical issue as it is annoying to the public and stressful to wildlife.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 critical issue as it is annoying to the public and stressful to wildlife. The Forest Service can deal with noise by requiring strict noise control devices on the machines taken into the SFNF or they can close all roads and trails near sensitive areas like the VCNP and Bandelier to these machines.

Public Concern # 62 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 with many OHV trails proposed to remain open near the VCNP boundaries, we have a very high risk of trespass by these riders who have cut fences in many instances in the past and who have trespassed on the VCNP in the past.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 With the USFS having few law enforcement rangers, the chances of OHV trespassers into the VCNP being caught is low. Thus your proposal to keep trails open to the boundary of the VCNP puts the VCNP at risk and puts the burden of protecting the VCNP on VCNP law enforcement. Presently, the SFNF and the VCNP have the same police force which is inadequate.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 We strongly suggest all trails and roads within 3 miles of the VCNP boundary be closed to OHVs of all types.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 SFNF will join VCNP staff in monitoring the preserve's boundary for OHV tresspass and work to effectively eliminate any trespass routes.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1028
Comment#

Comment#

1 turning our beautiful, peaceful, forests into motorized racetracks and racing mud pits.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 You know the people who support motorized vehicles in our national forests have been breaking the rules of our forest for years, disregarding signs, fences, wildlife, and humans.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 It is your job to guaranty the welfare and safety of its inhabitants, our wildlife. Everyone knows you do not have the manpower or budget to do that right now.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 Those of us who love to hike in our forests are told that you are going to designate 58 of its 121 trails to motorized vehicles, plus 48 acres for a motorized playground.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 They love dust, mud, noise, and scaring people and animals. They belong on motorized racetracks, which is where they will go after they destroy the forests. We have already made you aware of AWs running over and severing water lilies that ran to a holding tank for cattle.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 Remove motor vehicles from trail 113. Get rid of motor trails in T18N and R4E.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 they are discouraging hikes. We have been hiking on these trails for the twelve years we have lived here. Many times, we have had these motor bikes come barreling up behind us, irritated that we were in their way, kicking up dirt as they go by us. When we indicate they should slow down and be aware of people on foot, they are very aggressive

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 These vehicles are chasing the wildlife out of the SFNF;

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 Some of these trails have not been maintained for many years. Your manpower and budget cannot sustain your proposal. We beg you to please listen to the people who love and protect our national forests. Please do not create a monster with your projected plan. Your manpower and budget are not and never will be sufficient to protect and repair our forests from these invaders

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1029
Comment#

1 Much more designated allowed off-road dispersed camping areas and corridors are needed to meet the public's demand for camping.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The current designated allowed off-road dispersed camping areas and corridors are skewed towards areas that are not desirable, and are not currently being used. The total summary of corridors listed does not accurately indicate the areas that are desirable by the public
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 I request that all of Forest Road (FR) 117 be designate as a "Driving up to 300 feet off-road for dispersed camping O K roadway, especially the southernmost one mile. This is a popular area for hunters to hunt and camp.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 4. I request that all of Forest Road (FR) 69 be designate as a "Driving up to 300 feet off-road for dispersed camping OK" roadway.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 why dispersed camping is recommended 150 feet off of FR 20 south of State Road 126 along the Rio de las Vacas. This is exactly the type of area that the public desires to camp along, but the Forest Service has spent thousands of dollars over the past twenty years fencing this area off to public use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Esponola

6 why dispersed camping is recommended 150 feet off of FR 20 south of State Road 126 along the Rio de las Vacas. This is exactly the type of area that the public desires to camp along, but the Forest Service has spent thousands of dollars over the past twenty years fencing this area off to public use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 I request that dispersed camping areas not be allowed within 500 feet of all private in-holdings within the SFNF.
Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 I recently used a very nice under 50" wide trail extending north from Forest Road 106 near the Thompson Ridge subdivision on the Jemez Ranger District that extended for several mile across the Rio San Antonio connecting to Forest Road 144. I request that this existing well-used trail be added to remain on the designated trail map.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 object to many existing roads being eliminated from the designated open roadway map because of resource damage that can be mitigated by proper road maintenance and/or roadway reconstruction.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 object to many existing roads being eliminated from the designated open roadway map because of resource damage that can be mitigated by proper road maintenance and/or roadway reconstruction.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1029
Comment#

10 One glaring omission is the effect on the local economy. Many of the roads used in the SFNF, especially those used by dispersed campers, bring in considerable amount of money to the local economies of Cuba, La Cueva, Jemez Pueblo, Jemez Springs, Los Alamos, Gallina, Coyote, Youngsville, Glorieta, Pecos, Las Vegas, and Regina. If people are forced to not camp near their favorite area, they will simply find another area to camp. Given the vast reduction in proposed areas to recreate on the SFNF with the Proposed Action of the TMP, much of the public will elect to recreate in other areas far away from the SFNF.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 object to many existing roads being eliminated from the designated open roadway map because of resource damage that can be mitigated by proper road maintenance and/or roadway reconstruction.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 It is my opinion that the Proposed Action of the SFNF TMP is more of an attempt to avoid proper recreation management than protect "resources".

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

13 It is well known that the SFNF does not have adequate funds to maintain the existing roads or enforce illegal activities

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

14 It is well known that the SFNF does not have adequate funds to maintain the existing roads or enforce illegal activities

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1030
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action needs significant revision in order to meet the current and future need to provide motorized trail based recreation opportunity. The Proposed Action goes too far in reducing available motorized recreation, especially trail based motorized recreation.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 BRC requests that the agency develop an Alternative that, to the extent possible, seeks to maximize available motorized trail based recreation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We request that the proposals made by the Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance be incorporated, in full, into at least one such "pro recreation" Alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 BRC also requests that the planning team work with representatives from the New Mexico Off Highway Vehicle Alliance in formulating such a "pro recreation" Alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

5 We also request that all alternatives include mitigation as an alternative to closure.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 Regarding: The motor vehicle use map may be updated and changed as needed. For instance, some of the roads, trails, and areas proposed and eventually chosen may not show up on the first version of the map because the survey and clearance for heritage resources may not be finished at the time of the final decision. As the clearances are completed, the roads, trails, and areas will be added. It will be prohibited to use motorized vehicles on roads or trails or in areas until they are published on the map. The Forest will strive to produce motor vehicle maps annually. (Proposed Action, page 27) The using public needs to clearly understand what this means. For example, how many of the roads, trails and areas chosen may not show up on the first version of the map? How long does the agency estimate it will take to complete clearances on all of the roads. trails and areas? This is a potentially divisive issue. The agency may loose support of the OHV community if individual users get the idea that this planning process is a ruse, and endless analysis will delay their ability to use roads, trails and areas indefinitely. We suggest full disclosure in the DElS regarding this provision. Roads, trails and areas needing additional analysis should be identified and clear direction for appropriate clearance should be specific in final plan and the Record of Decision.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

7 We suggest that agency disclose the Memorandum of Understanding between the SFNF (or Regional Office) and the New Mexico State Historic Preservation officer in the DElS and fully explain to the recreating public how the "Section 106" compliance works. We also want to strongly urge the SFNF to, as the Washington Office has suggested, utilize budget resources from all departments, including soils, watersheds and wildlife, to pay for the necessary clearances.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

8 The information contained in the Proposed Action document and related materials' are not as helpful as they could be insofar as assisting the interested public understand and comment on the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 the Proposed Action document's discussion of Dispersed Camping, Off Route Game Retrieval and "Motorized Areas" is confusing. On these "issues," the Proposed Action document begins with existing condition - desired condition narrative, but the discussion of the existing condition is confusing and the desired condition statements are too general and, in some cases, far removed from how the Proposed Action actually addresses these three issues.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 the section on "Motorized Areas" seems to confuse route proliferation resulting from unrestricted cross country travel with the potential of designating "managed open areas."

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 The OHV community supports the move to "motorized travel limited to designated roads, trails and areas." We understand and accept that the popularity of motorized use now makes large geographic "open" areas unmanageable, but this is a separate issue than the potential need for small managed "open" areas for trials motorcycle opportunity.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 The discussion of the dispersed camping "issue" on pages 14 and 15 is also confusing, especially in contrast to the Notice of Intent. But the Proposed Action document's discussion of Motorized Vehicle Use for Big Game Retrieval is not clear at all. On this "issue," the existing condition - desired condition section begins with a discussion of harvest goals and objectives that are, for the most part, unrelated to the issue of motorized game retrieval. This section ends with this desired condition statement: Through coordination with the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the designated road and trail system would provide reasonable and accepted access to hunting areas on the Forest while minimizing disturbance to habitats. (Proposed Action, page 16) While this may be a good general travel management goal, it doesn't really relate to the specific issue of motorized game retrieval. It is only later in the document we learn that the agency proposes to ban any vehicle use off designated routes to retrieve downed game. Again, contrast this to the clear and concise paragraph addressing this issue in the Notice of Intent.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

13 The total lack of notice or discussion of any actual planning issues in the Scoping materials is a serious flaw in the agency's process. Lack of discussion of planning issues puts stakeholders directly affected by the decision at a disadvantage. For example, if the presence of listed, candidate or otherwise sensitive species is likely to be a key planning issue, stakeholders need to know that in order to comment and suggest mitigation alternatives.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

14 we appreciate that the SFNF acknowledgement of this important issue (dispersed camping). We lack the site specific knowledge to make site specific suggestions to how the Proposed Action deals with dispersed camping, but we advise planning team approach the issue with full analysis and with full public disclosure in mind. The public must be fully informed of, and support, the plan the agency is proposing.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 Off-route motorized Qame retrieval In general, BRC supports the ability of District Rangers to designate areas where travel off designated routes is permitted to retrieve lawfully harvested game.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 BRC supports "access to dispersed camping" and "off route game retrieval" as formal planning issues.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

17 The Proposed Action continues the trend of eliminating opportunity for vehicle-based recreation. In response to the increased popularity of motorized recreation by the general public, this Proposed Action responds by closing a significant percentage of the existing, legal nonsystem opportunity. Additional significant closures are being proposed by land managers across New Mexico. The amount of closures has reached a critical mass. Every single mile of motorized route that is open today is extremely important. Further closures will have a larger impact than those in the past. The cumulative loss of motorized recreational opportunity should be brought into the analysis and incorporated into the decision making process. Significance criteria could include number of miles closed, number of acres closed or other similar quantifier.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 The analysis should include a brief but accurate description of the current travel management rules on adjacent public lands.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

19 The analysis should also include a brief but accurate description of the ongoing travel management planning projects on adjacent lands as well as other public lands in the region.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

20 Trail-based recreational experience We are uncertain how the effects on recreation experiences will be considered in the decision making process. IVaturally, BRC's members and supporters are interested in a quality OHV trail system. Insofar as that can be reflected as a planning Issue, we would suggest "trail-based recreational experience" be considered. Significance criteria such as "loops," "level or range of difficulty," "scenic quality," "destinations" or other similar qualities OHV users appreciate in trails should be considered by the Planning Team.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

21 The importance of travel management warrants the formation of alternatives other than the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

22 The SFNF must not make the mistake of formulating a "range" of Alternatives where all significantly reduce motorized recreation opportunities.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

23 There is a need for the agency to formulate a "maximum recreational opportunity" Alternative. According to the study, Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation in the United States, Regions and States: A National Report from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE), from 1982 to 2001 OHV use became one of the fastest growing activities in the country. Between an earlier NSRE conducted in 1994-1995 and the time when the next round of NSRE data was collected, between fall 1999 and summer 2000, it showed a 32-percent increase. This represented a growth from about 27.3 million OHV users in 1994-1995 to about 36.0 million in 1999-2000. According to the NSRE, over 25% of New Mexico's population engaged in OHV recreation in 2004. The NSRE's updated report, dated February 2008, indicates the growth in popularity of OHV recreation is continuing, estimating over 27% of New Mexico's population enjoyed OHV use in 2008. The need to provide, or at least not reduce, the current amount of routes available for motorized use was a key theme during the many pre-scoping meetings and discussions.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

24 The planning team must not make the mistake of assuming the "no-action alternative" serves as a "maximum recreation" alternative. The agency can not legitimately claim that maintaining the current allowances and restrictions for OHV use and motorized travel, as described in the current forest plan is a viable "action alternative." There are numerous and obvious reasons why this is so.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

25 In order for the general public and decision makers to be able to estimate the effects of the agency's Proposed Action, Alternative A or the "no action" alternative must provide enough information to at least have a reasonable understanding of what the existing condition on the ground is. An accurate no action alternative is also necessary to assist potential environmental impacts from concentrating use into a smaller area (or miles).

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

26 There is a problem with the manner in which the agency is using the term "unauthorized." The term "unauthorized" now has a specific legal meaning pursuant to the Travel Management Rule. Although the Rule does not specifically define the word unauthorized, it does define the terms "~~nauthorizeroda d" and "unauthorized trail." (Defined as: "road or trail that is not a forest road or trail or a temporary road or trail and that is not included in a forest transportation atlas. ') The SFNF planning team must not dismiss this concern with overly-legalistic rationalizations of the use of the term "unauthorized" in this planning effort. Simply put, the Rulemakirlg has effectively made the use of the term "unauthorized" synonymous with "illegal." The use of "unauthorized" should properly refer to routes/roads/trails that have been lawfully closed pursuant to the travel planning process. Conversely, the use of "authorized" should properly refer to routes/roads/trails that are legal for certain motorized vehicles subject to seasonal or other restrictions. Indeed, the use of the term "unauthorized" during the planning process or at any time prior to the publication of the "Motorized Vehicle Use Map" is arguably inconsistent with the Rule itself. BRC strongly objects to the use of the word "unauthorized" to describe routes that are currently legal for motorized use. In addition, it would appear that using the term "unauthorized" to describe existing user-created routes is inconsistent with Region 3 Travel Management Rule Implementation Guidelines which direct staff to populate data in terms of "allowed uses." (Travel Management Rule Guidelines, Revision 4, June 30, 2008 pages 4-5) In this case, user created routes that were created in areas where motorized use was allowed should not be described as "unauthorized."

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

27 The Proposed Action document refers to road density standards. However, the Forest Plan specifically refers to road density as an objective. The DElS should clarify how the amended Forest Plan addresses road density. As a standard? As a guideline? As an objective? The DElS should also explain the difference between standards, guidelines and objectives and how all that worked under the planning regulations used at the time.

Public Concern # 20 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

28 In addition, when using the terms such as standard, guideline and objective, the SFNF should be as clear as possible in its proposed forest plan amendment. Given the current state of the planning regulations, it seems prudent to be as specific as possible and clearly define the terms used.

Public Concern # 20 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

29 In general, BRC opposes an open motorized route density being enforced as a "standard." Creating standards in a Forest Plan removes nearly all flexibility to address even a mapping error, let alone changes on the ground. We have seen simple travel plan amendments become unnecessarily complicated by the prospect of having to amend the Forest Plan to do what makes sense on the ground.

Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

30 As the agency has extensively documented, wildlife habitat effectiveness is based upon a multitude of factors, particularly including forage, cover and, to some extent, road density. A simple review of hunting statistics shows many well known hunting units have high motorized route densities. Clearly, quality of habitat has more influence on big game populations than low densities of roads. In summary, the data does not support any conclusion that there is a single factor causal relationship between road density and wildlife habitat effectiveness. Therefore, it is more logical to keep road density direction in the Forest Plan as a guideline, instead of a standard

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

31 1. The SFNF should develop loqical significance indictors for recreation The analysis must determine logical significance criteria for socio-economic and recreational opportunity impacts. Indicators such as miles of routes available for motorized use are useful, but others are needed for adequate analysis, such as number of loops, diversity of modality, number of existing campsites closed, level of difficulty, and similar factors.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

32 2. The analysis must disclose and analyze effects of the human environment in the proper context Far too often agency analyses are plagued by a preoccupation with documenting impacts to physical resources. Environmental impact analysis documents often include statement after statement regarding various negative impacts of roads and vehicle use; i.e., trampled vegetation, compressed soils, increased sediment loading, disturbed wildlife, etc. while including little or no information about what the existing condition is, or how the existing motorized and non-motorized uses are actually impacting resources, or whether that impact is significant, let alone a meaningful contrast between the current condition and the various alternatives. In addition to these physical resource issues, the agency must evaluate human and socioeconomic impacts, both positive and negative, including quality of visitor experience and economic impacts.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

33 lmpacts should be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use should be compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the proposed actions can be determined.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

34 lmpacts should be described in sufficient detail for the public to fully understand the nexus between the impacts and the conclusions and, ultimately, the decision reached by the Deciding Officer.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

35 An assumption that was often proffered by other stakeholders at the various open houses and collaborative meetings was that closing roads and trails to motorized uses would dramatically improve the effectiveness of wildlife habitat. In our opinion, much of the rationale expressed for restricting motorized vehicle use was tied to incomplete research and grossly excessive extrapolation of research data, and often directly contradicted the current condition on the ground today.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

36 The SFNF must not automatically assume that closing roads and trails to motorized use will instantly increase habitat effectiveness. The analysis must not improperly assume or overestimate the beneficial effects to wildlife resulting from motorized route closures. Research done at the Starkey Experimental Forest and Range is the most recent and most detailed and complex research done on deer and elk in relation to human travel modes consisting of ATVItrail bike, bicycle, hiking, and horseback. Previous studies dating back to the 1970s indicate that these animals flee from all of these travel modes. The Starkey research quantifies the different rates, times, and distances. However, they admit that the resultant impact on individuals has not been determined and no scientific conclusions are reached in the studies on how this disturbance affects individual health or survivability. Likewise, no relationship has been made between the four disturbance modes and herd health. All that is known is that deer and elk run from humans using any form of travel. Nothing in the Starkey research proves the existence of motorized trails actually results in a decrease in habitat effectiveness or in an individual animal's poor health and survivability, nor is this evidence that current vehicle use is negatively impacting herd health factors. It should not be assumed that the elimination of motorized use would drastically reduce disturbance of wildlife or improve "wildlife vulnerability" when walking persons, persons on horses, mountain bike use, bird watching, hunting and numerous other uses that are documented to disturb, harass or kill wildlife are still allowed.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

37 Routes should not be categorically excluded from being incorporated into the classified road and trail system simply because they lie within a soils or watershed "polygon." The Rule does not absolve the Forest from complying with other applicable law, including NEPA, which requires relevant, site specific analysis as well as the development of a wide range of Alternatives.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

38 Soils and watershed resources can benefit most from proper route alignment and provisions to monitor, maintain routes to minimize impacts. Closing routes to motorized use while still allowing hiking, mountain biking and equestrian use does not stop soil or watershed damage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

39 The SFNF must support any claim that various recreational activities (e.g., off-highway vehicle use, camping, equestrian use, hunting etc.,) pose significant threats to any sensitive, threatened, endangered or other species of concern. Claims that are highly speculative and based on little or no reliable data should be excluded from the environmental analysis. The agency must establish more than a causal connection between recreation activities and any perceived declines in the population of any threatened or endangered species known to reside in the planning area. At most, the technical data shows that some recreational activities, in some areas, have the potential to displace some species on a very local level. This, however, cannot establish that recreational activities pose a substantial threat to an entire population or subpopulation of a particular plant or animal.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

40 Herd health data available from the New Mexico Game and Fish must be publicly disclosed and considered in the analysis. 'The analysis should disclose the hunting seasons and tag objectives as well. Without current herd numbers and trends, it can not be determined that motorized vehicle use on or off the forest is impacting wildlife populations and herd health to such a degree that warrants further restrictions. Impacts to wildlife must be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use must be compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the proposed actions can be determined.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

41 the trail using public will not accept the agency applying a strict maintenance budget criteria only to motorized trails and not to other programs. And BRC strongly objects to using funding (or the ability) for implementation, monitoring and maintenance and enforcement as a "designation criteria." Most, if not all, U.S.F.S. programs are under funded. Indeed, the shortfall in the roads maintenance budget, and the trail maintenance backlog for trails in designated Wilderness, is well documented.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

42 Fortunately, the agency has the tools to address legitimate concerns about route maintenance. There are many grant and volunteer opportunities available. Therefore, our suggestion is that you address any legitimate concerns by incorporating direction in your travel plan to train agency staff on how to apply for grants, use the challenge cost share program, effectively manage volunteer programs and learn about and apply for other funding sources. In addition, you might consider MOU's or other similar agreements with recreational groups.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

43 Let us be clear; we think the Record of Decision itself should provide clear direction to leverage partnerships, pursue MOU's or other agreements with OHV groups, involve volunteers and leverage grant programs to monitor and maintain the OHV route system. (Plan for it -the dollars will come.) The final plan should incorporate direction to pursue agreements with motorized users and user groups. For example, the final plan could incorporate direction to establish Peer Group Trail Patrols in order to educate visitors and provide "peer enforcement" of the travel plan. (For more information on potential Trail Patrol programs, please contact Ric Foster at 208-237-1 008 ext 107).

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

44 Comments were also made in the TAP about the ability to enforce the travel plan.This issue is very difficult to incorporate as a planning issue or designation criteria. If it were, we would be arguing for the designation of the maximum number of routes as doing so would clearly be easier and less expensive to enforce.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

45 Still, enforcement is an important concern. Our recommendation is that you give the motorized visitor sufficient and enjoyable opportunity

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

46 BRC supports the designation of managed open areas for trials motorcycles Trials motorcycle riding is surprisingly popular among BRC's membership in New Mexico. We strongly support the inclusion of managed open areas for trials motorcycle riding.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

47 Even if the 2001 Roadless Rule is deemed to be the applicable standard, the agency must not interpret the Forest's authority in an unduly restrictive manner, concluding that existing unclassified (or unauthorized) routes effectively can not or should not be added to the designated route network without violating the 2001 Rule's prohibition on "road construction" in IRAs. This interpretation is contrary to the regulation and to the representations of the Forest Service and preservationist groups, who contend that the Roadless Rule does not prohibit motorized access to IRAs. See, 2001 Roadless Rule, 66 Fed.Reg. 3251 (Jan. 12, 2001).

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

48 Despite these consistent and ongoing positions from the Forest Service and proponents of the Roadless Rule, many Forests seem to be incorrectly interpreting the reinstatement of that Rule as imposing limits on project-level designation of routes in Roadless Areas. We urge you to take all steps necessary to rectify such misinterpretation(s). As the preservationist supporters of the Roadless Rule have made repeatedly clear, the 2001 Roadless Rule does not, and was not intended to, prohibit historical and existing motorized access along roads and trails in Roadless Areas.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

49 only Congress can designate Wilderness under the Wilderness Act. The act specifically states that, wilderness areas are "to be composed of federally owned areas designated by Congress as 'wilderness areas. The Forest Service simply does not have the authority to make any Wilderness-specific management directives until Congress has made a determination of Wilderness status. Offroad vehicles use, which are generally prohibited in designated Wilderness areas, but frequently enjoyed within proposed wilderness areas, must be properly and effectively managed by the Forest Service in non-wilderness areas, including proposed or recommended wilderness areas.

Public Concern # 65 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 1030

Comment#

50 The Forest Recreation Use Statistics, and the National Visitor Use Monitoring information presented in the TAP is not accurate. It reflects information gathered primarily from the permitted (Wilderness permits) as opposed to dispersed recreation sites. While some of the information may be useful, we encourage the agency to consider where and how the data was gathered.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

51 we do not agree that the problem depicted in this photo can be correctly described as a user created route. A "braid" or "bypass," as shown in the photo, is correctly described as a design or maintenance problem, not a route proliferation problem. Such situations can be effectively reclaimedlmitigated with proper route alignment, monitoring and maintenance. The reason for our quibble here is the hope that the staff at the SFNF understands that a braid or bypass problem requires different management solutions than a route proliferation problem.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

52 The Forest Plan does not specify any areas designated for motorized use. (Proposed Action, page 7) This statement is misleading. Of course the Forest Plan does not specify any areas designated for motorized use. However, Forest Plans do, and the SFNF Forest Plan does, specify that areas designated for motorized use would be desianated: Establish Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use areas and closures as needed to provide ORV opportunities while protecting resources and minimizing conflicts with other users. (Amended Forest Plan, page 18.) We know it's a quibble, but BRC is a stickler for accurate disclosure of existing land use plan direction.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1031

Comment#

1 Construction of bridges and roads can result in permanent loss of all habitats in the developed area, disruption of animal movement and dispersal, and creation of continual disturbance that affects animal communities in the adjacent fragmented portions of the forest. The Service anticipates some minor short-term impacts to fish and wildlife resources 3 associated with bridge and road construction. To ensure that federally listed species are not lLL 0 adversely impacted by the project, Endangered Species Act, section 7 consultation should be completed prior to construction.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 To minimize adverse impacts to birds protected under the LO Migratory Bird Treaty Act, tree stands or other adequately vegetated areas should be surveye@ for the presence of nesting birds during the general migratory bird nesting season of April LaLJ through August. Disturbance to nesting areas should be avoided until nesting is completed. C"

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 To minimize impacts associated with erosion, the contractor should employ silt curtains without lead weights, coffer dams, dikes, straw bales, or other suitable erosion control measures. Construction related petrochemical spills can also negatively impact fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, measures should be implemented to minimize the likelihood of petrochemical spills. Spill procedures should be in place prior to construction to minimize impacts associated with unexpected spills. To ensure that the objectives of the project are met, post-construction monitoring of the Project Area should be conducted. The Service is concerned with removing the quantitative objectives for road decommissioning. This practice ensures the rehabilitation of fish and wildlife habitat and should be continued.

Public Concern # 58 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1032
Comment#

1 Because of the size of the area, no action would be the best alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1033
Comment#

1 First and foremost, we are gravely troubled that our trail (previously designated on National Forest maps as a portion of Trail #218) has been re-designated as Forest Road 263B, according to maps #2, #6, #8, and #10 on the current website.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 re-designated as a "road open to all vehicles this trail is not, nor has it ever been, a public access "road this map indicates that there is currently public access all the way and completely through the Harvey Ranch front yard, which is not true.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 If the incorrect designation of this trail continues to be posted on the Forest Service website, I foresee that it will cause numerous problems for both the Forest Service such as public frustration, complaints, increased fire danger and possible injury, and major infractions to the ECH Corporation such as trespassing, poaching, and vandalism.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Maps #6, #8, #10 designate this trrail, (aka. "road"), as accessible to the public from the base of Road 263 to the meadow opening of the Harvey Ranch. This designation implies that the public is allowed access through the Douglass and El Cielo property, when in fact no public easement has been given.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1034
Comment#

1 Camping should be allowed along all routes in the final plan within the planned 150-300 foot designated boundary.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Do not limit to specific locations only as this will group all users together and reduce the peace and tranquility we go camping for.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1035
Comment#

1 I am a resident of the community of La Cueva. It is located in the beautifid La Cueva Canyon and has been my home for many years. I am an avid fisherman, hunter, and hiker. The proposed expansion of OHV use in this area is inappropriate and an abomination. It is my understanding that OHV users are only 2% of the population using the forest but they do 90% of the damage. It seems obvious to me that this is not proper usage of our natural resources.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1035
Comment#

2 I attended the Alarnitos-Glorieta-Canoncito public meeting at the Hondo station put on by the Forest Service. The meeting was structured in a way that very much limited public comment. While many were in attendance of this meeting, only a handfbl of people were able to voice there comments/opinions. The meeting was more of a promotion of the Forest Service agenda than it was a public meeting.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 After attending this meeting, it seems to me that the Forest Service really has no intention of listening to public opinion and has an inappropriate idea how the forest in this area should be utilized.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

4 I am a hunter and hiker, and the proposed expansion of OHV use will disturb/destroy a beautiful area that many utilize for hunting and hiking.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

5 There are already OHVs riding through a N i l e riparian zone with no Forest Service enforcement around

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 the increase in traffic will negatively impact this community. No longer will it be safe to walk down the road with our kids and dogs to visit our neighbors.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Also wildfires will only increase in this high-fire danger area, threatening lives and property.

Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 375 LBB -travels into the PAC and should be removed. The route continues beyond the route outlined on the Proposed Action map, going further into the PAC, encouraging use and causing W e r disturbance of the PAC.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 375LBB is also designated for dispersed camping of 150' on each side of the route. There should be no dispersed camping in the PAC. The current condition of the route is very light use. It will undoubtedly receive increased use once it is designated as a motorized route on the map, causing increased noise, pollution and disturbance to the Mexican Spotted Owl and the Protected Activity Center.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 375L - leads to 375 LBB (the PAC) 375M, 375MB OW routes should not be designated in ESA designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered species. In addition to the Spotted Owl, plant species and amphibians should be considered.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1035
Comment#

11 3) 375 -- the main road. We do not object to 375 as a route. However, 375 is designated for camping at the upper end of La Cueva Canyon where the creek runs, just beyond 35M. This is a spectacular riparian area (stream ru.nning, wild strawberries), and the head of the watershed for La Cueva Canyon. Vehicle camping should be eliminated on the lefthand side of the road near the creek. (GPS 431 112E 3946238N) The area is also part of and adjacent to archeological and cultural sites.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 4) 3756 and 53. These routes were added in the Proposed Action. This is a riparian area with the largest, most watered pools in the La Cueva Creek, archeological sites, active puebloan shrines and cultural sites, areas with potential inclusion in to the National Historic Register,.La Cueva watershed, rock gorge, and a severely eroded route which is impassable for motorized vehicles other than motorcycles or ATVs. Where the nature of the terrain tempts off road use and illegal clandestine activities where law enforcement will be virtually impossible. In addition, wildlife trails and habitat will be disrupted.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1036
Comment#

1 646 JA we would like to be allowed for this gare on Road 646 JA to be kept locked and all other roads and trails in this area be closed. These roads and trails were once closed, but the public opened them up

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I am very much in favor of the proposed road closure.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1037
Comment#

0 Duplicate/Form Letter

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1038
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action for Management Travel released for comment on July 10, 2008 is devastating to the OHV community. The proposal has only included a small subset of the trails originally requested. This results in loops containing widely disconnected segments of single-track trails. The recreational experience of single-track trail riding has been nearly completely lost.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We insist that the EIS follow-on to the TAP include a full analysis on all the routes and areas submitted by users.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The Forest Service must follow the requirements in CEQ 40 that they evaluate a “ No Change” alternative with respect to the Blackfeather motorized trails.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1038
Comment#

4 All the supporting documentation used in the analysis and decision making for the DEIS should be posted on the website as .pdf files as soon as the DEIS is published.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1039
Comment#

1 NMTA formally requests that this amendment as part of the Blackfeather/NMTA Citizen's Alternative proposal be incorporated as one of the altneratives in the Travel Management Rule (TMR) planning dovument

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 ...[the] areas NMTA seeks to have designated for use by trials motorycyles have historically been sites for observed trials competitions, often since the 1970's.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Areas that lend themselves to a quality experience for observed trials are characterized by: - a staging area suitable for parking and nearby camping; - a single-or double-track loop trail with termini at the staging area; - "sections" which are small areas linked by the loop trail - sections typically are as small as a few hundred square feet, with obstacles suitably challenging for riders of varying skill levels.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Each of the areas in the Jemez Ranger District has been a host location for at least one observed trials event for which the USFS granted a Special Use Permit (or the equivalent under requirements then in place). That means that each area has already been deemed suitable for such activity by the USFS at least once.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 During the research for this proposal, we have uncovered no evidence of any measured negative impacts from the historical use, either from within the managing agency or from outside sources. The areas have been managed under contemporaneous USFS policy and have survived for four decades with minimal problems attributable to recreation of any type.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 The OHV community has often received a disproportionate amount of negative public criticicism attributable to incorrectly identifying all OHV operators with those few individuals who may not fully respect our public lands or abide by the rules and common courtesies required for its use.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 Preconceptions of what backcountry experience should be could taint contemporary science that vilifies backcountry OHV recreation. These are individuals who see a tire track on the trail, or hear an OHV motor passing in the distance, and call it a disturbance simply because it does not fit with their preconceived ideal for a backcountry experience

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1039
Comment#

8 NMTA formally requests that this amendment as part of the Blackfeather/NMTA Citizen's Alternative proposal be incorporated as one of the altneratives in the Travel Management Rule (TMR) planning dovument

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Perception of negative impact without observable data should not be an influencing management criterion.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

10 It is likely that any measurable impacts will be very small, or, easily mitigated, because as noted above we have researched a body of literature dating from the mid-1970's to the present that scientifically documents that trail-based motor recreation has little or no measurable negative impacts.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 13 Not supported by scientific evidence

Letter# 1040
Comment#

1 FR 271 that runs through Paliza Canyon. I use this road a lot for turkey hunting and jeeping and just getting away from everything. I know the road need work mainly to keep water from running down the middle of the road. I don't see an erosion problem.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1041
Comment#

0 Duplicate/Form Letter

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1042
Comment#

1 I am concerned that many of the trails turned into the Travel Management Team by us, for inclusion into the process, were not included in the Proposed Action OpenIClosed maps currently being distributed, and on your website.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I am requesting that the entire trail GPS tracks turned over to your GIs person by the BTPA, be included in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as one of the Alternatives. These trails in the west Jemez include: Motown North Pass North Pass Extension Lower Grassy Roads Cerro Pelado PalizaIPeralta Dragons Tail Lost Jug Shady Lane Over Rover Beaver Pond Insulator Salt Lick Over 40 Alamos Hill Media Dia Killer Switchbacks Mainline Upper J Line Popovers Broken Arrow Cerro Pelon Teakettle 7 Mile17 Meadow Chile Relleno Espanola Tree Fine Line Chain Saw The Wall Double Down Wheeler Trail 105 Trail 107 All of Schoolhouse Mesa trails.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1043
Comment#

Letter# 1043
Comment#

1 I am concerned with the closure plan to close off a beautiful area used by many for camping near Forest Road 287 and 289B to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 There are hundreds of thousands acres already closed in this region and in preservation status with Bandelier National Monument and the Valles Caldera area which is why we need to keep more areas open in the SFNF. Please consider this in the NEPA process; These areas should stay openas much of the year as possible. Closing on August 31 is not acceptable.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1044
Comment#

1 The enclosed proposal and comment epesents my view of a fair, balanced and manaageable travel plan for the Jemez Ranger district of the Santa Fe National Forest.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 I am very familiar with the area and enjoy the peace & quiet.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 I do not want the area destroyed by off roaad vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1045
Comment#

1 I am in favor and agree with the attached proposal.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Over the last several years I have seen much more distruction, property damaage, landscape damage on bothe privt and public property by these vehicles, traveling wherever they please.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 There is more vandaalism and illegal activity - they cut fences to obtain access to the areas they want.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The increase in near road accidents is frequent. Speed unit are ignored. Etc.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 Where all is said and done there also needs to be real enforcement that will work. Many of these motorized riders will not obey they will continue to ride where ever they want.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1046
Comment#

1 San Pablo aea has been an aea where in previous years wildlife poaching got out of control. Since 1985 I have prevented some poaching by not allowing or controlling accessibility to area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Individuals entering on 4x4 vehicles haave done damage to some areas erosion.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 The San Pablo area is a migration route for deer/elk to the east side of the Tecolote River.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 On other approved motorized Travel areas Forest Department should require all motorized vehicles to be registered/be insured and outlaw knobby tires.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 Set up a staging area for vehicles - or a control area.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1047
Comment#

1 I am opposed to closure of roads within the Santa Fe National Forest. The roads should be maintained and left open for public use. There are hundreds of thousands acres aleady closed in this region and in preservation status with Bandelier National Mkonumnet and the Valles Caldera aea. I have no issue with this, but this is a more compelling reason why we need to have all areas open now in the SFNF stay open. This should be considered in the NEPA process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 It should be an important considertion that we are left with adequate open aeas to provide recreation opportunities for our region. With gas prices going up we will need to recreate closer to home.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 All areas should stay open the entire year. Closing on August 31 may help the FS save on expenses but the monies need to be found to keep all of our recreation areas open in the SFNF. Hunting begins September 1 and the hunters pay fees for hunting in these areas. They need to be open and accessible.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 More specifically, I want the FS to reconsider the closure of the area shown in the proposed Travel Management Proposed Action on Map#5 areound Forest Road 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized idspersed camping and other uses. This area has been used for camping for many years by campers, hunters and ATV/cycle users. This area is not shown with the correct designation on Map #3 it is not shown as being used for dispersed camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1048
Comment#

Letter# 1048
Comment#

1 I am aactive in Boy Scouts with my son. I aam concerned with the closure plan to close oof an aea used by scout troops and others. For camping near FR 289B and 287 to all activity including motorized dispersed camping and other uses. This arrea has been used for camping for many years. It is not shown correctly on Map#3 as it has been used for dispersed camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 There are hundreds of thousands acres already closed in this region and in preservation status with Bandelier National Monument and the Valles Caldera area which is why we need to keep more areas open in the SFNF. Please consider this in the NEPA process.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Families, scout troops and others need to have enough close open areas for recreation opportunities because the cost to travel is so high now.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 These area should stay open as much of the year as possible. Closing on August 31 is not acceptable. (FR 289B and 287)

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1049
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 1048

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1050
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 285

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1051
Comment#

1 This area[289B and 287] has been used for camping for many years. This very small area is flat and very suitable for camping. It is at a slightly higher elevation with an ecosystem unique to this area. It is approximately 12 miles to Los Alamos. With fuel prices this proximity to Los Alamos makes it even more attractive as a destination. It is off the main 289 road so is quieter and a great place for a weekend camping trip. This area is in close proximity to several immense areas already designated for preservation in Bandelier NP and also the valles Caldera area and as such there is not a need for this area to be noted as preservation with no motorized vehicle traffic and should be considered in the NEPA process. There is a need for public access for dispersed camping in this area which already has thousands of acres closed off only yards from this site

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 This fact that this area is such a short drive from the Los Alamos community and close to the main road should be considered. It is more important to have areas open which are closer to population bases than in the more remote sections so travel costs and time are minimized to get to the recreation areas.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1051
Comment#

3 This aea is not shown with the correct designation on Map #3 as it is not shown as being used for dispersed camping. This area is used extensively for camping currently and has been for decades (Note-on the first weekend in August 2008 there was a group of 40 Boy Scouts and leaders camping and at the same time there were three other family groups camping in the 289B and 287 area, including our family).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 This area should not be closed to use as of August 31. this area should remain open until first snow or Sept. 30 at a minimum.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The nearest area shown to be designated for dispersed camping is also the aea which is shown for the ATV trails. There should be areas designated for motorized camping which are close to the main road for motorized camping and not adjacent to the ATV and motorcycle trails. Ther are people who want to cmap and not do ATV's.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 this aea has been historically used for many years for motorized public use. The main road 289B has denigrated with rutting and needs to be leveled so the public is not forced to find alternate roads within this aea. That is the reason for the current road problems.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 I understand that this recommendation may have been made as it will be easy to block this area off. This is not an acceptable reason to deny the camping public the yuse of this land. I ask that this area be changed to allow dispersed camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1052
Comment#

1 I request the inclusion of routes and loops in the area north of Thompson Ridge to be included in the motorized routes of the new driving direction for the Jemez Distroc of the Santa Fe National forest travel management plan.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 These requested routes can and should be dedicated to off road (motorcycles and ATV) activity as the main route in the area identified (NF 106) is in serious disrepair past Thompson Ridge and it would be expensive for no apparent benefit to make routes accessible again for cars and trucks.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Use of this area as requested is a traditional use area mainly and especially for the home and cabin users at Thompson Ridge. This traditional use enables use from Thompson Ridge for short trips to enjoy the forest, gather firewood and partake of hunting without the requirement to load up equipment and transport it to other arreas of the forest under the new plans. (If environmental impact is a factor I would offer that continued use by residents directly from homes and cabins is half the effect of the new plans requirement that adds 45 to 60 minutes additional travel to get the same 1 hour of activity in the forest).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The new plan potentially has impact (reduction of value) on the property and inventments of the residents of Thompson Ridge.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1052
Comment#

5 It is an observation and opinion that this area is used very limitedly and probable exclusively by Thompson Ridge residents due to its lack of easy access from main roads through the forest and lack of extended trail paths from the ridge. The NF 106 access to Thompson Ridge and within and past Thompson Ridge enclave is and has been process for "Fire Wise" programs. This speaks to the added safety factor in including trails in the commented area of this submittal.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 The area mentioned is currently and also traditionally used for open grazing. The people with this use have used the old NF 106 to establish watering syistems for their livestock in the areas to be closed in the new plan. If this grazing activity is to rremain under the new plan off road vehicle access will continue to be required.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Review of the planning activity maps available on liine show that the area of this request is significantly below the targeted road density of the guidelines being targeted. Inclusion of the routes and loops requested would not exceed the guidelines being targeted.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 The areas of these comments have a significant buffer to neaar areas currently cataloged as "N - restricted for endangered species". These currently "N" restricted areas arre accessible and violated by NF 144,314,360 and 378S. From the NF 106 area of this comment to these restricted arreas there is a significant barrier due to the spacing and the topography, namely an un-navigaable ridge which precludes access to the new plan for NF 376. Access to the proposed plans continued use of NF144 at the north end of commented areaqs would be beneficaial to the Thompson Ridge residents and probable off load (lessen) the violation of the proposed plans continued use of N144 thorough the "n" areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 It has been commented by representatives of the Forest Service that this limitation in the current proposed plan for any use by motorized vehicles north of Thompson Ridge is due to the need to protect endanged species. These comments have no basis by any rational analysis as presented above, formal scientific environmental impact studies, and are not supported by the "n" areas identified on the planning maps. They clearly reflect the opinion of the commenter to raationalize the proposed plan. These biased and somewhat arrogantly delivered comments by the representative of the Forest Service are not an acceptable or valid reason for the exclusion of the requested roads of this comment.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1053
Comment#

1 Whaat percentage of Santa Fe National Forrest users are engaaged in motorsport activities and what percentage in "quiet" activities? A 2004 SFNF report shows motorsports to be the minority by a wide margin. Even accepting that the sport has grown over the years, we're now being presented with a situation where the minority is dominating the majority. Motorsport users have a disproportionate impact on the forest both physically and esthetically. Can it be argued that motorsport users have no more impact on tails and streams than hikers, sightseers or campers?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 the two groups of users are incompatible. How does a hiker escape the noise of OHV's or trail bikes? What part of the forest, beside the wilderness areas, will be off limits to OHV's?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1053
Comment#

2 Road between 103 and 103F must be left open for all vehicles road is used by all Forest Users. I tis a very importantn road. Identified in map.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

3 OHV use is inherently destructive: it's been referred to as "recreational bulldozing" such activity is clearly contrary to the Forest Service's mission and obligation to protecty the forest for the national benefit.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 How will this rule be enforced? Like the maintneance issue, this question has elicited similarly vaague and unsatisfying responses. Rrules with no enforcement are mere suggestions for public conduct, not rules. What will the penalties for violations be? Since enforcement is likely to be spotty, penalties must be severe and riders must clearly understand the penalties. Penalties similar to Game and Fish poaching penalties would be appropriate. Riders violating the rules are, in a sense "poaching" use of the forest and should be dealt with accordingly. These items, method of enforcement and penalties, should also be addressed in detail in the DEIS.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 A stated objective of the Travel Management Rule is to rreduce parallel routes. Many still exist. The areas around Sanpedro Parks are a good example of this although the situation exists throughout the forest. If a rule objective is to reduce parallel routes, why do so many exist in the proposed action? What's the justification"
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 Limit trails open to ORV's significantly.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Certainly to no moe than current budgets allow to be well maintained.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 Reduce the extent of roads open to motorized traffic even further particularly by reducing paarallel routes further.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Evaluate the overall plan in terms of available budgets; keeping in mind the significant impact of road and trail maintenance for motorized vehicles and the need for enforcement personnel.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1054
Comment#

0 Form letter see Letter #1052
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1055
Comment#

Letter# 1055

Comment#

1 there is so much damage from user created trails that those that want a quiet experience in that area are often afflicted by a few or sometimes only one motorcycle or ATV that can ruin any other's experience often for miles around.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Those that use the forest for quiet contemplation, bird or animal watching or other quiet non-destructive persuits are often molested by the dirt, dust and noise of the relatively few motorized forest users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 There are a very vociferous minority who selfishly disturb the quiet and even after they have gone there are often destroyed plands and killed small animals. The bigger animals are run off so that the resulting forest experience is significantly degraded. Animals will not inhabit an area of frequent motorized use even if exceeding the boundaries of the trails and roads used.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The jemez region is especially hard hit due to its proximity to large population centers of Santa Fe and Albuquerque, and I would like to see much stricted limits on the miles of routes allowed for use by this obviously destructive form of recreation.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 With every increasing concerns about climate change and how especially hard it will affect the southwest it only makes sense to protect as much of our watershed capacity and forests as possible. Further, this form of recreation creates moe dust which along with so many other environmentally destructive practices is causing a greater amount and earlier snow melt with less stream and river flows in the ciritcal later part of the warm season. We need to do all we can to stop this destructive progression not promote it in the name of silly and juvenile destructive recreation.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 the often loud, immature and selfish few "motorheads" are destroying the good for all man, animal and plants. I would like to see their activity severly and strictly curtailed.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1056

Comment#

1 Erosion, disturbance of wildlife, and recreational conflicts due to off-highway vehicles must be controlled. The Forest Plan's loose control of motorized traffic and its high permitted road densities were written when timber was king. Now ecosystem management is primary and wildlife protection is at least equal in importance to timber production (we would say much more important).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Proposed Forest Plan amendments (Proposed Action Appendix 3) are mostly desirable "bookkeeping" changes to accord with the proposed action. Maximum road densities by management type are probably a good thing, but, as given, they are arbitrary and often inapplicable to particular Management Areas [MA]; they should never be used as an excuse to leave roads open. As noted below, we object to the road density proposed for Mesa Poleo (MA E-32) and Virgin Mesa (R-111).

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Results so far on SFNF also are good -- 50% reduction in motorways -- but need further work to meet goals of the Forest Plan and of the Rule. Most Ranger Districts have really made an effort to close unneeded roads and motorized trails. Below, by District, we mention Management Areas in which proposed closures are especially to be praised as well as units in which we think more work is needed.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Especially to be praised: closures in the Anton Chico unit, on Gloreta/Rowe Mesa, east of Bull Creek (MA A-2 and southernmost B-9), Macho Canyon to Indian Creek (E-27), Johnson Mesa (C-13), near Arroyo Hondo (E-25), and near Walker Flats (B-11).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 1. B-9 Tecolote. More of the closely parallel roads in the Viveash Burn should be closed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 Especially to be praised: the southern Sierra Nacimiento (MA G-38 and R-109) and Borrego Dome areas (S-113 and southernmost P-100). Leaving a single road west of Valles Caldera (E-28 and N-98) is just right. We appreciate elimination of the many non-system trails in Jemez Recreation Area and on San Juan Mesa (C-15 and R-108)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 2. R-111 Virgin Mesa. The number of roads proposed to remain in this MA is alarming. "R" emphasis is on protection of cultural sites and of wildlife, yet you propose to leave more motorized ways than allowed in the Forest Plan? Probably more than half of these should go, with roadways for administrative access where necessary.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Q-102 & Q-103. Is an increase in permitted roadways needed for these small units with cultural sites?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 Especially to be praised is treatment of the northernmost part of the Forest (MA S-114 and R-112) and also closures west of San Pedro Parks (E-33). Actual closure of all those logging roads in MA A-4 and A-5, as proposed, would be great!

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

10 Holding Caones (MA L-84) at near-zero and closing many routes on the two adjacent mesas (A-5) is important.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1056
Comment#

11 Most of the District including most of Jarosa (MA A-5) and Cecilia (A-6) are left with many too many open roadways. Although the excuse of access to inholdings has been offered, that is not correct; the inholdings are to the east and north and access to them is from east and north, not through A-5 and A-6. In the west half of T22N R3E there are no relevant inholdings, yet a complex of roads is proposed for retention even though some are closely parallel. MA A-5 and A-6 should be carefully re-examined and road densities cut at least to 1.5 miles/sq. mile. A small number of "ways" open to permittees would meet most of these areas' motorized needs

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

11 French Mesa (MA A-7). Much the same comments as in #4; not every one of those canyons and mesas needs a roadway.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

12 Mesa Poleo (E-32). This area is designated for recreation and there are many inholdings, but even so a road density of 3.5 miles/sq. mile (as allowed in a proposed Forest Plan amendment) seems excessive. Not all of the existing roadways are used for access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

13 But these specific comments are not meant to detract from out main point: the Forest is to be congratulated and by and large we support the Proposal.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

Letter# 1057
Comment#

1 Changing the road numbers causes confusion. Prior writen books, maps, and documents refer to the numbers that have been used for years. People know the roads by the old numbers which are the numbers on the carsonite markers. In some cases the numbers are on aluminum tags on the trees. The database should be corrected to match the numbers on the ground and previous forest service maps, not the other way around. Changing the numbers will also make it harder for people trying to follow the ruls and stay on the right roads.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Peggy Mesa: This section should be open to all vehicles. It is not a high speed road, it does not have any traffic, it is used more than 653 and it completes a loop.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 558T. This section should be open to all vehicles. It is in good condition and is the main continuation of 553-558S which are more primative roads. This route is also an alternative route to radio toweres on Pajarito Peak, therefore it makes sense to provide service whhicles with the better route.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The section shown below in read is overgrown and no longer connects. ATVs have tried to push a road through the sections shown in brown. Parts of this were open, other parts have deadfall. Parts of this segment are being used as single track. This section should not be open to motorized vehicles. See photos below. The section shown in purple is currently being used and is sustainable. It should be used instead.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1057
Comment#

5 I personally would prefer the connection between 553 and 558S were not opened to motorized use, but realize it is important to complete the loop, so will concede that one. I feel the road should stop at the pass and the north-south segment of 558S should be closed. It has only come back into use in the last few years. I realized that deadfall can be cut out and that theste were once roads. I feel that because they have overgrown and reverted back, they should be left that way. Other roads have now become single tracks. Turning them back into roads, destroys their value as single track. There are lots of roads that are in good condition and have been 'maintained' that are being closed that coulb be left open instead.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1058
Comment#

1 608. The old road is shown in the PA in red is now a meadow and no longer exists. The current road is shown in magenta.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 since the dispersed camping has been eliminated along 606, the road shown in magenta (former 608I) would be a good candidate for dispersed camping. This is important to have a good place to camp in the center of the mesa for people mountain biking or backpacking the Grand Loop of the Mesas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1059
Comment#

1 the road segment shown as 605 in the PA (shown in red on the right) is not a 605 but an old road that is no longer used. The segment in magenta is the correct location for 605 which is the route that should be used and not the red segment.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1060
Comment#

1 611-611GA. These roads do not connect. See the red segment below. There is a ledge in between them. The road shown in magenta is a good way to connect them

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 These connections cannot presently be made as parts of these roads do not exist. The connection shown in read does not exist nor were roads there in the past. The roads shown in magenta do exist and are currently being used.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

3 539J is in the bottom of McMillian Canyon and is susceptible to erosion. This road has only been reopened in the last few years.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

4 532 dies bit cibbect ti 535

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1060
Comment#

5 Part of the segment shown in green on the left side of the map is almost like a bog when it is wet. This section is not currently being used by motorized vehicles and should stay that way. The part of 532 shown in green is currently used as a single track and should not be opened to motorized use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1061
Comment#

1 I prefer wilderness camping secluded from other campers, away from other peoples, loud music, gun fire, barking dogs, and screaming kids.

Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1062
Comment#

1 I am in support of Dawn Fischer's proposal, dated Aug. 18, 2008.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I also support Sen. Phil Griegos proposal concerning The Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Please increase the amount of roads availavle for camping

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Please read their words with an Open Heart. This land is our Heritage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1063
Comment#

1 461 2F Road between 461 and Wilderness bdry, must be left open for fence maintenance and salting hunting, rec. suggest open for ATV use only.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 Road between 103 and 103F must be left open for all vehicles. Road is used by all Forest users. It is a very important road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1064
Comment#

1 His property is located at T25N, R1E section 25. Spurs of 315B adjacent to his property on east and west side are OK to close.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 FR318G Must remain open to access his property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1064
Comment#

3 Concerns about game harrassment by motor cycles and ATV's in the area of 315B. This area is common with some proposed motor cycle routes.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1065
Comment#

1 Sharon Colby called representing Brother Christian from the Church of the Desert Monastery in the Chama River Canyon. Their concerns were whether access would remain for them.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

2 She also expressed concerns about an "unsafe" portion of FR151 above Big Eddie. This section is very narrrow along a very steep hissslope. The road is basically a two-track with little or no opportunity for turn-out. Sevral blind corners. I mentioned that I share her concerns for that segment of road: however, that work is beyond the scope of this project.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1066
Comment#

1 Mr. Newcomb called with concerns that we plan to close the only access to his property in Miller Estates. The Road is a non-system road #cff-99, shown on proposed action map # as proposed for closure. He would like to see the road remain open for his and his neighbors use to access their private land.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1067
Comment#

1 The current proposal for OHV trails in the Jemez mountains is too restrictive and closes man trails that have historically been traveled and maintained by the OHV community.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The remaining trails do not offer different skill levels that could be completed in a single loop

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 If the current proposal is adopted there will be overcrowding on the few trails remaining.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I would request that the single track trails defined in the Blackfeather proposal be included for analysis in the scoping study.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 OHV use has always been a less damaging to the environment that other forest uses such as mining and logging.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1067
Comment#

6 More than half of the Santa Fe National Forest is closed to OHV use; therefore it is reasonable that the rest of the forest should be considered for opening to responsible trail riding.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1068
Comment#

1 Are the user-created trails that were submited included withing the TAP database (appened matrix)? Satatements on page 3 and 13 talk about the trails (as opposed to roads) but it is unclear as to whethere the TAP only includes system roads and trails or also includes the user-created segments that were submitted

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

2 Will there be a detailed map available that shows the location of the corresponding route segments with the attached matrix?

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The pertinent information is only partially available to the public without the maps.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Without knowing which segments are which, it is not possible for the public to read and understand the supplied TAP documentation. A detailed map showing all the tagged segments is the 'Rosetta Stone' that allows meaningful public participation.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1069
Comment#

1 Analysis of cost and manpower required to monitor/enforce/manage the proposed restrictions.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Penalties that will be imposed and how this action will be carried out. Thruth behind this statement should be investigated.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Who will be entitle to "special" permits? Why and at what cost?

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

4 Put these people on horseback, with bikes, or on foot and set an example.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 1069
Comment#

5 Permitting process at a cost for "special" permits or free if just for motoring on designated roads. Monitoring in additions to the " permit" process will help to manage/track the number of people using the area, and fees could be a source of funds to support SFNF management and administrative functions. When people have to stop/call-in for a permit, reminder can be given of regulations/policies (guns, off-road, campfires etc) which can help with the education process. Restricting areas temporarily to a limited number of people by the permit process might help mitigate damage to sensitive areas.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1071
Comment#

1 I am writing to express support for Sen. Grieog's Alternative proposal for Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 FR326 WAFR 326PE: excluding the two roads and not featuring them on the map respect the rural traditional culture by providing a buffer or protection zone limiting the area from cross country travel

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 This along with public access to camping in designated areas strikes that balance between the natural tradition and the need to provide public access now and in the future.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1072
Comment#

1 I support Senator Griego's alternative proposal on TMR.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1073
Comment#

1 I support Senator Griego's alternative proposal.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I would like less roads and less ATV and OHV usage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1074
Comment#

1 I support the Alternative Proposal for the Travel Management role as well as the most strict regulations for OHVS, ATVs, etc.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Unfortunately the unregulated use of recreational vehicles impair the enjoyment of all other users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 1075
Comment#

1 Glorieta Mesa: I feel that the area needs less ATV trails.roads rather than more.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 The vehicles are destructive to the land, horseback riders, hikers and themselves. How doul an ambulance get up there to attend to an accident which happens frequently with these vehicles?
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1076
Comment#

1 I strongly support the Alternative Proposal for the Travel Management Rule proposed for Glorieta Mesa by Senator Griego.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 motorized vehicles present a clear danager of importive noxious and invasive weeds which can endager rangeland health and destrou traditional use. Disturbed earth created by ORVs present the prime opportunity for such invasions which monitoring will allow at least rapid attemps at control.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1077
Comment#

1 I'm writing mostly in support about the proposed action for managing motorized travel in New Mexico.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 According to the travel management proposed action map, an area between Dalton and Macho Canyon may be seasonally open to all vehicles (passenger cars, jeeps, ATVs, and motorcycles) including driving up to 300 feet off road for dispersed camping. My concern with seasonally open trail is the ease with which a person can travel beyond the designated area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 I would recommend designated the Willow Davis and Elk Mountain area as open to all vehicles and dispersed camping.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1078
Comment#

0 Duplicate of 372
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1079
Comment#

Letter# 1079
Comment#

1 EMNRD joins with the NMDGF to stress the importance of adopting actions to minimize impacts to wildlife and their habitats, safeguard environmentally sensitive areas, and allow only those activities that are compatible with these interests.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 I strongly support the Alternative Proposal for the Travel Management Rule proposed for Glorieta Mesa by Senator Griego.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Motorized vehicles present a dear danger of importive noxious and invasive weeds, which can endanger rangeland health and destroy traditional uses. Disturbed earth created by ORVs prsent the prime opportunity of such invasions, which monitoring will allow at least rapid attempts at control

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Alternatives should also be consistent with the Statewide NM Forest and Watershed Health Plan, to which the USFS Region 3 is a signer.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Like NMDGF, EMNRD recommends that each zone and particular area be examined and specifically evaluated. The unique characteristic of each zone and factors like, inventoried roadless areas, traditional use petterns; disruption of livelihood of ranchers, farmers, and permit users; other non-motorized uses' historical cultural patters of use' private property owners; increased fire potential; and enforcement capability- must also be speciffically considered.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1080
Comment#

1 I completely agree with the Proposed Action. Only main roads and trails should remain open to the public

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 There should be increased Law Enforcement presence and these Law Enfrocement Officers should take action against those that are destroyed federal lands and property.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 Private land owners and permittees should not be harassed for going to their property or for checking on their livestock. Private land owners should be able to access their private property within Forest Lands thru roads that lead to their private lands. There should be on public access to their private land. Permittees should be allowed to travel all main road and trails as well as all other roads and trails for maintenance of livestock and improvements and or emergency purposes.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 The propose action for camping is a great way to limit the destruction of cross-country travel. 150-300 foot access or corridors is plenty for those camping.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1080
Comment#

5 Big game retrieval by motorized vehicle should be prohibited except for those with disabilities. If game is killed off road then it should be packed out.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1081
Comment#

1 635 off County Rd A005. I as a concerned property owner, am opposed to opening up the entrance through private property gate to the public. For years the entrance to the FS land has been through the county road. Allowing the public to use this road will create all kinds of vandalism

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1082
Comment#

1 Enough land is dedicated to motorized vehicles - please protect the wilderness. It provides balance for the rest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1083
Comment#

1 I oppose the use of motorcycles (even registered and licensed), ATVS/OHVs on the Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 The users of these vehicles will traverse wherever they wish and therein lies the problem. Irrespect for the land and wild game have eroded my belief that these types of vehicles have a place on the forest, and therefor I object to allow them access to the Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1084
Comment#

1 I am writing to express two serious concerns regarding the decisions and directions the Santa Fe National Forest staff is taking regarding the Proposed Action map and implementation of the Travel Management Rule. Those concerns are 1) decimation of traditional loop systems and 2) increased risk of incidents involving vehicular (car/truck) traffic with motorcycle riders on main forest roads.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I am writing to express two serious concerns regarding the decisions and directions the Santa Fe National Forest staff is taking regarding the Proposed Action map and implementation of the Travel Management Rule. Those concerns are 1) decimation of traditional loop systems and 2) increased risk of incidents involving vehicular (car/truck) traffic with motorcycle riders on main forest roads.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 To date I have met only one Forest Service employee that appears to have reasonable motorcycle experience and generally, all other appear to have no idea at all how a motorcycle performs on crowned, off camber, twisty, gravel covered dirt roads.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1084
Comment#

4 I firmly believe consideration should be given to keeping motorcycles on single track trails and off main roads whenever and wherever possible

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1085
Comment#

1 The Jemez Mountain region administered by the Jemez Ranger District has, in the last several years suffered extensive abuse from off road machines.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Traditional travel thorough the Jemez is via a series of connecting trails. Few of these trails are mapped by the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 The proposed actin does put forth a plan to protect heritage resources in Bland Canyon and will reduce conflice between off-roaders and residents of the Bland historic community. It does protect the Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout populations in Medio Dia Canyon and Peralta Canyon.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

4 Proposed motorized use of that area will continue to damage habitat, historic places and traditional trael in the area above Bland, Forest Trail 113, and the Jemez National Recreational Area. Off Road vehicles on or near FT 113 will continue the conflicts and continue the destruction of the ancient trail system. I do wish to emphasize that Forest Road 113 must be protedted. It is very clear that this trail existed long before motorized traffic.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The off roaders have cut trails with chainsaws, wire cutters, winches and shovels. They have opened closed roads and drove off road to develop their doads and loops. These off road vehicle trails do exist illegally.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 Another issue is one of closure during the winter months. Your schedule does not allow for trails to recover. It impacts the timing of runoff when the trails are still covered with ice and snow.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 I have many issues with the way the NFS personnel have handled the issue in the past by allowing illegal opening of trails. We do appreciate the attention every one is receiving now. We do feel there is an equitable system whereby all citizens are treated fairly.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 The Santa Fe National Forest has released its proposed action officially on July 7, 2008. According to the SFNF, concerned citizens have 45 days to submit written comments on the Proposed Action, In order to continue to effect the travel rule, written comment must be submitted before August 21, 2008.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

10 The SFNF proposed action sacrifices high mountain areas to heavey motorized use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

11 Further removeal of motorized routes in the Jemez Mountain Salamander Conservation Area are required. This includes removing the off road trails at Cochiti Mesa, Paliza Canyon and Peralta Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 7 motorized loop trails are proposed in the area bordered on the north by s=State Route 4, on the south by Bland Canyon, on the west by Bearhead Ridge, and on the East by Medio Dia Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 Does the Forest Service think we won't care that off roaders cut trail here illegally? Stop rewarding lawbreakers with illegally constructed trails.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 Access to these loops is provided by Forest Road 282, literally, a short road along Bearhead Ridge that hits occupied Jemez Mountain Salamander Habitat. Remove all 7 motorized loops within the described area. Remoe Forest Road 282 from the proposed action, and thus save our salamander.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

15 Remove all of FT113 from all motorized use. No rational reason exists for promoting illegal motorized use. This area is habitat for the Jemez Mountain Salamander and the Mexican Spotted Owl. The Forest Service will argue that they are merely allowing current recreational use. This area was designated as prohibited to motorized use for fragile wildlife, let motorcross find another track to get their thrills on, Remove all of FT 113 from all motorized use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

16 The truth is that the Forest Service is rewarding lawbreakers with motorized access that flies in the face of the current law

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

17 The Proposed action islands motorless use. No thought has gone into the preservation of the traditional trail system for foot and hoof traffic. In fact, two different Forest Officials have stated that hikers and equestrians have their little islands-those areas hardest hit by climate change, fire and bark beetle devation. According to 2004 statistics, motorized use accounts for less than 5% of all SFNF users. Why then, is this 5% allowed to destroy the freedom of travel for the remaining 95%.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

18 According to 2004 statistics, motorized use accounts for less thatn 5% of all SFNF users. Why then, is this 5% allowed to destroy the freedom of travel for the remaining 95%.?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

19 Return to a functioning and connected trail system for motorless traffic. The basis for this trail system are the routes in use long before the creation of the National Forest Service. Bearhead Ridge, Bruce Ridge, Medio Dia, Del Norte, FT 113 are all part of this system, providien access for people to photograth, to paint, to backpack and to bird watch. After all, this wy 95% of all forest visitation happens.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

20 The proposed action leaves Forest Roads open too late into the year and opens them too early in the year Return to the traditional closing date of late December before the holidays. Open roads on the 1st of May, when they are safe to traverse.

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

21 On the positive side; The proposed action does a good job of protecting ancient and historic sites in Bland Canyon, It reduces conflict with Bland residents and off roaders, and will further protect FT 424 from illegal dirt bike use. Tell them that they did a good job here.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

22 However, the plan fails to protect the Mexican Spotted Owl habitat, and the Jemez Mountain Salamander Habitat. It fils to completely remove all motorized trails in areas designated as prohibiting cross country travel and contineues to destroy our aged and historic trail system.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

23 the issue of access to private land on top of Horn Mesa can be met without opening this route to regular traffic. The sensible alternative is to end public access at the private proerty in Bland Canyon just above the Cemetary Road, FR268D. FR268DD winds it way across private land before re-entering the National Forest. Mapping of this route will inevitably reignite trespass issues. No present conflict exists between area land owners, and access to the Albermarle group is open to qualified individuals without any need to designate the road as a public motorized route. The cemetary road, 268D, provides access to the whole of West Mesa without conflict issues. Removed 268DD from the proposed action.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

24 The greatest failing of travel management is the omission of motorless traffic from the plan. It is understood that Travel Management focuses on motorized travel, and that motorless travel is not on the agenda. However, motorless travel is the historic method for traversing the Jemez Mountains, and it continues to be an important and viable method of travel. The ethic of multi-use demands that the travel plan include at least a cursory knowledge and allowance for motorless traffic.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

25 The convenient motorized-only focus marginalizes other use, and provides an excuse for ignoring impact on quiet forest users.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

26 This process leaves the erroneous impression that only motorized users require cross country routes in the National Forest. Thus the ridiculous assumption that isolated islands free of motorized vehicles are all that are required to address the needs of motorless use.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

27 Adequate cross country travel can easily be demarcated by simply restoring to motorless travel the ancient routes traditionally serving as arteries. These arteries include; FTl13, the Bland-Frijoles trail, the Bland-Bruce Place trail, Bruce Place to Evans-Griffm Trail, Frazier Canyon,Bruce Ridge, Bear Springs, and Medio Dia-Del Norte. Simply including these routes as those reserved for motorless travel will aid all future planning and designations. It will be a great boon in the reduction of conflict, and it will return the Jemez to her historic place as a destination for those tourists who wish to backpack, hike, birdwatch, or simply travel across the back country without fear of conflict with speeding vehicles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1086

Comment#

1 As residents of this community, we feel that off highway vehicles are a legitimate use of the national forest system, especially for the use of the forest resources which we depend on for our livelihood.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 We as residents have been using the forest for hunting, fishing, collecting firewood, recreation and grazing of our cattle for generations. It is very important to us that we continue to use its resources in this way, in implementing restrictions and closing forest roads will greatly limit our access to the resources that we so desperately rely

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Regarding the proposed seasonally open dates (in reference to Map #7-), the proposed action for Mesa Alta, closure of roads would also affect the hunting in the early spring. Turkey hunting is a sport that a lot of the residents in our community enjoy, so it is important to keep them open in early spring for acccss to hunting areas.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1086
Comment#

4 Roads to be left open:
Rd. # 64- La Jara spring (up to 64 gravel rd. Mesa Alta) Need access to Hunting, fuelwood.
Rd. # 85A- need open for hunting, fuelwood, recreation, (family gatherings1 reunions)
Rd. # 8ZH- open for ATV-Hunting
Rd. # 169 F-need open for huntinglfuelwood
Rd. # 666 Across Chavez tank -need open for family reunions/camping/recreation
Rd. # 11G- need open for HuntingRecreation
Rd. # 666 -Junction 8 and 1 1 Mesa del Medio-need open for fuelwoodlhunting
Rd. # 666 -Corrales tank at la cueva Junction-open for fuelwoodlhunting
Rd. # 8UA- ATV use for HuntingRecreation
Rd. # 666 -Vegita escondida-open for hunting1 recreatiodfuelwood
Rd. # 8 P- ATV HuntingRecreation
Rd. # 9M & 9MAC I for ATVIHunting
Rd. # 8A- ATV access for Huntinglfuelwood -Tableta
Rd # 75A -ATV access for recreatiodHunting
Rd. # 7 1A- Traditional Use for Recreation-(Historical use) Gallina canyon
Rd. # 11-0 -ATV use -Vegitas area- need open for HuntingIGuiding
Rd. # 11 OB- ATV access for HuntingIGuiding
Rd. # 1- 1 1 -A -ATV access for Hunting
Rd. # 1 - 1 1 -B -ATV access for HuntingIGuiding -presently closed REOPEN
Rd. # 1- 1 1 - ATV access for HuntingIGuiding
Rd. # 1 99-D -ATV access for HuntingJGuiding -closed- to REOPEN
Rd. # 1-7 1 -D- HuntingJGuiding (loop road)
Rd. # 161 AB- need open for fuelwood, wood products, Hunting- (Drill Hole)
Rd. # 64 AL- Mesa Alta for Hunting 1 Guiding
Map # 7
Seasonally Open Dates-
Proposed to close from Rd. 770 - to 77 Bl
Need to be open early spring:
Rd. # 468- Mesa Camino Rd.
Rd. # 463, # 469. #464F, 77B1,91, and 93 JA
Above roads need to stay open for early spring turkey hunts. (Mesa Alta)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

4 It is the consensus of the community of Gallina, that we need the designated roads open for our use. A list of these roads are on the comment forms provided to us from the Santa Fe National Forest.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1087
Comment#

Letter# 1087
Comment#

1 To whom it may concern: I respectfully request that consideration be granted to hunters that use the forest for hunting and need to retrieve big game. I believe that it should be acceptable for a hunting vehicle to travel within 300 yards of the "open route" (as published in the proposed route designation map forthcoming) on all the forest where practical to do so. It is very hard to load some game animals due to their physical size and weight and using a tree for a lifting hoist location to back under is very helpful. Please include this clause in the alternatives. Thank you.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1088
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Cover email for the WildEarth Guardians proposal.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1089
Comment#

1 As the CEO of the North American Trials Council, Inc. (NATC) it is my opinion that the FS has wrongfully ignored input from the New Mexico Trials Assn. (NMTA) which has requested several areas be dedicated exclusively to the sport of observed motorcycle trials within the SFNF.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 As the CEO of the North American Trials Council, Inc. (NATC) it is my opinion that the FS has wrongfully ignored input from the New Mexico Trials Assn. (NMTA) which has requested several areas be dedicated exclusively to the sport of observed motorcycle trials within the SFNF.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 My concern is that the FS has not taken the time to understand the neglible impact that this sport has on the environment. Has the FS taken the time to distinguish between motorcycle event types like enduros, motocross, hare scrambles or observed motorcycle trials? Does the FS distinguish between motorcycles and ATVs?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I see no evidence of any due consideration of NMTA's requests and am convinced that lumping all ohv users into one area is not very smart and will have the worst impact on the environment

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1090
Comment#

1 I am extremely concerned about the Santa Fe National Forest's (SFNF) Travel Plan and the process it used to formulate the Proposed Action.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 1. The Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly estimated environtmental imacts especially as it relates to the requets for trials "areas" made by the New Mexico Trails Assn.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 1090
Comment#

3 2. The SFNF must develop a true range of Alternatives respectful to organizations like NMTA that have utilized the special use permit process for years.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 The proposed action discriminates against law-abiding organizations like NMTA and reqards those who only speculate about environmental impacts.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1091
Comment#

1 As an avid OHV enthusiast I am extremely concerned about the Santa Fe National Forest's (SFNF) Travel Plan and the process it used to formulate the Proposed Action.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I find that your preliminary decisions to limit NMTA to only one riding area shows blatant discrimination towards an organization that has abided by FS rules for decades and has never left any kind of environmental impact from any of the many events and the countless thousands of hours of use by members practicing in the forests.
Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 In the past few years, NMTA has been denied special use permits due to alleged salamander habitat concerns, where the FS has apparently relied on un-verified information from certain environmentalist groups' maps alleging "salamander habitat, yet these maps are based on speculation only--no proven actual salamanders have been found in the areas requested by NMTA.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1092
Comment#

0 Form letter. Analyzed previously
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1093
Comment#

1 I strongly support the proposed closures of unsustainable OHV trails and routhes.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 OHV's have a disproportionately negative impact on the landscape compared to other user gourps, and should be restricted accordingly.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 The argument that more OHV sales should mean more OHV access is fundamentally flawed, and is unfair to Americans who enjoy less damaging forms of National Forest recreation.
Public Concern # 25 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1094
Comment#

Letter# 1094
Comment#
0 Form letter. Analyzed previously
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1095
Comment#
0 Form letter. Analyzed previously
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1096
Comment#
0 Form letter. Analyzed previously
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1097
Comment#
1 concerns that we plan to close the only access to his property in Miller Estates. The Road is a non-system road #cff-99, shown on proposed Action Map # as proposed for closure he would like to see the road remain open for his and his neighbors use to access their private land.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1098
Comment#
0 duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1099
Comment#
1 I assured her that FR151 will remain open, is not proposed to be closed.
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1100
Comment#
1 You have eliminated all access routes to non highway legal vehicles.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 You should leave all roads on Glorieta Mesa open to all types of vehicles including ATV's and dirtbikes.
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The dispersed camping area on Glorieta Mesa should be expanded to include all of the open roads on Glorieta Mesa.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1100
Comment#

4 By confining them to small area, you will change thri recreational experience that they are on the Mesa to get.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 By closing off roads that lead to private land you are denying the gerneral publi to legitimate access to public land where roads already exist.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 FR 123 - this road should be open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles. FR 123 and 123a should have a deispersed camping buffer the entire lingth. This is a heavily used area for dispersed camping buffer and all vehicles, not just highway legal ones the entire length. FR 79 should be open to all vehicles, not just for highway legal vehicles. Also, there are two miles of road that go from the trailhead at FR79 to private land. This should be opened up to the public and used as exclusive use land for the landowner.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

7 Glorieta Mesa Area - All roads should be left open to all vehicles, not just highway legal vehicles including: 326, 326pga, 32626pe, 326wa, 326 w, 326u, 326v, 612d, 612, 87, 87j, 326jd, 326ad, 326a, 326ak, 327n,326j,326ea, 326eb, 326ad, 326ej, 124de, 124h, 124hf, 325m, 324hh, 594, 324, 325kd, 325k, 325kd, 325k 525f, 124w, 330, 330g, 324hf, 325, 330f, 330e. A trail, that is not named or on your map that James Munos is well aware of and should be placed into consideration for being open to single track users.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1101
Comment#

1 Is the Santa Fe National Forest continuing to accept user provided routes?
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1102
Comment#

1 Please allow decent access for the those that are mobility impaired with mobility devices off trails for hunting and game retrieval.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 (Then why can't there be incorporation of the same idea--into a paid permit system would for the disabled to access off of the trail to hnt and for game retrieval.)
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1103
Comment#

0 Not a commnet. Correspondence
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1104
Comment#

Letter# 1104
Comment#
0 Duplicate
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1105
Comment#
0 Not a comment/ Support document for comments
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1106
Comment#
1 FR36 to FR289 to Hwy 4 are designated year-round b/c this is how him & neighbors get out to Los Alamos. *John sopported designation of Highway legal vehicles only.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1107
Comment#
1 The road segment at the south end of 605 shown in brown on the right, should be closed and 608G shown in magenta left in service instead. This segment of 605 was bermed and closed years ago. It is only used occassionally, by those willing to go over or around the berms. Part of this road segment is very sandy. The south end was not connected through to 608 until last year. 608G is a very good road. Part of it has been treated with crushed roack. Part of it is bedrock (tuft).
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1108
Comment#
1 17 is currently closed between 20 and 20I. It has several ponds behind berms. The upper part of 17 is currently being used primarily by ATV's. 17 gets very muddy when wet. It has some steep narrow sections. I would prefer to see this road continue to be closed, but if not, it may be best that it only be used for ATV's and motorcycles.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1109
Comment#
1 I realize the handicaps in developing and effecting a plan that allows some areas open to off-road vehicles while at the same time attempting to preserve the environment and the native species.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I have seen some of the devastation as a result of ORVs, careless campers and increasingly groups that seem to have little or no regard for OUR forest lands.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1109
Comment#

3 The forest service has been doing an excellent job and I hope continue to enfoce those regulations that promoste the environment and at the same time make our national resources available to all

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

Letter# 1110
Comment#

1 The trail system in the north Jemez is going to be effectively useless because all the entry routes have been closed. Why did you close off all access from the highway to FR31 and FR 19? Why did you close off access to FR 100 near Youngsville? Why did you close off access to FR 316 from the highway? Why did you close off access from state road 4 to FS 289 and FR268? Why did you close off access to these same roads from the cochiti lake entrance? I wish you would reconsider opening these routes to allow access to the trailheads that I have used for years. At the very least can you respong as to why they are proposed to be closed?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1111
Comment#

1 Mushroom Basin, Thompson Ridge, take no action please!

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1113
Comment#

1 The Department continues to be concerned with the Forest Service's ability to enforce a "closed unlesssigned open" status for the Santa Fe and other New Mexico National Forests. We urge the SFNF toinstall open motorized road and trail signs as a result of this process, and to continue to seek additional funding to maintain signage, add additional law enforcement personnel (which will likely need to include ATV-or motorcycle-mounted patrols to apprehend violators), increase funding for educational outreach to the public, and seek additional funding to begin implementing physical road and trail closures for those roads and trails that do not become part of the system.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

2 Constructionofphysicalbarriersand enforcement ofclosures implemented through the Travel Management process will facilitate natural restoration of ecologically damaged roads and trails caused by excessive motorized use

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 The Department requests that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement(DEIS) discuss what the proposed disposition of these roads are relative to theProposed Action and DEIS alternatives yet to bedeveloped. For example, are all ofthese roads being permanently removed from further consideration?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 We also request that the analyses of the potential for wildlife disturbance and wildlife habitat degradation be split out between the East and West sides of the SFNF, to be able to determine where the majority of these adverse effects are occurring.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Becauseoftheecologicaldamagethatisoccurringfromthese roads, the Department recommends that they be closed topublic motorized use without further consideration of reopening inany ofthe DEIS alternatives, unless they are required for administrative purposes (e.g., Pipeline Road on West Side) oras the only access route toprivate lands.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 The PA discussion of motorized trails does not attempt to quantify miles of unauthorized or user-created motorized trails and states that the SFNFdoes not have a complete inventory of these trails,although user groups provided digital data on 291 miles of trails that they ride that are not already a part of SFNFsystem. Because apparently a similar analysis of trails that are causing wildlife harassment and significant disruption of and damage to wildlife habitats has not been conducted, the Department requests that the DEIS analyze impacts of motorized trails in the same manner as done for roads as stated above. We also request that a separate analysis be conducted for motorized trails for the East and Westsides ofthe SFNF, to enable us to determine where significant adverse effects to wildlife and wildlife habitats may be occurring.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Page 30of the Travel Analysis Process Report identifies 198 perennial and 1,726 intennittent orephemeral stream crossings by roads. On the SFNF and elsewhere in New Mexico, the Department is concerned about degradation of aquatic and riparian habitats because they are essential for the survival of a majority of wild life species of New Mexico. The quantity and quality ofthese habitats state-wide have been significantly diminished. Ofthe 867 species of vertebrates known tooccur inthe state, approximately 479 (55%) rely wholly,or in part, on aquatic, wet land or riparian habitat for their survival (Biota Information System of New Mexico (BISON-M) database Version 2.5, 1994). A majority of the 96 species that are imperiled (i.e., listed by the state as endangered or threatened), are associated with these habitats (51 species, or53% of the total). Almost half of the native fishes of New Mexico are either extinct or endangered. Therefore, theDepartment requests that the DEIS identify how many proposed motorized road and trailcrossings occur and where they are located by alternative, so that we may better estimate possible effects to important riparian and aquatic habitats and Species of Greatest Conservation Need,as identified in our CWCS.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Because ofthe potential adverse effects to wildlife from loss ofeffective habitat and habitat degradation from motorized use oftrails as well as roads, the Department requests that motorized trails be factored into the calculations for road density standards as identified in the SFNF Forest Plan (see further discussion ofloss of effective habitat in West Side comments below). We believe not doing so fundamentally underestimates adverse effect towildlife, and precludes the ability toestimate effects ofoff-road motorized use on elk, mule deer, black bears, turkey,and other wildlife. We further request that motorized road and trail density standards replace road (only) density standards in the upcoming SFNF Forest Plan rewrite.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 Ingeneral, the Department is pleased with the proposed minimum motorized system for the East Side, and believes that the PA, if implemented, will minimize adverse effects towildlife and important wildlife habitats from motorized vehicle use.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

10 Within the Osha Creek drainage south of Elk Mountain, FR 92, 92P and associated spurs are parallel travel routes that appear to be redundant. Multiple loops are formed by these routes as proposed. Loop roads are particularly difficult forconducting effective wildlife law enforcement activities. We therefore request that this network ofroads be reduced.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 FR635, which is mostly on private lands northeast of Morphy Lake,appears to cross Santiago Creek numerous times. Santiago Creek is occupied by Rio Grande cutthroat trout (Oncorynchus clarki virginalis)(RGCT), and approximately 4.8 kilometers of the creek have been identified in the Long Range Plan for the Management of Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout in New Mexico (NMDGF 2002) as a Reserve Conservation Population. This population should be protected from habitat disturbance and degradation. Current use of th is travel route appears to be primarily by private land owners. Increased motorized use and sedimentation may lead toa decline in RGCT habitat. The Department recommends that this route be designated for administrative use only, with motorized access provided to private landowners as needed. Additionally, it is our understanding that the SFNF purchased a parcel of land east of Gascon Point to be used as an access point for non-motorized recreation. A trail head was to be developed in the Rito Garcia drainage in conjunction with this purchase. Currently, motorized vehicles (primarily ATV's) are illegally accessing land near or within the boundaries of the Pecos Wilderness in this area. Identifying FR 635 and associated spurs as open topublic motorized vehicle access will likely increase illegal use inthis area, creating increased cumulative effects tothe Rio Grande cutthroat trout population in Santiago Creek.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 FR 79 to Canada de los Alamos and many roads on the west end of Glorieta Mesa are proposed to be open only to vehicles legal on paved roads. These are mostly unimproved dirt roads. If the intent is to close these roads to ORVs under 50 inches in width("dirt"bike motorcycles and ATVs),it is not clear that the state will be able to assist with enforcement. By state law, an OHV, if registered properly and operated by persons either over 18 years of age or supervised by an adult,can travel on public non-paved roads and trails open to other motorized vehicles. Please discuss the intent of this designation in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

14 The Department has stated in our previous comments tothe SFNF on Travel Management that we do not support further road building, and by inference, no motorized access within Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs). The Department appreciates the SFNF excluding most motorized trails from IRAs on the West Side. IRAs offer the highest quality hunting opportunities outside ofdesignated Wilderness Areas, as discussed inour report Wildlife, Habitat and Hunting: New Mexico's Roadless Areas (seeweblinkabove),whichwassubmitted insupportoftheMay2006 Petition of Governor Bill Richardson for State Specific Rulemaking to Protect Roadless Areas In New Mexico (Petition).

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 Because of the similar adverse effects of less that 50 inch width ORV use on motorized trails (as compared to roads) that can cause wildlife disturbance and habitat degradation, it is the Department's position that authorizing motorized trails within IRAs undermines the spirit and intent of the initial U.S. Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation Rule of 2000, and the desires of Governor Richardson and the State of New Mexico to protect these areas as identified in the Petition.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 Therefore, we strongly request that Trail 105 through the Polvadera IRA not be authorized for motorized use. Precluding this trail from motorized use will greatly increase the potential for quality hunting, maintaining intact wildlife habitat, and solitude experiences within this IRA.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

17 Therefore, because of the extensive network of motorized trails that are proposed for authorization in the PA, and the potential for wildlife disturbance and wildlife habitat degradation from ATV and motorcycle use of trails, the Department requests that the DEIS analyze the potential for disturbance to wildlife and wildlife habitats from OHV use of trails as well as roads.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 The Department requests that the selection of motorized trails focus on trails that closely parallel existing Forest roads authorized for use by OHVs over 50 inches (cars and trucks) to concentrate noise and visual disturbance impacts across the landscape. We further request that the SFNF deemphasize selection of motorized trails that occu rin more isolated, higher quality habitats, to minimize disturbance to wildlife.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

19 The Department also requests that a traffic volume analysis be conducted within the DEIS to estimate the quantity and distribution of motorcycles, ATVs and full-sized OHVs that use the SFNF on both roads, trails and in areas, including analysis of user trends,with separate analyses for theEast and West sides. We believe that this level of quantitative analysis will be necessary to determine the magnitude of direct, indirect and cumulative effects of implementing theTravel Management action for both sides of the SFNF,particularly relative to the concentration of traffic on fewer motorized roads and trails as compared with current conditions.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

20 Perryand Overly(1977;in Heffelfinger et al. 2006)found motorized vehicle use through meadow habitats reduced deer use, whereas motorized use through forested habitat had less effects on deer use. On the West Side, apparently many meadows habitats such as at the Evans-Griffin Place are proposed to continue to have motorized access through them. The meadow at Evans-Griffin likely would support elk caving in the absence ofmotorized use. We are concerned that the authorization ofmotorized trails through meadow habitats outside ofthe Valles Caldera National Preserve not restrict the capacity of these meadows to support ungulate reproduction.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

21 Therefore,theDepartmentrequeststhat the DEIS contain an analysis of the cumulative effects of motorized access for each alternative to meadow habitats.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

22 The alternatives could consider extended seasonal closures for certain motorized trails and roads to protect the elkcalving period of 15 May to 15 June.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

23 To estimate lost effective habitat to elk and mule deer from motorized use of roads and trails, we conducted a buffering exercise using GIS. Using SFNF data from Map 9 Proposed Open and Closed Routes West Side, we buffered 200 meters outward from centerline of each road and trail proposed for motorized use in the PA. An area analysis was also conducted using GIS. Assuming a 200 meter avoidance zone around each motorized road and trail, we estimate a loss of 264,317 acres of effective habitat for the West Side. This analysis and an assumption of the associated volume of motorized use occurring on these motorized routes indicates that a high degree of habitat fragmentation and loss of effective habitat is occurring outside of the Valles Caldera National Preserve (VCNP), and San Pedro Parks and Chama River Canyon Wildernesses. The density of motorized roads and trails proposed in the PA creates small island patches of habitat between motorized routes that are likely not suitable for maintaining resident large game animals such as elk, mule deer and black bears. The Department seeks to increase quality big game hunting opportunities outside of VCNP and both Wilderness areas, to meet local landowner, stakeholder and sportsmen desires. Therefore, we believe that additional motorized road and trail reductions are necessary for the West Side tomeet this goal

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

24 We submit this map for your review,and request that a similar analysis be conducted in the DEIS for each alternative. Please compare your alternatives analyses with our recommended motorized road and trail densities within big game habitat of less than 1.0 miles per square mile for elk calving and mule deer fawning habitat, and less than 1.25 miles for elk and mule deer summer and winter range

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

25 Because of the higher density of motorized roads and trails proposed in the PA for the West Side as compared with the East Side, and based on NEPA case law requiring consideration of a range of alternatives, we request that the DEIS contain alternatives that propose motorized road and trail densities less than what is proposed in the PA,to meet wildlife and habitat needs. These alternatives could be considered "wildlife-friendly" alternatives.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

26 We estimate that the PA proposes to authorize 57.3 miles, representing a removal of apprOXimately 46% of motorized roads and trails in Essential Habitat open to motorized use. With the physical closure of closed motorized routes and sufficient enforcement, we believe this will benefit JMS conservation by allowing previously motorized roads and trails to naturally revegetate.

Public Concern # 56 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

27 We believe this action may reduce habitat fragmentation significantly for JMS, and
request that no DEIS alternatives consider opening additional routes within Essential Habitat.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

28 Climate change and associated increasing fire frequency and intensity are likely the greatest threats to the persistence of the State Endangered Jemez Mountains Salamander (Plethodon neomexicanus)(JMS). The PA (p. 21) acknowledges that larger systems of motorized roads and trails increase the risk of human-caused fires. Motorcycles, ATVs and full size OHVs have been known to unintentionally start wildfires. Because of the potential for wildfire starts by OHVs within and near JMS Essential Habitat, the Department requests that the DEIS contain an analysis of how many wildfires have been started on the SFNF, within Region 3, and nationwide on National Forests by "dirt bike" motorcycles, ATVs and full size OHVs. To put into context, this analysis could compare OHV fire starts against other man-made sources of fire starts such as chainsaws, and natural wildfire starts by lightning.

Public Concern # 11 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

29 "Crosstown Trail"
The "Crosstown" motorcycle trail is apparently an unauthorized, user-created trail that occurs between two JMS Essential Habitat polygons in Priority Survey Area Number 3 (Plan Figure 1). According to the Plan, six priority survey zones were identified within the greater JMS Conservation Area. At least portions of these priority survey areas likely will merit reclassification as Essential once surveys are conducted (Plan p. 14). The Plan states that surveys to determine occupancy are required when habitat altering actions (Category 1and 2activities) are proposed (p. 18). The Department considers off-road OHV use to be aCategory 1activity, which is defined in part as: 1) ground disturbance such as excavation, churning, compaction, or any activity that reduces interspaces and subsurface channels; and 2) vegetation modification to the extent that ground surface microclimate is made drier or otherwise altered through increased exposure to sun and wind (p. 15). If surveys determine that JMS occur within and/or near the Crosstown Trail system, the Department believes that the Endemic Salamander Team needs to be consulted for further recommendations.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

30 "Ridge Trail"
The Department supports the SFNF decision to remove this motorcycle trail from the PA. This trail is apparently usercreated and unauthorized, causing significant damage to slopes from erosion, and occurs within JMS Essential Habitat. Essential Habitat is defined in the Plan as having a management objective of conservation and sustainability of the JMS and its habitat. Actions that adversely impact the JMS will not generally be conducted within the Essential Zone, and no Category 1or 2activities will occur in the Essential Zone without timely written review by the Endemic Salamander Team (Plan pp. 16-17). Because of the ecological damage occurring from this trail network, and adverse effects to JMS Essential Habitat, the Department recommends that this trail system not be considered for authorization in any of the DEIS alternatives.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

31 Trail paralleling Forest Road 144
The Department supports the exclusion in the PA of the northern half of the motorcycle trail that starts at NM Highway 4 in T19N, R3E, and continues northward, paralleling FR 144 to T20N, R3E, Section 30, where it rejoins FR 144. Earlier maps show this motorcycle trail continuing to parallel FR 144 northward through aJemez Mountain Salamander Essential Habitat polygon. The Department requests that this northern portion of the trail through the JMS polygon not be reconsidered for opening in any of the DEIS Alternatives.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

32 CRV trails on Cochiti Mesa A network of unauthorized roads and trails occur on Cochiti Mesa within JMS Essential Habitat that are causing ecological damage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

33 The Department requests that the SFNF prioritize developing easements with private landowners in the area to reduce OHV damage to the extent possible.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

34 The Department requests removal of motorized Trail 273 down Canoncito Seeo Creek north of the Valles Caldera. There is a relatively recent reliable report of cutthroat trout in this drainage. Although not currently a Conservation PopUlation as defined by the Long Range Plan for the Management of Rio Grande Cutthroat Trout in New Mexico (NMDGF 2002), genetic studies need to be conducted to determine if this population would qualify for special status.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

35 The Department requests removal of motorized Trail 107 that crosses the South Fork of Polvadera Creek, which contains a Core Conservation Population of RGCT.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

36 Although not a Conservation Population, cutthroat trout do occur in upper Peralta Creek. The Department requests that no motorized crossings occur on this upper reach of Peralta Creek where cutthroats occur.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

37 The Department requests the opportunity to maintain access to the Pipeline Road between FR 144 and FR 157J for management purposes.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

38 We recommend closure of FR 188D and FR 188B, where excessive erosion is occurring to motorized use of side trails accessed by these roads. Atrail or 2-track that connects FR 1880 and FR 280 is particularly bad, and is causing habitat degradation within Essential Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat. FR 1880 and FR 188B do not appear to be used for access to private land, and closure of these roads would increase the potential for quality hunting opportunities outside of the Valles Caldera National Preserve.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

39 Proposed motorized road and trail densities are still high throughout the Coyote Ranger District, particularly in Management Area Eeast of San Pedro Parks Wilderness and Management Area Rwest of the Valles Caldera. The Department recommends eliminating more motorized roads and trails within Management Area Eand Rto meet Forest Plan goals

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

40 The Department requests that the road to the Bluebird Mesa Wildlife Management Area (WMA) off of Forest Road 533 (Cuba Ranger District) be designated an administrative road only. The Department would like for conservation groups such as the Wild Turkey Federation to be allowed to use this road during organized maintenance projects.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

41 Trail 113 located between Forest Road 89 (Cochiti Canyon Road) and Forest Road 289 (Dome Road) is proposed to be open for motorcycles seasonally. The Department recommends making this anonmotorized trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

42 The Department would like to continue the special use permit with the SFNF to access San Gregorio Reservoir for trout stocking. Please maintain the access road to the lake as an administrative road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

43 The Department recommends motorized route closures on Joaquin Mesa including FR 488 at the junction of Forest Road 337G to the SFNF and Jemez Pueblo boundary, and FR 537 at the junction with FR 558. This would eliminate FR 488KA, 488M, 488ND, 488NB, 537, 537G, motorized trails 488J, 488JA, and the loop road created by the joining of FR 558 to FR 488. This area contains good turkey, mule deer and black bear habitat. Populations of these species will benefit with no motorized road or trails in the area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1113
Comment#

44 Appendix 3 outlines proposed amendment language to the SFNF Forest Plan,which will be needed as a result of implementation of theTravel Management action. With regard to Management Areas with wildlife as an emphasis, automatically defaulting to the upperend of the range of road densityallowed in the current SFNF Forest Plan will generally not fall within the Department's minimum road density recommendations for big game of less than 1.0 miles per square mile for elk calving and mule deer fawning habitat, and less than 1.25 miles for elk and mule deer summer and winter range. Areas of particular concern relative to this PA include elk calving and summer range 1) around the rim ofthe Valles Caldera outside of the Valles Caldera National Preserve; 2) to the south and east ofthe San Pedro Parks Wilderness Area; 3)habitats between the Valles Caldera and San Pedro Parks Wilderness; and 4)on the northwest and southwest sides ofthe Chama River Canyon Wilderness

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1114
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action for Management Travel release for comment on July 10, 2008 is unacceptable to the single-track mototrcycle riding community. The proposal has only included a small subset of those trails originally requested. This results in loops containing widely disconnected segments of single-track trails. The recreational experience of single-track trail riding has been nearly completely lost.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We insist that the forest service follow the requirement in CEQ 40 that they evaluate a "No Change" alternative with respect to the Blackfeather motorized trails.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We specifically request that this alternative be incorporated into the analysis and released for public comment and review within your travel management designation process as a stand alone Alternative.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 The "open" trails included in the proposal are only a small subset of those originally requested and historically used for motorized recreation. We insist that the EIS follow-on to the TAP include a FULL ANALYSIS on ALL of the routes that have been submitted by users.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 The current FS proposal consists of only widely disconnected single track segments. Trail segments are connected by too many miles of road segments. The recreational experience of single-track riding is nearly completely lost.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 The small number of trails included ill result in overcrowding and overuse.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 We request all single track trails defined in the Blackfeather proposal be included for analysis in the scoping study.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 We request that all trails be open at all times when there is minimal snow cover, typically May through late November.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

9 If the Santa Fe National Forest staff chooses to identify alternatives by "theme," or "philosophy," this Alternative would be one which maximizes the opportunities for pursuing 'serious leisure' activities, as discussed in detail in section 4.3…
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 Therefore, we urge USFS staff to examine the research cited and seriously consider incorporating the substance of this alternative as it stands.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 Areas that lend themselves to a quality experience for observed trials are characterized by: (1) A staging area suitable for parking and nearby camping, (2) a single- or double-track loop trail with termini at the staging area, (3) "sections" which are areas, linked by the loop trail, as smal as a few hundred square feet with obstacles suitably challenging for riders of varying skill levels.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 Our trail riders' goal is to maintain an environmentally appropriate trail route system linking single-track trails with existing logging roads and forest roads that provide "riding loop systems" with starting and ending points in proximity to the staging locations.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 Designate all existing single-track trails shown on the maps provided, as open to motorcycles, bicycles, equestrians, and hikers, based on the evidence presented in the following paragraphs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

14 Designate the trails riding areas documented and described in this alternative proposal as open to that activity.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

15 Designate all roads currently in use by motor vehicles, as open to motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 This system needs enough mileage to support the increased use that will occur when USFS publishes and distributes maps documenting this trail system.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

17 Conduct a cultural resources survey of the routes to establish that they comply with the Antiquities Act.
Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

18 Set the existing trails condition as the baseline for the monitoring program, based on section 4.1.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

19 Develop and implement a monitoring program, as detailed in section 4.3.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

20 Develop a uniform procedure to follow in the event that a measured negative impact becomes unacceptable, as detailed in section 4.1.4.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

21 Develop a formal agreement with Black Feather/NMTA/NMOHVA to provide the skills and labor resources to reroute any section of trail where there is a specific natural or cultural conflict

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

22 If there are any species of plant, avian, or animal listed as threatened or endangered, follow the specific steps for protection as set forth in the recovery plan for that species. It is not necessary for the SFNF to expend further staff resources on developing their own standards for the recovery of these species.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

23 Monitor all trials and areas closed to motorized use for "environmental reasons" exactly as the motorized trail areas, and review the closures on a periodic schedule with public input and communication.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

24 We have uncovered no record of any measured negative impacts caused by these trails. Therefore, these trails and areas provide a feasible baseline model for the designated trail system and designated trials areas. It is unlikely that this "starting point" will fall below the standards.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

25 The trail segments have been maintained and have survived for three decades with minimal erosion or width-creep problems.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

26 The OHV community has often received a sdisproportionate amount of negative public criticism due to sterotyping all OHV operators with those few individuals who may not fully respect our public lands or abide by the rules and common courtesies required for its use… These generalized messages are deceiving, incomplete, and inaccurate.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

27 In a 2004 report, "Effects of Off-Road Recreation on Mule Deer and Elk," the data show that up to 500 m distance, ATVs, mountain bilkers, and hikers, have virtually equal impact on the possibility of elk flight. Mule deer exhibited a very low rate of flight response during all human activities.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

28 Another relevant report entitled, "Mt. Blue Experimental ATV Trail Environmental Research Report (1990)," states "Based on monthly measurements, an increase in trail erosion was undetectable."

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

29 Importantly, the report also states, "Bird surveys showed no discernable changes in relative species composition attributable to ATV use."

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

30 A list of references used here is provided in Section 6 to assist staff in evaluating the feasibility of this alternative. Since the early seventies, numerous fiel research studies on animals and avian responses to motor vehicles have been conducted. In report after report, the evidence shows that wildlife easily habituates to predictable human activity that does not destroy the habitat.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

31 Water quality has also been earmarked as a potential OHV issue. However, another report refutes the negative perceptions on this front when compared to horse traffic. A 1990 stufy conducted by the Gergetown Ranger District in northern California monitored water quality (both upstream and downstream) and fish habitat in Rock Creek and the Rock Creek Watershed during the 1990 CERA Fool's Gold Motorcycle Enduro, which had 320 participants.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

32 Another revealing study was conducted by Mountain Research & Development, Vol 14, (1994) entitled "Erosional Impacts of Hikers, Horses, Motorcycles, and Off Road Bicycles on Mountain Trails in Montana." This study concluded that although all of the uses had some effect on trails, primarily with uphill and downhill grades, horses caused greater increases in soil compaction, litter, trail width, and depth compared to hikers and motorcycles.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

33 Impacts from resource extraction and grazing often far surpass that done by the recreational community as a whole and OHVs in particular.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

34 PhDs researching the effect of ATVs in the backcountry also tested sound impact. Their results found that "although the sound of an ATV may be considerably quieter than other ambient sounds (airplanes, car traffic, lawn mowers, etc.) and in some cases not even quantitatively detectable, the level of sound that individuals find disturbing in the back country is affected by their attitudes toward the source of these sounds. Hence, some people consider any detection offensive. This cannot be considered a negative resource impact; this is a problem of perception in a forest managed by law for multiple uses.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

35 OHVs cause less discernable physical damage than previously supposed and widely speculated in print.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

36 Section 4.1.3 Monitoring - The specific subect areas to monitor and the standards to be met are: (1) Trail width (keep to 3 feet or less); (2) Soil movement (per Forest Service Best Practices standard); (3) Stream sedimentation at water crossings (per EPA standards for non-point pollution sources); (4) Appropriate use behavior (staying on trail, riding steep/switchback sections carefully so as to not dig out the trail, etc.); (5) Rate of change from the baseline (tread width and location). The indicators of excessive change would be user-created bypasses, and/or items 1, 2, and 3 exceeding standards; (6) Wildlife population monitoring is expensive and requires enormous amounts of non-OHV information before it is of any value in determining whether motor recreation is the cause of any negative effects; therefore, it is appropriate here to rely on the existing body of literature to guide management of this activity.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

37 It is likely that any measureable impacts will be very small, or, easily mitigated, because as noted above we have researched a body of literature dated from the mid-1970s to the present which scientifically documents that trail-based motor recreation has little or no measureable negative impacts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

38 4.1.4 Actions to address below-standard monitoring data: (1) Identify the exact measurement that is unacceptable; (2) Identify the cause; (3) Identify the exact section of trail that is below standard; (4) Select a solution: tread repair, structures, or reroute as appropriate; (5) Implements the solution on the ground; (6) Monitor the repair, to ensure the site has been brought up to standard.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

39 The areas are relatively lightly used by others except during hunting season and possibly by cross country skiers during the winter… We also refrain from riding on hunting days. Thus, it is difficult to quantify any danger to the nonriding public due to use by motorcycles.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

40 On shared use routes such as 4-wheel drive roads and Level 2 roads, there is a slight possibility of vehicle collision. The safety advantage in having the motorcycles using single-track trails instead of roads is the reduced potential for collisions between autos and motorcycles.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

41 Accident records from several National Forests close to the metropolitan areas (with significant levels of heavy auto traffic on the Forest roads), such as the Mendocino NF, the San Bernardino NF, and the Los Padres NF, reveal approximately one reported motorcycle accident (which resulted in injury or fatality) per ten years.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

42 Trail routes are developed as loops that eventually return to the defined starting points without significant backtracking. This minimizes chances of meeting oncoming traffic. It is undesireable and decidedly unsafe to provide trails that force riders to turn around and ride against oncoming riders. If this becomes a more serious problem as OHV use increases, it may be desirable to designate the most popular trails as one-way only.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

43 Very high quality leisure activities, called "serious leisure" by researchers in the field, require a considerable number of complex factors, which, in combination, provide satisfaction, personal growth, and fulfillment to the participant (Stebbins, R.A. 1982)… Motorcycle trail riding and observed trials competition and practice fall directly into the most complex forms of "serious leisure."

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

44 There is a compelling case to be made for closely examining the perceived negative impacts, and correcting inaccuracies.There is also a compelling case to be made that the "err on the side of caution" policy in matters of speculative negative impacts is counterproductive to the USFS purpose and mission of offering quality recreation opportunities on the National Forest - particularly opportunities that are not available in any other setting.

Public Concern # 23 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

45 We need a variety of trail types, ranging from easy, wide, level, smooth trails through the woods for beginner and intermediate riders to steep narrow off-camber trails with rocks, ledges, roots, switchbacks, etc. for the most advanced riders.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

46 Trail routes (loops) need to be anywhere from 25 to 100 miles long depending on the skill of the rider and the difficulty of the trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

47 It is especially important that the loops are really loops and not a series of out and back segments. In addition, to the improved recreational experience of a loop, the out-and-back segments are more dangerous because of the higher chance of a head-on collision.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

48 A synthesis of the literature on user conflicts on multiple-use trails, sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration in 1995, tells us that user conflict is not due to any "inherent incompatibility" between different trail activities. It is a perceived "goal interference" on the part of the offended trail user… the key element for the elimination of genuine, heartfelt conflict for any given individual is to make sure that every person who uses the trail system knows what to expect, and that the resulting experience is consistent with that expectation (Moore, 1995).

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

49 Given the large percentage of the SFNF that is set aside as Wilderness, any argument that OHV usage lessens the non-motorized recreation experience is not compelling. Individuals who find even distant motor vehicle sounds intolerable have an enormous Wilderness land base into which to escape. Neither Blackfeather nor NMTA disputes this entitlement, and Wilderness tresspass by motor vehicles is rare.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

50 Blackfeather and NMTA advocate for all of these closures to be reviewed and considered for opening to responsible trail riding, in light of the research provided with this alternative. This is consistent with Step 3 of the Region 3 TMR Implementation Guidelines.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

51 Connecting subsystems of loops or isolated trails to expand the mileage will reduce the physical impacts of all human recreation activities.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

52 Other forest visitors also use the trails for recreational purposes. These visitors include mountain bikers, cross-country skiers, hunters, hikers, and horseback riders. For the most part, if off-road motorcyclists had not created these trails, they would not exist.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

53 We request that once the first phase of the Transportation Rule is in place, that the SFNF would consider opening up these closed areas to a few trails in or across the areas for observed trials competition and practice.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

54 We are also willing to provide administrative and maintenance help as required to keep these trails and areas open.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

55 Multiple trails/routes are required to prevent overuse and crowding of the trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1114
Comment#

56 The trail segments in this loop are also suitable for hiking, cross-country skiing, mountain biking, and horseback riding.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1115
Comment#

1 This is a private easement and should be removed from this map altogether.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1116
Comment#

1 Region Three actively solicited pre-scoping TMR input from one class of New Mexican (off-roaders). Simultaneously, it actively concealed information about the TMR or actively diverted input from another class of New Mexicans (grazing permitees) away from pre-scoping.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 The problem in an nutshell is that a disproportionate burden (increased noise, injury of livestock, destruction of rangeland, property damage and loss of income) falls on a class of individuals who were systematically excluded from the pre-scoping phase of NEPA.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 It is clear that Forest Service personnel presently feel free to ignore regional guidelines. Blatant disregard of existing guidelines directly leg to widespread NEPA violations against members of New Mexico's traditional rural culture.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1117
Comment#

0 Duplicate message of letter # 212. See letter # 212 for comments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1118
Comment#

1 Eliminate fixed corridor camping.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Eliminate loop routes on the Valle Grande allotment. Close forest roads 324 HH 324HF, 330, 325 and 330Q in order to eliminate loop routes on the Valle Grande allotment. Loop roads to close on the North end of the mesa woulg be 326WA and the eastern portion of 326PE.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 Unless the forest Service has an easement, it should close roads that run through inholdings.

Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1118
Comment#
4 It is possible that there are private property owners adjacent to the National Forest that can only access their propterty through the National Forest that are unaware of the Travel Management Rule being implemented.
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1119
Comment#
0 Form Letter See letter # 208 for comments
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1120
Comment#
0 Not a comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1121
Comment#
1 Regarding County Rd 51, she reported county RD 51 is a restricted road for ATV use and "day after day" continues to see and hear ATV's being used onthis road. Individual stated it is Forest Service responsibility to put an end to ATV use on this road, in addition it is the FS responsibility to put a sign indicating ATV is restricted.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1123
Comment#
1 One of my favorite rides if starting at the bottom of Paliza Canyon and going up to cerro Pelado. Please consider keeping FR270D between the Paliza Canyon road(FR271) and FR 270 to cerro Pelado as a trail route. It links to several loops at the top that you are already keeping. There are also several geo caches in Paliza Canyon access would be very limited if this is closed.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1124
Comment#
1 Take no action!
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 1125
Comment#

Letter# 1125
Comment#

1 I see allowing the frenzied energy, inescapable noise, and discarded garbage and beer cans in Cochiti Canyon a similar situation to the debris in Plaza Blanca. Let them ride their motorcycles and ATVs in another place, we have so few places left where we can access solace and renewal through peace and quiet. I beg you, on my knees, hands clasped, to let the of road vehicles have a place that will be less affected by their noise and disruption. A place that is not as enclosed, nurturing, and pristine as this canyon. It would break my heart to not be able to be contemplative and reverant in this sacred location, continuing to make my life a ceremony around slowness.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1126
Comment#

0 Not a comment FSRes

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1127
Comment#

1 One the exixting westside use map (map 3), it shows that the green "unauthorized used" road through Canyon del Norte currently is on Forest servic eland for a portion of the northern part of Sec. 13. Further, the red "existing road open to public "shown adjacent this section has been impassible for at least 20 years to my personal knowledge.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Thus on the proposed westside use map (map 9), the seasonally open road in this area makes no sense as it would require adding 30 ft of roadway across

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 As shown on this map, the roads I would like to see closed because of their impact on private property owners: 268A, 268B, 286D, 188B, 188D, The trail that goes east and then north from 268AB and connects to 268. The nonexistent road extension mentioned in part 1 The road in Del Norte Canyon to the south of this.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The roads have historically been used by hikers and equestrians and their use by motorized vehicles would be incompatible with their current use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 3) Errors in roads shown as open all year which should only be seasonally open. The Forest Service map of seasonal road closures shows 268 from the Valle Grande, over the pass, and down onto Cochiti Mesa as open to the public all year. It has always been closed during the winter. Shows 268A down into the upper part of Del Norte Canyon as open to the public all year, only seasonally open. Also shown as open year round is 289 across Bandelier, but only as far as the boundary with the Forest Service at the first cattle guard. Again, this should only be seasonally open.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1128
Comment#

Letter# 1128
Comment#

1 I had the pleasure two years ago of taking part in a vision question with the Heyokah centre people in Cochiti canyon. I understand that the posers that be are considering allowing motor biking in the canyon. In my opinion this would destroy the peace and tranquility and tremendous access to nature that this canyon affords people who are already drowning in modern tehnology and machiner. Motor bikes are very noisy and have nothing to contribue to the canyon that I can see. I hope that common sense will prevail and that the bikers will be encouraged to go elsewhere for their thrills.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1129
Comment#

1 I very much hope that off road motor vehicles will not be allowed on forest roads 89 and 113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1130
Comment#

1 Forest Roads 89 & 113 in Cochiti Canyon, on the last retreat I attended this past July I was shcocked and dismayed to see & hear motorcycles speeding up & down the only road or trail that exists in the narrow canyon. It is very loud and disruptive and ruined my intention for a time of quiet intropesction and enjoyment of the sights and sounds of nature. Please do NOT allow this truly unique & pristine environment to be destroyed by off road vehicles!

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1131
Comment#

1 I currently live in Arizona and recently camped in an area that had been opened to off road vehicles, with friends who ride. Even with a respectful approach and designeated trails for riding, the noise, dust and fast paced traffic were non-stop.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Several campers reported riders who "strayed" directly through campsites, potentially endangering people, pets and belongkings.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 The co-existence of peaceful and pristinge settings with off road vehicles is unrealistic and the impact on nature will be too high of a price to pay,

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 As stewards of this earth, we need to preserve such precious sttings, so that we can nurture and heal ourselves, others and the earth itself - you have to be able to create peace in order to share it and spread. Even now, studies are demonstrating the impact of too little green space and interation with nature on the human psyche, energy levels, creatively and health. Preservation of such space today lays the foundation for our collective healthy and peaceful future.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 Please do not allow off road motor bikes in Cochiti Canyon Forest Road 89 and 113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1132
Comment#

1 I am writing to ask that you not allow off-road motorcycles in the Cochiti Canyon

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Our society is full of motor noise. We need natural places to renew our spirits and to nourish the non-human life that supports a healthly planet.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1133
Comment#

1 I ask all of you to reconsider the importance of NOT ALLOWING these bikes to be in this canyon. PLEASE save Forest Road 89 and 113. SAVE Cochiti Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1134
Comment#

1 I plead with you, who might be able to have a strong voice in holding on to what is unique and special in Cochiti Canyon, to deny dirtbike riding routes to invade this Blessed canyon. I hope to bring my children there, 1 at a time, to be under the awe-inspiring natural lands of Cochiti Canyon in the near future.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1135
Comment#

1 What I am asking you to consider is the fact that people with ATV's love to ride in the snow. When we ride we always stick to roads such as 144 and mushroom basin above Thompson's ridge. We only rid eon the roads that in current conditions when closed have a 50" wide gate on the side for snowmobiles and ATV's. We also only ride these roads when the snow is deep enough to keep from rutting the roads and getting us all muddy. Snow riding is a great part of our lives'. Some years we will go on a snow ride at least three or four times. We even have a yearly New Years day ride that we have been doing for the last 10 year's or so on forest road 144. When we ride on these trails only us on foot leave the roads' mostly so that we can take picutes. I now have a 2 year old son. It will be severeal years before he is old enough to go on a snow ride in the Jemez Mountains with his dad. Please let him have the opportunity.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1136
Comment#

1 By turning Road 89 and 113 into a motorcycle track, it will alter the balance of Cochiti Canyon's ecosystem. Many animals will be forced to move to a different location to survive and if they are unable to move, many will die off. For some, it is hard to see te direct effects of such a minor development as a motorcycle track; but humans have been degrading the earth's ecosystem one small development at a time.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1136
Comment#

2 Some values that should be looked at before considering development are a) its use value - the worth of things from Cochiti Canyon that we use directly (water, places to hike and explore); b) option value-worth of things we do not use not but we might need in the future (trees_; c) aesthetic value-not worth of the beauty that Cochiti Canyon brings to us; d) cultural value= the worth of things that sustain or help to define our culture; e_ scientific value-the worth of things that may be the subject of scientific research (plants, animals); F) educational value-the worth of things at Cochiti Canyon that may teach us about the world and ourselves; and g) existence value-the worth of things simply because they exist, even if we never experience them directly (endangered species that live in Cochiti Canyon).

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Recently, my mother went to Cochiti Canyon, Road 89 and 113. She went on a spriitual retreat to honor the land, the creatures that reside there, and the ancestors that have lived there in the past. It was a life changing experience that my mother was presented with. Cochiti Canyon gave her the gift of truth; this gift she will now take home with her and share it with her friends and family. My mother was so excited to take me to Cochiti Canyon so that I too could one day experience such pristine nature. If this place starts to become deeloped and populated. I am sure that my experience will not be the same.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 Please take action by denying any motorcycle riding routes that will invade and disturb this pure and valuable canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1137
Comment#

1 I talked to Mike Dechter about FR 135. He was saying the designation as street legal was because of fragile soil and for protection of the archeological sites. I don't remember the soil being a problem until you get way down to the south end. Even then, that area is fairly level. My personal interest in 135 is primarily for use on a mountain bike to access the Padre Alonso Trail and Canyon de la Canad and for the views off of Cat Mesa. If the south part of 135 where closed completely to vehicles, it would be gone in a few years. It would not see enough use to sustain it as a trail. It doesn't make sense to use it as a loop to 489 in it's current condition, though it would be nice to be able to connect that way. It does make sense to keep it open should there ever be a fire on the west facing slope of Cat Mesa. Riding down 135 into the south end of Canyon de la Canada is a fun ride, but the bottom section down the Brigde Road is very sandy and unridable unless it is moist. I agree that 135 should not be open to vehicles between Bridge Road and the junction of 489/135. So my final comment is that I don't see a problem leaving 135 open to all vehicles to the junction of 489 (which doesn't really exist anymore). There are not a lot of people going out there, but it would be nice to have that option.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1138
Comment#

1 I am trying to understand if the Forest Service is currently accepting user routes.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1139
Comment#

Letter# 1139
Comment#

1 I was under the impression that the Forest Service was going to end its acceptance of user submitted routes las winter
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 12 Misunderstanding of the NEPA process

2 The continued acceptance of user provided routes is leading to serious conflicts between private property and trespassing
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 I sincerely hope you will listen to reason, and end your ill conceived policy of soliciting for user provided OHV routes.
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1140
Comment#

1 Unauthorized, user-created trails that reside in a designated section A (defined by the Forest Service as "closed to cross country travel") should be eliminated from the Travel Management proposed action. Areas such as Upper Medio Dia Canyon, Bruce Ridge and Frazier Canyon that border the Valles Caldera corridor and are known to be essential Jemez Mountain Salamander habitat should be protected and the previous Forest Service designation should be honored
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Roads leading to private property that are redundant and are predominantly being used as access by OHV traffic should be eliminated from the TM proposed action.
Public Concern # 60 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Roads leading to private property that are redundant and are predominantly being used as access by OHV traffic should be eliminated from the TM proposed action. Examples of this are FS road 188B and 268A/B in the especially hard hit and abused Jemez Mountain district of the Santa Fe National Forest as well as the myriad of roads that are cutting through and crisscrossing the Schoolhouse and Virgin Mesa area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The current trail maintenance budget for the Santa Fe National Forest is so low that it is already on an unsustainable schedule of trails being serviced at an interval of every 25 years if all of the trails were to be considered.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 The Forest Service should prioritize protection and enforcement over the call for more OHV access.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1141
Comment#

1 Why are there still so many parallel roads open? The area around Coyote seems especially bad.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1141
Comment#

2 Why do some trails/roads lead right to private property, stope there, then begin again on the other side of the private property? What message is being sent by the FS with this practice? Look south of the caldera in the FR 289 area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Miles of roads and trails open should reflect their representation in the total user population.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Miles of roads/trails open should reflect their representation in the total user population.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1142
Comment#

1 Better method practices should be established ensuring proper responsible use,

Public Concern # 53 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 If those practices exceed the capability of Forest Service staff, the public needs to be formally invited to aid volunteer, etc.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Initial funds to implemate restrictions practices is steep, however, funds to maintain these practiced methods would be minimal.

Public Concern # **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1143
Comment#

1 l) In spite of a docimented increase in popularity of OHV recreation, the proposed action is reducing opportunity & has failed to consider most of the trails submitted.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The proposed action does not consider replacing lost 2 wheel motorized trail mileage by opening other trails to maintain existing 2 wheel-motorized mileages. This will only increase impacts on the trails and may promote resource damage.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 By not doing this forest service is promoting resource damage by forcing too many users onto too small a trail system.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 The Forest Service must disclose and analyze the effects of reducing recreational opportunity in the planning area and attempt to quantify and disclose those impacts within this process.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 (& adding upon to create a great motorized loop single-track system,

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 (This loop system with motorized trails from easy to challenging will encourage users to stay on designated trails)

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 Would not the increase in motorized use indicate a need for management to increase motorized opportunities.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

8 The current alternatives propose closing single-track trails to motorized use, which will increase the impact on the remaining trails, contrary to the stated goal of the plan to minimize impacts.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 One criteria used by some Forests is that trails receiving little motorized use should be closed does not consider that many motorized users enjoy little used trails, just as other recreationists do.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 PUBLIC NOT AWARE OF PLAN

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 These multiple-use motorized trails are open to everyone & therefore provide the Greatest Good in terms of opportunity to all users, as well as increased funding from OHV fees & OHV volunteerism.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 l. To preserve the last of the best motorized single track in Forested Primitive high alpine setting for future generations. 2. To promote motorized Loops & Destination Trails as encouraged by Forest Service 3. To preserve motorized trails of every experience level possible. 4. To provide for the growth of family motorized trail bike recreation.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

13 This would require the current process to address opening more trails to handle user capacity.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1143
Comment#

14 It is far more expensive to clear or maintain Non Motorized trails, so any change of trails from Motorized to Non Motorized will significantly increase Forest cost.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

15 The Plan neglects to consider the economic loss of reduced single track Motorized tourism caused by proposed closures

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

16 budgets how can the Santa Fe afford to clear these trails of the huge amount of downed trees each year without motorized trail funding & volunteetrs?

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

17 Our vision for motorized recreation includes opportunities such as the proposed Great Western Trail and Oregon Back Country Discovery Route, and other regional opportunities that include connection between forests and adjoining states. A system of OHV back country discovery routes and OHV byways could provide loops and interconecting trails to points of interest including lakes, streams, rivers, ghosts towns and scenic overlooks.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

18 What is the basis upon which the Santa fe staff proposes to close some trails to motorized use to protect public safety.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

19 We suggest that all expert level trails be signed as such & remain open to motorized use, in keeping with the public's desire to enjoy them, as well as the Forest Service comment allowing motorized use in an environment of challenge & risk.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1144
Comment#

1 In response to Senator Phil Griego's Alternative Proposal for the Travel Management Plan, subject to Glorieta/Rowe Mesa, I strongly support this plan and encourage your consideration for implementation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I am a fifth generation rancher with property in Rowe Mesa and have seen the destruction of fences, the dumping of trash, deep tire ruts, and vandalism left behind by off-road, ATV vehicle operators.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Evern since the ARV came into existence, we are experiencing more of our fences being cut and our cattle roaming into private property or other allotments.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1144
Comment#

4 Myself, and the undersign would like to see off-road and ATV vehicles restricted only to the main roads.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1145
Comment#

1 Why motorcycles treated more generously than ATV's?
Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 50" does not say length or width what does +-50 mean width or length?
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1146
Comment#

1 We support Senator Phil Griego's alternate proposal.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 there should not be so many roads for people to ride there off road vehicles on.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 This brings to the subject of people destroying the grass, trees and fences. Also destroying the beauty of the forest with litter.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 There is also the problem of people making campfires. If these get out of control we could loose the beautiful country which was left to us from generation to generation.
Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 In the past we have found our fences cut.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 If there is cattle or horses they tend to get spooked with loud noise.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 if there is not anyone to enforce the rules there may as well not be any rules
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1149
Comment#

1 I request that all the trails in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance "Citizens Proposal" be kept open.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1149
Comment#

2 Every trail we've requested is regularly ridden and maint.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 This will onlylead to the breaking of needless laws that serve only special interests and will not serve the needs of the public. Please keep the trails open for the benefit of all mankind and future generations

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1150
Comment#

1 private road easement which is located on Glorieta Mesa situated in Township 15 North, Range 11 East, Section 8 NMPM, specifically, the east halp of the southwest quarter of Section 8, comprising 80 acres, more or less. We wish to advise you in accordance with subsection C of the private road easement, that the above land has been sold to the Harold and Elisabeth P. Zuschlag Revocable living Trust (the Zuschlag Trust). Accordingly, the rights granted under the private road easement should be transferred to the Zuschlag Trust, as the new owner.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1151
Comment#

1 The Proposed Action outlines what I would consider to be a fair compromise between OHV users and others, such as myself, who would prefer to never encounter an OHV when on foot, mountain bike, or horseback in the forest.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I would advocate something like a "zero tolerance" or perhaps "3 strikes you're out" approach. In either case, once a violation or pattern of violations become obvious the adjacent legal route would then be closed to OHV use.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 As Forest budgets are squeezed it may become less likely that an adequate enforcement presence will be applied to ensure compliance. If this becomes obvious, by widespread and persistent violations, the only appropriate response would be to roll back the dispersal of legal routes and trails to something tht can be legitimately managed.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 1152
Comment#

1 I wholeheartedly agree with Senator Griego's proposal regarding an alternative plan for the Glorieta Mesa.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 speed limits should be instituted for the safety of Forest animals, livestock, and other users, (hikers, horseback riders, etc.), as well as to help minimize damage from dust.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 1152
Comment#
3 nothin will work without proper enforcement!!
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1153
Comment#
1 I compliment Senator Phil A Griego for submitting our proposal for the Travel Management Rule Proposed Action on Glorieta Mesa.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 In m opinion, people using the Forest roads and lands should take their trash with them. Throwing beer cans and bottles out of vehicles onto the road can cause vehicle damage. A beer bottle can ruin a tire if it is run over by an unsspecting driver.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 signs should be posted with telephone numbers to report those who are abusing Forest Lands.
Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1154
Comment#
1 We the Romero family have faith that you will agree with Senator Griegos proposal regarding the Mesa.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We also hope this plan will be enforced for everyone safety
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1155
Comment#
1 WE HAVE READ SENATOR GRIEGO'S PROPOSAL AND FEEL THAT THE SENATOR'S PROPOSAL IS WELL BALANCED IN PRESERVING THE MESA DN IN MAINTAINING THE CULTURE THAT OUR ANCESTORS LEFT US TO PASS ON TO OUR FUTURE GENERATIONS IN
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I WOULD LIKE SUGGEST THAT ALL FOREST SERVICE OFFICES CREATE AN ASSEMENT FILE FOR LAND OWNERS AND PERMITTIES, SO THEY MAY REPORT ANY INCEDENTS THAT OCCUR BY OHV AND OFF ROADERS, INCLUDING OTHER ISSUES THAT MAY OCCUR DETERMING THE FUTURE OF THE MESA.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1156
Comment#
1 I have seen an increase in travel by motorcycles Jeeps, & four wheeled & three wheeled ATV's, I have been just about over run by al the above mentioned. The mesa is not a racetrac, or an R.V. Place.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1157
Comment#

1 I have just returned from a most amazing Vision Quest, hosted by Julie Rivers and Dona Wilder, in Cochiti Canyon, on Forest Road 89 and 113. We have been informed that this area is being considered for off road vehicle traffic, most particularly motorcycles. It is my belief and assertion that this would be a very, very tragic mistake, as this beautiful canyon is one of the few places I have visited that remains a virgin forest, and provides quiet and relativ solitude for those who wish to find such a rare opportunity.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1158
Comment#

1 Human tunnels/porter landing 2 trails going up the west side of Holiday and Stable Mesas get ery little use and should remain open.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 If crossing the stream just north of the tunnels is a concern, you could build a bridge with culverts or reopen the trail that runs southward from porter landing on the east side of he stream.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 I have used these trails for 36 years and would not like to see them closed losing access would change it from a day trip to a full week but to get to the canyoan and enjoy the rim ----

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1159
Comment#

1 Why is FR527 not included in the Proposed map, FR527 is a major connecting road between FR144 and FR117 I would guess the company that owns the Pipeline wqould like access to there road for repairs. FR527J that goes north of of FR527 shows to be an all vehicle travel propsed. It needs to be looked at more closely. I would be more than willing to go with the Forest Service to view more closely.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1160
Comment#

1 I want to be able to ride my motorcycle and camp in the Jemez.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1161
Comment#

1 Only one trails area is insufficient.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The plan should include our traditional areas from the 60's. 70's, 80's, and 90's such as Spruce, Pines, Bear, Barely, Bland and Cochiti Canyons

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1161
Comment#

3 Your mission with this plan is document areas for use not eliminate them. Your proposal eliminated most trails.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 The Blackfeather Proposal is a good compromise and should be adopted.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1162
Comment#

1 Stard an adopt a trails program for people who live near forest lands.
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

2 Keep the fire people from taking all the money for fire fighting.
Public Concern # 48 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Get portable or permanate Bio mass electric generator station.
Public Concern # 22 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 Get more public involved to restore the trails and stop erosion. We need more equipment for trail maintance hand tools and heavy equipment
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

5 I would like to keep up a trail maintance program
Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 I would like to keep up a open looped trails open
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 I am concerned about keeping ATV trails open only trails that are used seasonally
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1163
Comment#

1 Single track trail bike riding and OHV use in general is becoming more popular. You're proposing a reduction in trails. This will cause an over use on these trails. How is this meeting the public needs? You should be protecting the forest for the people not from the people.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1164
Comment#

1 The area to the North and West of the Caldera is way away from anywhere. Why is this area not being used for motorcycle trails is beyond me. Please reconsider this area for riding. It's large. It's far away from commonly used areas. Who's it going to disturb.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1165
Comment#

1 the amount of TRAIL was so minimized the expierence of trail riding was lost.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1166
Comment#

1 Cochiti Please conserve the quiet of this Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1167
Comment#

1 I was informed that Forest Rds 89 and 113 in the Cochiti Canyon are being sought after for regular use by motor bike enthusiasts from around the country. Please do not let this happen, as the entire canyon and its vegetation, wildlife, water reserves, beauty, would be affected in life-altering ways, what with the noise, the pollution, the disruption of the peace of nature, that the fast moving vehicles would bring. Retreats for quiet time, healing and restoration would be disrupted. I am listing my reasons below to make it easier to log these concerns to NOT allow off road motor bikes on Cochiti Canyon Forest Rds 89 and 113.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1168
Comment#

1 I request that you include all trails listed in the Blackfeather Trails Preservation Alliance "Citizen's Proposal". The reason I believe that all of these trails should be included are: The EIS should include a full analysis on ALL of the trails

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The proposed action may be mitigated one way or another whether it will be redirection, constructing bridge crossings over riparian areas, installation of erosion conrol measures, etc.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Furthermore, these measures could be put in place by all volunteer force overseen by Forest Service personnel if necessary.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Reducing the number of trails will result in overcrowding and degradation considering that the current proposal represents a roughly 60% reduction in trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Current budget allows for roughly 40 miles of trail maintenance by FS personnel annually and some years less. So even when the number of trails/miles of trail are substantially reduced (yo 140+/- miles) the Forest Service cannot possibly maintain 1/3 of them.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1168
Comment#

6 In the end it will be a huge, short-sighted mistake by the Forest service to reduce the number of trails when the number of users/visitors is going up each year.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1169
Comment#

1 I am sending you this letter to express my concern over the use of off road motor cycles on forest road 89 and 113. I understand that these two roads are being considered for motor bike routes. I never in a thousand years would have thought that road 89 in Cochiti Canyon would be considered as this is a water shed, have ancient ruins, and many many medicinal plants that do not grow anywhere else in New Mexico.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The last couple of years, the off road vehicles has found this canyon and it has been very disrupting to our retreats. We must walk on the road as there are no walking trails in the canyon and the motor cycles often give us quite a scare as they go very fast and we must jump out of their way many times. We have also noted that they make ruts in the roads and send lots of dirt and oil on the roadside plant life where evening primrose, wild roses, horsetail and many other plants grow.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 not allow off road motor bikes in Cochiti Canyon Forest Road 89 and 113. 1. One of the last pristine Canyon that is watershed, has ancient ruins, and medicinal plant life. 2. Sound disruption that does not allow campers to be quiet in nature for retreating and vision questing. 3. These off road motor cycles destroy the road and plant life. (I understand that the cabin owners do a lot to keep this road open for all of us that visit the canyon) 4. Increased probabilities of accidents to hiking campers and otherautomobiles coming into the canyon from the fast moving motor cycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1170
Comment#

0 duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1171
Comment#

0 duplicate

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1172
Comment#

1 From what Ken has told me, it seemed the 4-wheeler crowd that widened this single-track trail was on "Mainline", as it departs from the FR 144 corral area just after you leave Hwy 126. Which leads to the next recommendation of posting these trails for equestrian, hiking or motorcycling use only (single-path width).

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1173
Comment#

1 I note that dirtbikers have created hundreds of new "trails" on the Santa Fe National Forest and the Forest Service intends to establish some of these as permanent trails under the Travel Management process. … and many of them are in roadless areas or are "built" in ways that do not follow trail construction rules in terms of erosion control, watershed protection of wildlife habitat.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Is it legal for a member of the public to build trails on the National Forest without the approval or involvement of the Forest service?

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 If it is illegal for me or any other memebre of the public to construct a trail or road on the National Forests without the involvement of the Forest Service… why s the Forest Service plannign to reward the dirtbikers for their continual illegal addition of new "routes" and "trails"…..If no NEPA was done on the construction of a trail, can it be added to the official trail system on the national forest through the Travel Management process without construction specific to NEPA?

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I feel strongly that all illegal trails should be removed from the system out of respect for the rule of law. NEPA shuold be done on those trails separately from the Travel Management Process.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1174
Comment#

1 Obvious ommisions west of Baca Location, this road is needed for fir eprotection plus gas line access/maintenance.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

2 Lower mesa Canyon is a much used road to access hunting areas/retreive game and for camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

3 Wolf Canyon road along the power lines is closed and needs to be kept open for power line access and firefighting.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

4 Reduction in the number of trails can be a real problem in fighting forest fires.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1175
Comment#

Letter# 1175
Comment#

1 The proposed "areas" restrict observed trials to a very limited area in which to ride. The future of our sport depends on "areas" the current plan almost entirely shuts down the sport of observed trials within the Santa Fe National Forest!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1176
Comment#

1 More separation between ATV's and M/C

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Acess to FR144 from Thompson Ridge must stay open as ATV & MC trail.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 ATV use is damaging to small areas where dispersed camping is allowed.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1177
Comment#

0 Duplicate/form letter

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1178
Comment#

1 I am very opposed to motorcycle traffic on trail #105 & 108 also on the small section from F31 to 144 east of Perchuelas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 31 n &423 on Abiquiu Grant are not public rds. 1783 does not exist.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1179
Comment#

0 Form Letter see letter # 1179 for comments

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1180
Comment#

1 this trail system has become part of the official Forest Service trail system as with FT113, FT140, FT126, and FT424. In other places, the trail system has been overtaken by road building, as is the case with FR282, parts of FR501, FR268, FR286, and FR188

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1180
Comment#
2 Black Feather Motocross, NM 4 Wheelers, and others have acted as if their access and use of these trails means they are motor trails first, when the exact oposite is true.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1181
Comment#
1 Please include the road to our property in your newest version of the transportation map for the Jemez Ranger District.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1182
Comment#
1 Concern: cert locks and chain on private land and Indian Creek. 8 acres use his cabin to call for accidents. Roads not maintained. Too much noise. No respect for private property. Riding on my private perperty. Problem is mostly w/ATV's and motorcycles.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1183
Comment#
1 He would like for only one access to be opened and would prefer it be Morphy Canyon.
Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 He thinks the PA routes are redundant, plus will damage water resources and private land.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1184
Comment#
0 not a comment/ Meeting
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1185
Comment#
0 Telephone conversation with a number of different residents in Las Vegas. No indication of road name/number. See comments submitted by Lawrie for information
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1186
Comment#
0 Duplicate Letter see letter # 327 for comments.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1187
Comment#

1 Many La Cueva residents feet strongly that this route (375G and 53) doesn't belong on the Travel Management Plan map, and we've stated the reasons why in our comments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1188
Comment#

1 The Southeast quarter of the Northesast quarter of the Northeast quarter, the East half of the southwest quarter of the Northeast quarter of the Skouthesast quarter of the Northeast quarter and the easthalf of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section seventeen in Township 16 north of Range 11 east of the New Mexico Principal Meridian, Santa Fe county, New Mexico, containing thirty acres. We are expressing to the National Forest Service thatthis road is extremely important to us. It is the only access we have to this 30 aacre plot and the cabin that we use. It is our unstanding that the possibility exists that this road may be closed in the near future. We would respectfully like to ask that it remain open or that the National Forest Service is aware of the situation in our access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 We are researching the probability of an esement that existed between the Forest Service and our grandfather, Ira M. Young. Several contractors that built the caabin with our grandfather saay that such an easement does exist.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1189
Comment#

1 The trail "Over 40" is a 4 mile trail that was omitted from the Proposed Action. Why is this? This trail is certainly meets the criteria of sustainable as it is in good condition and shows little sign of erosion. It is a quality single track trail that has been enjoyed by a multitude of users of a number of years. Please consider including this trail in the Proposed Action for the EIS.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1190
Comment#

1 I am against closing roads especially in Nothern Los Alamos County.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

2 I am against restrictions against driving off road to recover game animals.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I am against reduction of area for dispersed camping

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1191
Comment#

Letter# 1191
Comment#
1 192 miles of motorcycle only is not adequate especially when much of it is not open during the prime riding season
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1192
Comment#
1 Roads are not fun. It is the singletrack only that counts. Riding the same small network of trails over and over does not make for a fair and reasonable experience.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1193
Comment#
1 as an active member of the Sierra Club Forest Committee, I am pleased with the direction the proposed action is heading i.e. reducing the nubmer of roads & trails that are open to motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 We are still concerned about the ability of SFNF to monitor & enforce the restricted routes once the trail maps are produced. Maybe we can provide some assistance.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1194
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Correspondence
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1195
Comment#
0 Not a comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1196
Comment#
1 Add more about why 'unmanaged recreation' is one of four major threats to national forests. Why is it a problem? Use your meeting as a forum to educate attendees about unrestricted use or problems resulting from ORVs.
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Set some 'operating principles' before you start presentation, such as one person speaking at a time, respect others' opinions, etc.
Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1197
Comment#

1 Please do not allow illegally created trails and roads to be considered for legal use - now or in the future.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1198
Comment#

1 We should keep as many of the existing roads and trails open to allow for dispersed recreation and plan for future users!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Avoid overcrowding

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Please leave them open unless there are multiple parallel roads!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1199
Comment#

1 Can Forest set aside a sacrifice area of 100 or so acres for all to enjoy. This area could eliminate lots of problems.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1200
Comment#

0 No Comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1201
Comment#

1 The impacts on the land, wildlife, and noise are documented.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 There should be no motorized "trails" specially set aside.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 This plan overall is a good step and a 53% reduction is a good step.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1202
Comment#

Letter# 1202
Comment#
1 This single track trail is very erosion prone die to fire damage and should be closed to motorized traffic.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 1203
Comment#
1 417B and 417BA Trails near Aspen Ranch - If you allow motorized access here, it will spread into the Borrego trail area. This is not a good idea.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 1204
Comment#
1 No ATV Park
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1205
Comment#
1 After examining the maps, and comparing the way things are now with the proposed changes, it appears the SFNF is moving forest management in a positive direction in regard to resource protection and long-term forest health.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 Enforcement efforts should become more efficient through tightening up the system and on-trail requirements. I urge the SFNF to implement the proposed changes.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1206
Comment#
1 Please keep all our national forest land safe for future generations. If someone else's use of public land makes it difficult or impossible for me to hike and camp with a quite surrounding, that isn't fair.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1207
Comment#
1 In general, no answer was given as to how rule will be enforced, who will enforce it? How can FS create an unenforceable proposed action? There is NO rationale here!
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1208
Comment#
1 Please respond to area residents calls to increase patrols
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1208
Comment#

2 Please grade Forest Road #79.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 Please clean up trash from illegal dumping
Public Concern # 44 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 Put up road closed or road open signs along FR#79. Please pur Road Closed sign up at Old Forest Trail.
Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

5 Please close off to motorized traffic all unauthorized routes.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1209
Comment#

1 Please leave as much alone as possible plain and very simple.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 1210
Comment#

1 I expect a wide range of alternative; more than 5 would be realistic.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1211
Comment#

1 As a licensed outfitter my camp is located in Trail Creek. The amount of ATV traffic in this area is very high and very discouraging for my clients and myself.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1212
Comment#

1 The approved 1987 SF Plan identified Forest Road 637 between Gascon and Sparks Canyon as "Closed to the Public". Possbily because it was in an area "A" designation which has "emphasis on timber production and enhancement of wildlife habitat diversity." Unless there is a good reason to change this "closed" designation, it should remain as such or a definitive rationale must be provided.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1213
Comment#

Letter# 1213
Comment#

0 Duplicate of John O'Malia letter dated 7/21/2008

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1214
Comment#

1 I am very skeptical about the ability of a few forest rangers and the occasional Sheriff's deputy to regulate the behavior of OHV users in the vast areas of New Mexico's forests.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I think OHV use should be restricted to those Forest Service roads that are already open to r and trucks.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1215
Comment#

1 They hold a sincere concern in respect to the traditional values of the land with regard to the harm that has already been done as well as the threat of further damage and destruction that would lead to the inevitable demise of an existence that is a cornerstone of New Mexico culture and tradition.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1216
Comment#

0 Not a comment

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1217
Comment#

1 Motorized trails reduced 54%!!! That is ridiculous! (and that doesn't even include losses due to the loss of cross-country routes)!

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The reduction in roads alone represents a radical change from current policy.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Many closures are not sensitive to the need of recreational ATV/motorcycle users for loops (safety/interest).

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 Reasons for closing specific routes should be available for review.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 21 Request for information

Letter# 1217
Comment#
5 There should be a method to propose changes/additions to existing trail. Including construction of new trails to create better loops.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

Letter# 1218
Comment#
1 The trails submitted by the Black Feather Alliance should be in the proposed maps.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1219
Comment#
1 The popovers are used for access to many of the upper trails.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1220
Comment#
1 The old fence line trail gives access to the teakettle rock area
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1221
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1222
Comment#
0 Add to mailing list request
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1223
Comment#
1 I believe that the trails should be open to all to enjoy.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1224
Comment#
0 Not a comment.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1225
Comment#

Letter# 1225
Comment#

1 The proposed action is a good step toward balancing wildlife, scenery, valuable artifacts with human needs for recreation. Personally, I would prefer more.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Also, limiting the large sound footprint from low flying small aircrafts.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1226
Comment#

1 Still plead the case for banning ATV use on public lands, and I bed for the consideration for their potential in the future.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1227
Comment#

1 The open trails included in the proposal are only a small amount of trails requested and used for motorized recreation. We insist the EIS include a full analysis if all routes that have been submited by users.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1228
Comment#

1 We need acces to FR144 via Fr104 from Thompson Ridge closing this section gives no access to Fr144.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1229
Comment#

0 Duplicate.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1230
Comment#

1 Camping should be allowed along all routes in the final plan within the planned 150 - 300 ft. designated boundary.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Do not limit the specific locations only as this will group users together and reduce the peace and tranquility we go camping for.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1231
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Recod of conversation
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1232
Comment#

1 I would only plead with you - as a citizen of this world for 77 years and a resident in NM for 11 years that we don't allow this wonderful nature to disappear right before our eyes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I don't know how many bikers use these trails - however - you must have seen the erosion caused by them over the past few years.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1233
Comment#

0 Duplicate form letter.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1234
Comment#

1 We take no stand for or against the location of motorized access to dispersed camping shown on the proposed action map number 6. but would strongly oppose any expansion of these areas

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We consider the 300' wide fixed distance corridor indicated in the legend to inappropriate for the specific locations indicated and unnecessarily detrimental to the fragile rangeland in these areas. Although the fixed distance corridor tool is a legitimate tool for access to dispersed camping it must be used sparingly and then only when other available tools are deemed inappropriate.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 there is no compelling need for cross-country motorized travel to access campsites in these areas. The areas indicated provide an abundance of high quality camping opportunities close to the road. The areas indicated are remote, seldom used and there is no need to travel cross-country to obtain privacy or visual seperation from other campers. There are no heavy traffic areas that would require a large setback from the road for safety consideration.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 It is the consensus of the grazing permit holders, traditional ranchers, long-term property owners, residents and others with intimate on-the-ground knowledge of the proposed areas that fixed distance corridor access is not an appropriate solution for the specific areas indicated and that minimizing negative resource impacts can best achieved through roadside parking.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 Motorized vehicles be permitted to pull off the road a distance not to exceed 20' from the edge of the road for the purpose of camping.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 With the exception of two roads we take no stand for or against the location of motorized route designations indicated on the proposed action map number 6 for Glorieita Mesa, but would strongle opposed any expansion of these routes.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 At a meeting with the FS on February 23, 2008, ranchers, permit holders and residents of Glorieta Mesa discussed an area that they believe requires special protection from the negative impacts or recreational ORV traffic. They repsresented this zone graphically on tracing paper overlaying maps provided by the Forest Service. This "living cultural resource protection zone" is depicted in exhibit A.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 Two specific routes, the eastern portion FR-326PE and FR326WA (indictated by dashed lines on exhibit B) within this zone are not necessary for the functioning of a healthy forest and have the potential to ezasperate the negative conditions listed above.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 These roads both connect with FR-326W at their eastern end near a windmill used for stock watering. This windmill has been vandalized several times and on two occasions the water has been diverted onto the ground for mud bogging. On a separate occasion a 4-wheeler stuck mud bogging in an adjacent earth tank winched out using one leg of the windmill for support. This bent the leg and compromised the structural integrity of the tower. Accesss for maintenance and repair of the windmill is historically by way of FR-326W. Providing two superfluous points of access to a rnageland improvement frequentlu vandalized is contrary to the intent of the rule to minimize potential user conflicts when designating routes.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 The eastern portions of these routes parallel themselves and both parallel FR326. This represents a textbook example of conditions to be avoided when establishing a minimum road system. Both routes cut directly across rangeland and represent unnecessary erosion potential. FR 326WA accesses a portion of rangeland which is periodically used as a "party spot" and which on at least one occasion has resulted in bonfires left ablaze and unattended after the party disbanded.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 The eastern portion FR326PE and FR326WA (indicated by dashed line on exhibit B) not be opened to the public for motorized accessm that they be decommissioned and restored to natural condition.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 The motorized camping access shown on the proposed action represents a significant departure from historical patterns of use and has the potential of increasing fire danger, disrupting wildlife, damaging natural resources and interfering with the livelihood of the traditional ranchers who graze on these allotments.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

13 The proposed action opens portions of the Barbaro allotment and a large portion of the Valle Grande allotment up to all classes of motor vehicles and to extensive motorized camping. This proposed change to the historic usage pattern runs the risk of undermining or completely compromising the ability of these areas to continue their contribution to our rural New Mexican heritage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

14 We have discussed our concerns with the Range Improvement Task Force and they are willing to assist the FS in developing a monitoring plan to be managed by the agency as well as to assist in analyzing and interpreting the data.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

Letter# 1234
Comment#

15 The TMP for Glorieta Mesa contain a thorough, science-based monitoring plan with action-oriented management responses to address the problem areas associated with ORV travel.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

16 The TMP for Glorieta Mesa include a provision that requires notification and involvement of the permit holders, in-holders and adjacent property holders before modifying the plan in any way.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1235
Comment#

1 TU is supportive of the PA

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 We seek to minimize impacts on Rio Grande cutthroat trout.We ask the SFNF to reconsider motorized routes, both seasonal and year-round, that have the potential to impact core or conservation populations fo RGCT. Specifically, we are concerned with in stream crossings and motorized routes within 300 feet of streams designated by the USFWS as containing cor or conservation populations of cutthroat trout.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 West side map indicates motorized route designated as 539 along the Rio de Las Vacas. This stream is important to the long-term health of Rio Grande cutthroat in the SFNF and we believe this route is damaging to the fish populations in those watersheds

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

4 West side map indicates motorized route designated as 422A along Polvadera Creek. This stream is important to the long-term health of Rio Grande cutthroat in the SFNF and we believe this route is damaging to the fish populations in those watersheds

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Espanola

Letter# 1236
Comment#

0 Attachment already analyzed

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1237
Comment#

0 Attachment already analyzed

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

0 Duplicate of 1236

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1238
Comment#

1 I am a resident in lower Canoncito, living on Paseo del Valle, and am well aware of the fact that there is some consideration of letting ATV and other off road vehicles turn the Mesa up aboe our house into a playground. One could say I am very concerned.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 I feel this is very unsafe, we bicycle, and walk our dogs on the road every day, and would not have enjoyed this group driving past me and m family while on foot.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1239
Comment#

1 Gordon Spingler discussed the Citizen's alternative porposal with Diane Taliafferro on a few other topics

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Blackfeather upset about the FS referring to the 500 miles of trails that they have provided the FS with as unauthorized routes. It is felt that this is not a fair catagorization of the trails they ride because many of these trails were built 15-30 years ago and the FS allowed and even partnered with them in establishment and development of these trails. They prefer the trails are referred to as user created routes, non-system routes, or single track routes.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Discussed the ID teams educational background and feel that there is not a good representation of motorized users on the team.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Emphasized the importance of long single track looops that have some distance. They are proposing eight long loops in their proposal and would like all of these loops.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 Safety concerns where loop opportunities are on roads open to public motor vehicles. The current PA provides loops that are on system roads that area open to vehicles and this is a safety concern

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 They are willing to ride on roads that will not be open to vehicle travel.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Many of the opportunities that they provided in their alternative are not availiable are not available in the PA

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

8 They are willing to work with us in the future regarding signing, development of TH and parking areas, patroling and maintenance that includes cutting out logs, cleaning drainage features, moving rocks, closing of braids, etc.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1239
Comment#

9 They are willing to work with us in the future regarding signing, development of TH and parking areas, patroling and maintenance that includes cutting out logs, cleaning drainage features, moving rocks, closing of braids, etc.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

10 Blackfeather feels that a majority or the trails on the Jemez District are not in the PA due to the Salamander.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 Blackfeather showed Diane T. a s tate document which has a membership council which dictates activities that could impact this species - salamander -. They looked at what the various categories were and Blackfeather feels the existing trails that they use do not fit because they are not new construction.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1240
Comment#

1 Glorieta Mesa. I would effectively displace the traditional culture of the grazzing permittees

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Cause extreme environmental destruction in the form of erosion, loss or grassland and distruption of wildlife habitat.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 The August 2007 Draft Proposal would have been a threat to rare archeological sites as well as complete nuisance to wood-gathering, hunting and quiet recreation: horseback riding, hiking, and biking.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 We would like to acknowledge the SFNF TMR pre-NEPA team for designing a very well, balanced Proposed Action for Glorieta/Rowe Mesa. Your proposal protects traditional users of the Mesa and quiet recreationists, as well as providing routes for recreation ORVs. It also takes into consideration our fragile soils and the wildlife corrigor.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 We endorse Senator Griego's Alternative Proposal for Glorieta/Rowe Mesa, with the following exceptions:

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 The designation for ATVs should only be on State Hwy34- as a trail designation. No ATV routes in the Grass Banks, or on the rest of Glorieta/Rowe mesa. Our reasoning is that there is no history of ATV use in the Grass Banks, a fragile grassland and ATV riders, by their very nature are encouraged to "Off-Road".

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1241
Comment#

Letter# 1241
Comment#

1 I support your plan for managing and limiting motorized travel in the SFNF.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

2 Motorized vehicle use threatens wildlife habitat.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Motorized vehicles use degrades the experience of users traveling on foot.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1242
Comment#

1 Closing off roads (bad) for atv usage and fire control. My age restricts my access to many areas without motor usage.
Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Closing off roads (bad) for atv usage and fire control.
Public Concern # 50 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 We (4 wheel ATV) do not damage terrain- do not Create new trails.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Do need to retrieve game.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1243
Comment#

1 Taking the number of trails open to such a short distance with the same number of ohvs is asking for safety issues. A lot of these trails are single track that are going to become magnets for head on collision.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 What about a legitimate attemot at policing first?
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1244
Comment#

1 Implement the Citizen's proposal or the no decision/Action proposal.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1244
Comment#

2 The trail maps that you have made up for motorcycles are verry dangerous and have 2 way traffic. These trails will be very congested and there will be a lot of accidents on these trails

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The trail maps that you have made up for motorcycles are verry dangerous and have 2 way traffic. These trails will be very congested and there will be a lot of accidents on these trails

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Motorcycles need more trails to provide recreation experience.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1245
Comment#

1 I do not agree with limiting road access at all.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 I personally utilize forest roads on atvs, enduro motorcycles and dirt bikes with my children. Not only do we ond and have a great time, but I am able to teach them responsible habits and appropriate usage of the natural environment.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 decreasing the usage by so much seems completely unreasonable. Without a comprehensive scientific study directly indicating motorcycle usage more damageing than other usage it seems unconstitutional.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1246
Comment#

1 I believe that all roads should be open to the public, with special permits, aquired by personal schooling and or training. If you don't have this permit than you can only be on designated areas.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We should concentrate on education more than anything else.

Public Concern # 57 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1247
Comment#

1 Spend some time marking the trails, and designating them accordinly. Also learn how to actually manage the open forest as well.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1248
Comment#
0 Not a comment
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1249
Comment#
1 We are interesting in riding 20-40 miles loops.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1250
Comment#
1 The Forest Service needs to adopt the existing used trails and establish a restricted/maintained/enforcable program to address them.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The Forest Service needs to adopt the existing used trails and establis a restricted/maintained/enforcable program to address them.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

3 The Forest Service needs to adopt the existing used trails and establis a restricted/maintained/enforcable program to address them.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

4 A reasonable trail system should not require orv and motorcycles to travel roads shared with cares and trucks to access different trails.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1251
Comment#
1 Disability access to camping areas, restroom facilities, trailhead conviences.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Trail head conviences.Because their disability limits their mobility it is imparative that they are able to rid atvs.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Trail head conviences.Because their disability limits their mobility it is imparative that they are able to rid atvs to scenic orverloos and to streams for fishing. Their access must be given a high priority.
Public Concern # 26 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1252
Comment#
1 Please propose an alternative that minimizes the real closures but closes off road travel.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1253
Comment#

1 I believe we should have more areas to ride trials and camp in the Jemez. We need more than just Lake Fork. We used to be able to ride and camp in many areas like Spruce, Barley, Bear Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 We need more areas for our childrens' future.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1254
Comment#

1 I would like you to consider adding FR160 off of FR100 just south of Youngsville. At the end of FR160 it has some really great views of Abiquiu Lake and surrounding area. This road should be for high clearance 4x4 full size 50 inch or wider. Not just motorcycles or ATVs.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1255
Comment#

1 I am specifically concerned about retaining all existing roads and trails withn a five mile radius from the intersection of Telephone Canyon and the Rio de las Vacas, where I have invested extensively in a mountain cabin. I atv regularly on all existing two-track roads in this area.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

2 The Proposed plan fials to address this increasing demand, as the plan cuts the amount of current roads and trails allowed for motorized uses by over fifty percent.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 The plan does not adequately meet the needs of hunters, anglers, and other recreationalists that need access to remote areas of our public lands; especially elderly citizens who have more time to actually use the forest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 It is obvious that in some Ranger Districts, namely Cuba Ranger District, the objective is to reduce legal road densities to a level that will not meet the minimum needs of the public recreational needs, and will also not meet the FS's administrative and fire suppression needs.

Public Concern # 16 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 The proposed plan will congregate current and future forest users in a much smaller available total area, thereby decreasing the value of the "forest experience" for everybody.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 Allowed road densities in the Cuba Ranger District are less than all other ranger districts, especially the area bounded by the Valle Calderas (west boundary); State Road 126; and Forest Roads 103 315. This indicates to me that the decision for closing roads ins based upon the local Distrcti Ranger's preference over resource management.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

7 I support all designated roads curretly included in the Proposed Action, and I have personally used almost all of them.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

8 I also support increasing the amoung of designated roads and trails.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 I request that the existing dead-end road along moon canyon west of FR 117 be added to the approved map.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

10 I disagree that this road is causing any resource damage- certainly not any more than the nearby FR117, which is sown as a designated road way
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 I question whether FR 17 and FR 201 connect Red Top to San Miguel Canyon. If so, please disregard my question. I support this roadway to be included in the plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

12 Why doesn't FR 527 extend east of FR 117 toward Calveras Canyon. I thought that this was an engineered, graveled arterial roadway that also serves as a gas line maintenance road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

13 I question whether the unnumbered road shown around the east side of the Chaparral Girl Scout Camp connection the Rio de las Vacas (FR 539) to Ojitos mesa (FR 531) exists. If so, please disregard my question. I support this roadway to be included in the plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

14 A few more roads are needed in the area of Mining Mountain to support the recreational uses in this area.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

15 I use and support designating the existing road up Barley Canyon (south of Wolf Canyon) east off of State Road 126.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

16 I use and support designating the existing road up Wolf Canyon along the poer line from Barley Canyon for FR 117
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

17 The roadway (FR 98A) currently shown going off the west side of Bluebird Mesa connecting to FR 533 should be designated as an "under 50" roadway.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

18 It appears that similar roadways are shown differently for different Ranger Districts. This shows a lack or quality control in the planning process. Please note the different legends being used for roads on Rowe Mesa vs. roads designated on the Jemez. Coyote, and Cuba District.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1255
Comment#

19 Forest Road 117 should be improved with a graveled surface immediately for approximately the first one-mile north of State Road 126 to reduce environmental damage.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

20 Many roadways that are being deleted due to "resource damage" (especially in the clay soil areas of the Maciemento mountains) need only a little bit of soil surfacing to make the roadbeds stable.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

21 Water bars used to close roads and divert water flows actually cause more environmental damage as roadway users go around the waterbars. Such is the case now in Moon Canyon west of FR 117.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

22 Most "open" roads are shown as "seasonal". When are the seasons for these roads to be open? Without any of these roads being open for use, the actual allowed road system is diminished much further than the proclaimed " 53 percent" reduction

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

23 The Travel Management Plan does not adequately address the traditional and cultural uses that require motorized travel. These activities include hunting, camping, fishing, and motorized travel itself.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

24 Why doest motorcycle use get 50% more exclusively designated trails than "under 50" trails"? ATV use is certainly more prevalent than motorcycle use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

25 I support the recent closure of the area adjacent to the Rio de las Vacas south of the private property boundary where the Telephone Canyon wetlands enter the Rio de las Vacas.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

26 I support closing of the road leading to the corral inside this enclosure. Dispersed camping in this area before the closure was beginning to cause environmental damage.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

Letter# 1256
Comment#

1 The NMTA submitted 6-7 proposed riding areas by means of maps and GPS coordinated. Only one of the proposed areas has been included in the current proposal. This almost entirely cuts this user group off from use of the public land. Areas Submitted" Lake Fork, Barley Canyon, Bland Canyon, Cochiti Canyon, Spruce Canyon, Bear Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1257
Comment#

1 Implement Citizen's Proposal
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Please take no action on these proposals.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The current proposed action is unreasonable.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 All trails included in Citizen's proposal should be implemented in the travel management plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 77 non- looping miles out of 277 is unreasonable.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1258
Comment#

1 I have been losing riding areas for my motorcycling for the last 30 uears and it is very unfair and emotionally upsetting.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1259
Comment#

1 Mile Marker 36, Hwy 4. The proposed change will not give me access to the forest on my ATV. Would like to work out a way there so I can access the Forest Trail from my property.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1260
Comment#

1 The elimination of all but one historic area from motorcycle trails is not acceptable.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1261
Comment#

1 Please work with applicable uses that require areas for their use and create these areas within the proposal.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1262
Comment#

Letter# 1262
Comment#

1 Keep the roads open at least 80% of the existing roads/trails including user created trails.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Keep the Jeep-/4wd trails that those groups are proposing.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1263
Comment#

1 I noticed that the 12 miles of single track trail on Glorieta Mesa were not included on your Proposed Action map. This relatively small amount of trail aren't hurting anything and will allow some of the younge men that live in the Santa FE area a place to ride, without traveling long distances, such as the Jemez Mountains to recreate.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1264
Comment#

1 If the propsal to ban access to some of the trails are approved, then give us an alternative area. We area not so wedded to thos areas. Simply put, please do no legislate restrictions such as those proposed. Let us have the freedomws we now enjoy.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1265
Comment#

1 In Croom you were required to provide ownership of ORV and pay a yearly fee. This not only provided funds for the area but also kept the dedicated useres aware of the area.The forest dept. provide yearly stickers to put on your orv and have a check point guard to insure compliance.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1266
Comment#

1 I don’t think any area should be closed. The environment has been okay and will be okay. Jkust do not open anymore that way what is not touched will be preserved and the animals will be okay.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Closing so much space is going to agrivate people, then it will no longer be an enjoyable place to go.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1267
Comment#

1 I fail to see how the proposed action serves the public.

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1267
Comment#

2 I think there is to many special interests being served.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1268
Comment#

1 Why close thr trail parallel to 144. It connects major loops and is one of my favorite trails.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1269
Comment#

1 Our concern is access to the 32-acre tract of land we have owned since May 1978. It is located at the head of Arroyo Hondo just a few hundred feet from the watershed: W/2 of Tract 35, R 107E, I7N, S35

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 FR 79 ends at the trail head for the hiking station, about four miles north of Canada de Las Alamos. The maps show that FR 79 originally continued on north along Arroyo Hondo through what was at one time private land and continuing on through our 32 acres ending as the histroical source for watershed access.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

3 In the transaction, the SFNF in the appraisal (by the SFNF) and in the warranty deed, recognizes the right of private use of an easement along FR 79 to Mary Lopez to reach a tract she owned in the East half of Tract 35, adjoining our acreage. I don't see this recognized in your plans.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

4 The non-recognition of FR 79 as access to out 32-acres and that of another 11 property owners in the Eastern half of Tract 35, does not seem to indicate traditional access or access will be provided.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 Also, is OHV or off road behciles the best classification for this access?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1270
Comment#

1 When we were out there this Sept 12-21/08 we were informed that the canyon is being considered to have off road motor vehicles, and motor bikes [routes 89 and 113] run through the canyon. Both theres roads are being considered for motor bike roads.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The impact of the motor bikes traffic, and off road vehicles is pacting the bio-region. We call for a briological study of the region before motor bikes are allowed to impact the area. Not only the for the plants but for the plants but for the animals inhabiting the region.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1270
Comment#

3 We request you carefully consider the contracts you are being asked to undertake and to consider a greater picture that has to do with our future, and our children's future.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1271
Comment#

1 From campsites on FR270 in the Jemez District, there are only a few connected routes to other trails that would form a loop. The areabeside FR270 and FR 268 needs to be evaluated and some loops for atvs put in place.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1272
Comment#

1 data collected during the work week will be skewed low since most recreation occurs on the weekends.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Visitation on those routes proposed open is likely to be significantly lower than normal as motorized recreationists seek to enjoy the impending loses while we can and saving those routes that are currently believed to survive this latest round of cuts.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 I urge you to plan accordingly to disperse the recreationists rather than to concentrate them.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 To expand road opportunities by closing loops rather than closing roads and thereby reducing opportunities.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

5 it only makes sense to disperse and reduce visitor density to redce impacts and conflicts.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

6 I have noticed, and commented, that the miles of roads available, the areas available, and the opportunities in general for motorized recreation on the National Forest system have continued to erode significantly during this time of increased interest.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 One might conclude that the agency's apparent management goals are to overly concentrate the mechanized visitors, sacrificing the resource to do so, and to then ultimately exclude, due to now legitimate resource damage brought on by this concentration, all visitors other than the few (<2%) who seek out designated Wilderness.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

8 I would suggest that a better strategy would be for the agency to try to plan for, and meet, in a resource friendly way, the continued growth of mechanized recreation rather than continue to follow the destructive path of user concentration that seems to have been so prevalent over the past 15-20 years.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

9 There seems to be a tendency of non-motorized users to perceive much more user-conflicts than is felt by my fellow four-wheelers.
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

10 All of the existing and /or proposed routes mentioned here and indicated on the hard copy maps I have ":marked up' in the nearest NF office should become part of the new OHV designation.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 The agency should look for opportunities to create loop routes from parallel or nearby existing loops.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

12 Further, it helps to diversify the opportunity for your visitors by allowing for longer backcountry trips with more dispersed, [romitive, camping and greater opportunities for solitude for the mechanized recreationist.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 I strongly support thorough, objective, environmental review and analysis as a part of any route designation process.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

14 As part of ongoing monitoring and subsequent appropriate maintenance of agency managed recreational infrastructure if necessary.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

15 I do not support, however, is being presented with a "range" of management alternatives which all represent a significant reduction in all OHV opportunities.
Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

16 I do not support is the ongoing concentration of forest visitors dierectly resulting from the widespread elimination of legal recreational options.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

17 Nor can I accept your assertion that this concentration will not have a deleterious effect on the resrouces without first reviewing the data collection and interpretation methods.
Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

18 What I especially do not support is the agency claiming, as an end goal, to build a 'sustainable road and trail system for motorized recreation only to find that, after numerous comment sheets, letters and map markings, the provided maps and proposed alternative previously presented, seemingly ignore virtually all of the motorized community's input preferences, or worse, has been used to find additional routes for closure.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

19 It is also important for the agency to acknowledge that an overwhelming majority (if not all given that the SF is an 'Open' forest) of the so called ' user-created' trails (many are actually older agency created or timber sale created routes which have been eliminated from the agency 'system' through previous travel planning efforts) on the forest are currently legal for motorized use.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

20 It is also important to note that the agency has a full range of options, including closure, if and ONLY if the totality of current users is resulting in significant resrouce damage which cannot be either corrected or eliminated through proper management, which, of course, must not be the case if further visitor concentration is not, as you assert, damaging.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

21 I belive that closure of any resource to the public is a failure in the agency's resource management and Not generally a legitimate tool for routine use, although it is all too frequently used as such.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

22 Close coordiantion with other agencies to ensure maps and route markings are consistent with one another and legitimate routes do not dead end into closed routes.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 14 "Vote" rather than an issue or concern

23 The agency must choose what level of impact is acceptable. In order to determine what that level is for a given trail or road, there must be quantifiable criteria and verifiable facts to justify closing that road or trail.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

24 Criteria for closing a route to OHV use must not be more, or less, stringent, than the criteria for non-motorized use.

Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

25 Please explain, in detail, in the DEIS haw continued reductions in opportunities, serves the increasing demand for mechanized access.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

26 Explain how the increasing visitation is planned to be addressed

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

27 How does the agency plan to reconcile existing emergency closures of selct routes in the planning process? Will these routes require complete, separate, NEPA evaluation prior to reopening or will they be assumed as existing system routes for this exercise? When will the emergency closures be lifted and the routes reopened or will the closures become permanent?

Public Concern # 37 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

28 How will the ultimate system maps be promulgated? Will the traditional FS maps still be available? Will there be some form of disclaimer or caveat that these maps are no incompatable with the legal road system. I would suggests that each major access point to the SFNF have the most current system maps available so that recreationists can comple with the changes. This could be done via kiosk, Staff standing by, etc. Perhaps an RTF education grant?

Public Concern # 54 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

29 Will updates or changes to the system map, which the agency has assured the public can be made annually, require additional full NEPA evaluation? If so, this would seemingly preclude the annual updates assured at the scoping meetings. If not, why not?

Public Concern # 15 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

30 What provision will there be to ensure a variety in the challenge levels of remaining routes? System roads should not be required to conform to the agency's, or anyone else's , transportation requirments, maintenance requirements, or travel flow requirments.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

31 Since the stated intent of this exercise is to provide the users with a trail system they want, is it possible to form a council of users to help the agency direct the evolution of the system? Can the agency contract the New Mexico OHV Alliance to provide consulltancy services to help steer development of the system?

Public Concern # 15 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

32 I feel I must insist that all motorized routes on the forest be included in the full analysis, including both 'system' and 'non-system'.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

33 I must incist, that all existing routes, including those screened out in the TAP, everything the users submitted, and everything else all the motorized users have been using or are using. Remember, motorized recreation is just one of the many motorized uses in the Forest

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

34 'Habitat fragmentation' should not be used as a reason to not designate a route for motorized use. Banning motorized users from roads and trails will continue to exist and be used by all the other forest users, and motorized use by the Forest Service, private land inholders and permittees will continue. Reality would suggest that the mere presence of a road does not, in fact, fragment habitat if the road can easily and safely be traversed by wildlife.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

35 All of the supporting documentation used in the in analysis and ecision making for the DEIS must be disseminated, either by mailing hard copy to previous commenters or posed on the website as .pdf files as soon as the DEIS is published.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

36 Complete maps MUST be provided as soon as possible and/or the comment period must be extended. The eleven Proposed Action Maps don't even have lebels on the separate road segments ' analyzed' but there is no corresponding map with that level of detail.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

37 You must define exactly what standards you are applying for identifying and analyzing trails.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

38 Routes should not be closed to motorized recreation unless they can show direct causality between motorized use and significant harm. The agency must provide the specific criteria it will use to decide which routes to designate, and identify what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

39 The proposed action 'decommissions' a lot of roads, literally thousands or miles. Please define 'de-commissioning' and exactly what the agency's plan is for each of those roads.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

40 The agency must evaluate the condition of all of the 'non-system' routes submitted by the various OHV users.
Public Concern # 40 **FS Response:** 4 Already part of the proposed Action

41 The criteria for route closure and for acceptable impacts must not be more stringent for OHV routes than for non-OHV routes.
Public Concern # 28 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

42 Road density targets should not be used as a reason to not designate a route for motorized use.
Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

43 Analysis should include the published studies which also show that impacts caused by roads in use by non-motorized users are similar to those of motorized users. Road impacts should not be confused with, or used interchangeably with trail impacts.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

44 The Forest Service must carefully analyze alternate funding sources and the impact of volunteer labor on trail maintenance costs.
Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

45 The agency must do a full analysis of options if a road/route/trail is identified as a resource concern. They should include a full range of options on correcting the concern.
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

46 In the case of claims of watershed damage, the agency must provide measurements of the background count of sil movement from the watershed.
Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

47 The Forest Service must implement a complete monitoring system.
Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

48 The goals should include specifics of what the system must offer in terms of connectivity, variety of topography, and diversity of challenge. Describe the requirements for the designated system to include a diversity of elevations to extend seasons of use.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

49 Lack of funding should not be used as an excuse to close roads and trails to motorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

50 Trails identified as having resource issues must include details where the perceived propblems are, the extent of the potential problem and possible corrections short of route closure.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

51 The agency must present evidence of actual impacts on wildlife, and not just assume impacts exist because motorized vehicles are on trails and roads in habitat areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

52 The analysis should include the current information on recreation trends.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

53 The purpose and need should reflect that the trends show motorized recreation is growing and non-motorized recreation is decreasing. The designated motorized route system should be designed to serve the growing need.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

54 No motorized trails should be closed unless absolutely necessary and there is no way to correct problem areas.

Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

55 Connected cohesive loops are very imprtatnt to motorized users, especially to motorcyclists and ATV'ers. Interspersing too many road segments with trail segments has a negative effect on the ejoyment of the user and this impact must be fully analyzed in the DEIS.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

56 The agency simply must not make unfounded assumptions about what specific visitor group is damaging cultural resources.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

57 The agency must recognize that theft from ancient sites is a crime independent of the type of access used, whether the person came on foot, on horse, or in a motorized vehicle.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

58 Closing trails which hold cultural resources to motorised use, but leaving them open to others is clearly discriminatory.

Public Concern # 29 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

59 I am concerned that the designated systems will not be properly designed to serve the recreational needs of the mechanized visitors.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

60 The analysis should include successful motorized recreation systems from across the country.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

61 I remain concerned, and more than a bit skeptical, regarding the agency's assertion that the further concentration of users does not lead to additional resource damage.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

62 each new initiative by the agency to define, or manage, or control, the growth and use of the OHV on public lands has lead to widespread loss of existing opportunities, this latest scheme appears to also be heading in that direction with some proposals taking another half of current system roads.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

63 I cannot accept, absence any reputable data to support it, the contention by the agency that this is increased, and increasing, concentration of visitors does not lead to additional resource damage.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

64 I am likewise concerned that the growth trends in OHV recreation are not properly appreciated by the agency and will not be adequately considered in the development of the final system.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

65 The analysis must look at the recreation budget and reapportion how the money is allocated. Currently there are only five miles of trails officially designated as motorized. This means that no fundws have ever been assigned to motorized trails in the past.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

66 The analysis of costs must acknowlledge that the motorized trails and roads are open to all non-motorized users also. This means any funds spent on maintaining motorized trails benefits all users, including hikers, mtn bikers and horse riders. By contrast, funds spent on Wilderness trails benefit only hikers and horse riders.

Public Concern # 33 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

67 I will simply state that I would be strongly in support of the retention of all system roads indicated on the 1975 edition of the agency map plus all so called 'user-created' routes presented to the agency to date.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

68 Trails which have been identified as having resource damage issues must have real damage that has been verified on site. It is not acceptable to merely look at maps or aerial photos and assume a trail is creating resource damage because it, for example, goes through a mapped area of 'sensitive soils'.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

69 Further, the agency must acknowledge that all trails being used by OHVs are also being used by every other type of user.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

70 The analysis must examine the studies showing the negative impacts from non-motorized users, and balance that with the impacts of motorized users. Motorized use should not be banned when other users contribure similar impacts but are allowed to continue using the trails.

Public Concern # 4 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

71 Primitive system roads should not be maintained other than to reduce resource damage and then minimally. My concern is that the few remaining road segments left after this exercise will be maintained to a trnasportation standard which renders them useless to the mechanized recreationist.

Public Concern # 46 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

72 roads and trails should not be closed to motorized use because of unsubstantiated, general, unmeasured and vague statements that motorized use on routes is damaging to wildlife. The analysis should include the published studies which show animals and birds are more afraid of hikers, especially hikers with dogs, than they are of motor vehicles.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

73 The agency must acknowledge that the trails would continue to exist and be used by others, and continue to be a source of soil movement even if there is no motorized use.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 8 Describes an effect of No Action

Letter# 1272
Comment#

74 The analysis should not make accusations that motorized recreation causes or leads to the 'harassment' of wildlife unless they have proof of deliberate harassment steming from motorized recreation

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

75 Road numbering and status are often not coordinated with other land management agencies resulting in user confusion and the inadvertant violation of closures.

Public Concern # 49 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

76 RS 2477 status should be considered prior to any decision to close a route even if an assertion under the statute has not yet been made. It is far easier to retain the route if it so qualifies pending assertion than to restore it after the fact.

Public Concern # 47 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

77 The sham that is the latest 'Travel Management' effort will result in a significant and unjustified reduction of legal roadb-based motorized opportunities at a time when motorized recreation is growing at an unprecedented rate. You have an opportunity to not only build something that is necessary and which will benefit both the forest resource and the visitors but also provides the opportunity to educate those ever increasing numbers of new motorized visitors in responsible, legal, OHV use and it appears to me that you've chosen to ignore these opportunities. I believe strongly that the agency's failure to adequately balance and respect the needs of those visitors most affected by this effot will lead to far greater long term problems than would a truly balanced and well considered plan that does address the needs of your constituency.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1273
Comment#

1 I wrote to you, Steve and Michael during the 45 day TMP response time regarding my families land in More NM, near Morphy Lake. We are most eager to learn about your plans in our area, specifically if you are going to pursue public through our propery as we are in the process of building a home there.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1274
Comment#

1 Please leave the existing trail network as is including the user designed trails so that current and future riders will have the chance to use these trails and experience the wonders of the forest. Manage the forest, please do not close it.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1275
Comment#

1 Please consider FR 315 "Old Sky Trail" and FR 315 "Fenceline Trail" as alternative in the second scoping period as these trails will keep riders off of the main road for safety reasons due to the fact that the high traffic volume of vehcles and the speeds they travel could involve a motorcycle and vehicle causing great bodily damage or even death.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1276
Comment#
1 Please consider the Water Canyon Trail from Thompson Ridge to state road 126 in your alternative plan.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1277
Comment#
1 Please consider keeping the entire trail that runs along FR144 open for safety reasons due to the fact that many vehicles travel that road at higher speeds than safe and there could be a collision between a vehicle and an off road motorcycle causing great bodily harm or even death
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1278
Comment#
1 The appropriate use of the trails and lands that are being considered for motorcycles only should remain as it has for centuries. Foot traffic only. The residents of Cochiti Lake live in these areas, along with native americans, to enjoy the natural beauty and peace- the proposal to convert to motorycle use would destroy the [traditional] use.
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1279
Comment#
1 I am in strong opposition to the proposed action for motorized route and will support any and all activities to prevent this route activity.
Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1280
Comment#
1 I have been using this road with my faimly for the past 45 years. I am asking you to please not close this road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1281
Comment#
1 I would like to see areas that have endangered species pinpointed so there could be a possibility of building a go around from that area
Public Concern # 5 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1282
Comment#
1 I applaud the decision to reduce motorized vehicles on publicly-owned land.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 Vehicles disrupt habitat, pollute air, erode and scar the ground, destroy the quiet, and burn fossil fuel contributing to global warming.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1282
Comment#

3 As a sport, ATVs can be dangerous and do not provide good physical exercise.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1283
Comment#

1 FR 144 on north rim of Caldera. We are asking the VCnp to allow access to views of the Valles Caldera. One is the FS viewpoint at Hunter's Point (Annie Apodaca said she is familiar with it.)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1284
Comment#

1 more efforts need to be taken in order to preserve the beauty and wildness of the forest which has been disturbed by the reckless and unthinking use of off-road vehicles.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Any trail or road that has been illegally constructed by off-road vehicle users should be closed, especially those within areas already designated as off-limits to off-road vehicles. Giving them these trails is an affront to justice and the rule of law.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 Any road or trail that dead-ends on private property should be closed, as this will only cause conflicts between landowners and off-road vehicle users who believe that they should be able to cross private property in order to use any trail they wish. Similarly, in a number of places, especially around Del Norte and Bland Canyons, sections oftrail between private lands are open, while the parts of those trails that cross private land are closed

Public Concern # 72 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 Any trail or road that could cause damage to artifacts ofNew Mexico's rich cultural heritage, such as ruins, sacred places, and relics of past times, should be closed to prevent the sullying of our heritage.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 I believe that all ofTrail 113, also known as the Bland-Frijoles Trail, should be closed, as it is a traditional corridor for non-motorized traffic and many parts are in poor condition as a result of the abuses of off-road vehicle users

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1285
Comment#

Letter# 1285
Comment#

1 I support the closing of all roads to the east of Road 50-A to general public access, as shown on the proposed map #lo. Further, is my opinion the Road 50-A should be open ONLY to street legal, licensed vehicles. The southern drainage of Los Alamitos Canyon terminates with an extensive reclamation area which includes a seasonal stream, several small wetlands and large areas of old mine tailings covered by a waterproof membrane.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 Current HOV traffic routinely violates this protected area.Road 50-A is used to access private property holdings in and around the Los Alamitos drainage. It passes through several parcels of private property before it reaches the boundary of the Santa Fe National Forest. Consequently, it is evident that this road needs to be open to licensed, street legal vehicles for access to these private properties which utilize the 50-A road as a means of access. However, to open this road to OHV's will invite more violations of the sort mentioned above and will promote possible damage to the reclamation project's membrane. Additionally, the Los Alamitos drainage provides a relatively unspoiled wildlife habitat, the wetlands being used as stopovers for migrating water fowl and nesting grounds for seasonal birds. It is evident that increased OHVtraffic in this area will disrupt the resident and transient wildlife populations, with little added recreational value for OHV riders.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1286
Comment#

1 Rt# 10. It is already a gated private property road. Thru the years they have spent countless time, effort and money to improve the road to their now built home. To open an access road thru their property would destroy over twenty years of hard work that went into making their retirement dreams.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1287
Comment#

1 Please keep FR 106 open from Thompson Ridge to Fr 144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1288
Comment#

1 Ron Poulson and myself have both requested these Blue Diamond trails be left open for summer motorcycle riding. We have listened to Mike Dechter reasons for closer and I request these trails be listed in the FSNF Proposed Action to be analyzed by the NEPA process.You have all the GPS and know all of these trails.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1289
Comment#

1 I have noticed a large inconsistency between EA for timber salvage and single track trails. There's "no problem" with erosion, salamanders, or falcons when it comes to selling timber in the burn area near Cuba. BUT when it comes to a lone single track trail cutting through the woods all the same reasons seem to be a reason to close it down!

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1290
Comment#
1 Due to the fact that the TAP has not been truly usable for most people until this week (08/13) I feel extending the comment period is only reasonable.
Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1291
Comment#
1 I had heard that the Fish and Game had closed Media Dia Trail due to the Peregrine Falcon being on the Endangered Species List. Peregrine Falcon is no longer on that list it has moved to the Threatened List. If that is true than Media Dia should be reopened. Last I heard not even the mountain bikers can use that trail.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1292
Comment#
1 I would like the Proposed Action to have a plan to monitor OHV users satisfaction. I noticed at camp grounds the Forest Service is interested in camper satisfaction. I feel that with the largest change to motorized travel in the history of the forest this is a basic requirement to keep in touch with motorized users of the forest.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1293
Comment#
1 I read in the Proposed Action pages 12-13 Desired Condition Trails you use all the right words to describe what a single track trail rider would want BUT the Proposed Action does not meet your own goal as described.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1294
Comment#
1 THIS IS A REDUE OF MY MOST CONFUSING COMMENT! More than half of the SFNF is presently closed to single track trail riding. Considering the large amount of the forest that motorcycles can't ride in the argument that we lessen the outdoor experience for the hikers is not compelling. HIKERS CAN HIKE WHERE THEY WON'T HEAR MOTORCYCLES IN THE OTHER HALF OF THE FOREST! Hikers near Santa Fe motorcycles near the Jemez.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1295
Comment#
1 I ask you to please consider the New Mexico Four Wheeler's Citizen's Proposal.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 There is room for all users, from the hunter to the hiker to the Jeeper to enjoy the forest in harmony, without barring anyone access from the current trail network.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1296
Comment#
1 Closing ofFS 154 located in Tl9N, RJE, Sections 7 and 18 Horseshoe Springs Association Incorporated (HSA Inc.), whose property basically parallels FS 154 on its east side, has no objection to your closing this road. In fact we will applaud its closure. 'However, we will require an "Administrative Use Only" permit for a short section ofthe road for the following two reasons. We have a USFS Special Use permit to operate and maintain our water system. I am not sure how to reference the permit so you can verify. It was issued on 02/13/98. Holder number is 4049-0 I and was signed by Leonard Atencio on the issued date. The cover letter has a File Code: 2720. We also need access to FS 154 to get into the canyon on the north side of our property.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1297
Comment#
1 391CA :I am totally opposed to the Forest Service considering establishing a road in this area. Iwas born and raised on Gascon Ranch and still maintain some management oversight of the ranch. This will provide for unnecessary and excessive vehicle traffic in the area.Along with this traffic comes the threat of a cigarette being tossed out and thus an ensuing wildfire. There are NO areas of the National Forest attraction areast hat will be accessible by a road in this area. There are no camping sights, it is all heavily timbered and steep terrain.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1298
Comment#
1 51C-51D - Soaring Hawk Trail. Please keep Atvs out of here.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1299
Comment#
1 Our hiking trip was completely spoiled by encounters with inconsiderate motorcyclists who obviously didn't think they needed to cede to pedestrians - tempting me to think sharing trails with motorcyclists is impossible.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1300
Comment#
1 Why not charge a fee or require a license for motorized traffic in national parks to pay for the damage caused by ATV's, motorcycles?

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1301
Comment#
1 Restrict them to the main road if their aren't outlawed.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

Letter# 1301
Comment#
1 It is time to remove all ATVs and OHVs from out Santa Fe National Forest. The destruction caused should serve as a glimpse of what is going to enventually destroy our forests if ATVs and OHVs are allowed to continue creating hundreds of trails throughout the forest.

Public Concern # 43 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1302
Comment#
1 We have lived in this area for nearly 30 years and it is a constant battle to keep the forest clean. We need to take better care of our forest and limit driving there.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1303
Comment#
1 Pleasekeep Forest Road number 106 open from Thompson Ridge to Forest Road number 144.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1304
Comment#
1 CR 83c and 83CB: These roads should remain closed to motorized vehicles. Many places are erroding badly due to vehicles driving on them. Wherever vehicles are driven there is trash.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1305
Comment#
1 391CA: I am opposed to the Forest Service considering establishing any kind of road in this area. My husband was born and raised on Gascon Ranch and is still involved with the management of the ranch. This area is rugged and pristine. The ranch and the National forest compliment one another and the forestry management practices in use at the ranch have been to the benefit of the forest. Establishing public access with a new road to this remote area will serve no purpose other than bring in an increased threat of wild fire during fire season, increased wildlife habitat destruction, increased wildlife poaching and increased trespassing on the private lands in the area.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1306
Comment#
1 391: I am opposed to the Santa Fe National Forest Services proposed opening of a year round open road through my property located in Sparks Canyon. The Forest Service does not have an easement through my property and I am not willing to give an easement for such a road. The proposed road would only create more problems for me in protecting my property from trespassers.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1307
Comment#

Letter# 1307
Comment#
1 391: The US Forest Service does not have an easement through my property and I do not want a road to open up for the use by the general population.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1308
Comment#
0 Formletter
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1309
Comment#
1 There is no recorded access to Santa Fe National Forest through Gascon Ranch there is no reason to build roads into this forest now. I listed, copied directly from the USFS, SFNF map the 7 basic reasons why a road should never be built in this section of SFNF: 1. Wildlife Habitat Protection, 2. Water Quality and Erosion Control. 3. Public Safety 4. Conflict of Use 5 Legal Mandates 6 Special Seasonal Closures 7 Fire Danger
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

2 As budget cuts continue in all forest management areas, there is obviously no monies available to enforce the 7 point directive as listed.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1310
Comment#
1 391CA: I strongly feel that this location should not even be considered, for several reasons. My extended family make our living "off the land", or, off of our long owned ranch . The thought (or threat) of allowing access for more people "through' our property flat scares me....you would be putting MY "savings account" as well as my "retirement account" (the standing timber! and trees) at high risk to fire.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1311
Comment#
1 391CA: PleaseDO NOT even consider opening a road in this area! I am familiar with this area of the National Forest and its proximity to our ranch as well as several other private land owners in the immediate area
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1312
Comment#
1 391CA: I am very opposed to the USFS considering establishing a road in this area.There are no National Forest features accessible in this area and the road would lead to no where. It would, however, have a definite negative impact on our ranch aswell asthe neighboring private lands. My biggest concern with a new road in this area is the increased threat of wild fire due to increased vehicular traffic.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1313
Comment#

Letter# 1313
Comment#

1 The increasing use of off road vehicles on the existing hiking trails in this area, plus the extensive trails created by the motorcycle riders in the last 6 years has had a very negative impact on our community.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The Travel Management Map shows a number of short roads that corss onto private property in our community but are not used by the property owners. In fact, there "roads" are impassable to anything but off road vehicles. They include roads 286D, 268A and 268B. Keeping these roads open will only continue to encourage off road vehicles to trespass onto private property

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 The trail connecting 286AB to 268 is used by motorcyclists to access roads that lead to private property. Closing it would help greatly in reducing the problem. Also the one road that I have highligheer in light blue does not exist where shown and should be removed from the map.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 The lower part of Cochiti Mesa has many more trails created by motorcycle riders than is shown on your map. Under the proposal, only trails 286F, 286FA, and 286FAD are to remain open. How do you propose to keep the users of these 3 trails off of all the many other trails in this same area? Other than having a law enforcement officer there every weekend, it isn't going to happen, all the trails will continue to be used regardless of your plan. The only way to prevent the use of the closed trails is to close all the trails on the lower part of Cochiti Mesa.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

5 The upper end of Medio Dia Canyon is a very special place with both Jemez Salamanders and Cutthroat Trout. Please close roads 188B and 188D to protect this beautiful place.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 The map of seasonally open roads shows 268 and 268A as open year round to the public. These roads have always been closed during the winter with the gate at the junction of 268 and Highway 4 locked. Please continue to keep these roads closed in the winter.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Despite the claims of the motorcycle riders that they do extensive trail maintenance, my experience shows this not to be true. They do cut the trees that fall across the trails they use. As a hiker, fallen trees across a trail are not an issue for me. What is a problem is the severe trail erosion caused by the motorcycles. Trails that were once easy to walk on are now a deep V shaped groove.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Until the Forest Service has the money to do the necessary trail repairs, or the motorcyclists do it themselves, I ask you to close all of the erosion damaged trails to off road vehicle use.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1313
Comment#

9 Finally, I can see nothing in the Travel Management Plan that preserves any long distance trails for motorless travel. The plan favors motorized travel in giving them long segments of roads and trails and hikers and equestrians lose everything we had. Closing trail 113 to motorized vehicles be a small step toward resolving this issue.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1314
Comment#

1 I fully support the proposal by State Senator Phil Griego

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

1 I have ridden thousands of miles off-road through New Mexico and the desert Southwest and can say from first hand experience that "off readers", particularly ATV's are causing irreversible damage to our fragile desert.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 there is a largely silent group of motorcyclists that agree that things have gone too far, and this group has failed to curb it's member's abuse of the land and abuse of the residents of the communities that they ride in. To give voice to riders like myself that put the environment and their communities first, I have founded an organization called the New Desert Rats (www.newdesertrats.org) to advocate for preserving the deserts, particularly from off-road abuse.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 there are more than enough remote roads and single track trails on the draft proposed action map to keep me (and any other advanced rider) happy and busy for days.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 There is no reason to increase the density of trails. The only outcome of that is to ruin all of the above mentioned benefits, and to attract more i'non-local" riders who have no connection to the community or the land, and who's main motivation is to tear into virgin land, regardless of what is on a map.

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 plan for success by limiting the plan to what is enforceable by the Forest Service.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 In fact, following Senator Griego's plan could make our local Forest Service team and example for the rest of the nation.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1314

Comment#

7 Only licensed, street legal vehicles with observable plates (see the Code of Behavior advocating this on newdesertrats.org), with the exception of those used by local ranchers, licensed hunters and wood cutters. Strict enforcement of 80db or quieter noise limits, and spark arrestors on all machines

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 Make the Grass Banks and any areas used by local ranchers off limits to ATVs and Dirt Bikes.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 No Fixed Camping Corridors. I would propose limited, small, well designed camp areas that would limit soil damage and ease enforcement efforts, and help limit fire danger.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

10 Limit the trail area to an amount that can be strictly enforced by the current staff.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 Publicly accessible records of trail monitoring and clear, understandable trigger points for closing of trails.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

12 Sizable fines for off road abuse.

Public Concern # 31 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1315

Comment#

1 I live on Cochiti Mesa, an area surrounded by Santa Fe National Forest lands. With my family, I hike the trails in the area almost every weekend. Much of our neighboring watershed, including Del Norte Canyon, Medio Dia Canyon and Frazier Canyon, have for years been designated as an area with restrictions on motorized travel. In fact motorized travel has been prohibitedoffof"ForestDevelopmentRoads and Trails"accordingto the SantaFeNationalForest map. Despite this, motorcycle riders have been creating new trails across this beautiful and delicate watershed.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 We are very glad that you have designated as closed the path through Medio Dia Canyon above its confluence with Del Norte Canyon

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 We are also glad that you have designated as closed the trail up the steep hill just south from the cattle guard at Del Norte Pass, where motorcycle riders have created a maze of trails as trees fall across existing trails.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Once the Travel Management Plan is in place, enforcement of restrictions on off-road vehicle traffic will be key to its success in preventing any further degradation of this area. If a route is to continue to be open, the Plan must take into account how easy or difficult it will be to enforce the closure ofother off road routes in the area.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 So I suggest that you just close to motorized vehicles the old abandoned roads down Cochiti Mesa starting at the trailhead on Forest Road 286 for Trail 113. This will be more easily enforced than having some trails open and some trails closed.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 I am glad that you have closed Trail 113, from the top of Cochiti Mesa to the bottom of Cochiti Canyon, to motorized traffic. This no doubt was due to the degradation in the trail caused by motorcycles.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

7 I would also like to see Trail 113 closed on the other side of the canyon, from Cochiti Canyon up to the east to where it meets the Dome Road to motorized traffic. This part ofthe trail also has deteriorated from motorcycle use in recent years.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Enforceability is also a concern in the rest of the Medio Dia and Frazier Canyon and Bland Canyon watershed. If you leave some routes open and close others, how are you going to enforce the closures? The designated routes need to be clearly marked and travel off ofthese must be enforced.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

9 A more enforceable plan would close all the motorcycle trails in this watershed, including the so called Tin Cup trail.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

10 Another issue is the temptation to motorcycle and ATV riders to enter private land ifthey drive on a road or trail that crosses the boundary between Forest Service land and private land.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

11 Several ofthe roads that you designated on your map as open are unused, unmaintained old Forest Roads that dead end at private property. These roads are: 286D, 268 AB(or 284) and 268A. All these dead end on private property but are not used for access by the private property owners because the owners have usable access established on open Forest Service Roads (268 and 286) and through granted easements on private property. These three unused spurs off ofopen designated routes should be closed to motorized traffic because they provide the potential to encourage motorcycles and ATV's to trespass on our private land in this neighborhood.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1315
Comment#

12 We also encourage you to consider the noise impact of motorized traffic. Quiet recreation, hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers, do not disturb the peace of the surroundings they pass through and they have much less impact on trails than motorcycles and ATV's, who can be heard from miles away and have many times the impact on the ground they pass over.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1316
Comment#

1 I noticed Carl Shipman was OPEN only from Sept. to Dec. Realistically, because of winter that trail would be open about 8 weeks for the entire year. Secondly, Sept-Oct is the hunting season and doesn't mix well with motorcycles.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1317
Comment#

1 Keep FR 106 from Thompson Ridge to Fr 144 so that people that live there will not have to load up their motorcycles and drive to access the north Jemez.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1318
Comment#

1 How can any member ofthe Blackfeather Trail Preservation Alliance be expected to make a coherent argument for keeping our trails open when we have not been informed of the rationale for closure as of this date? Many of us are leaving town for several weeks and will have no opportunity to provide rational and coherent input. I therefore request that the response period be extended 45 days from the date that we are provided the necessary/reasonable information.

Public Concern # 8 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1319
Comment#

1 Your table 8 in the TAP report indicates OHV use at less than 1/2 % of all uses. This seems to fly in the face of objectivity and of course reality. If the participation is at the rate indicated why would there even be a need for a Travel Management Plan in the SFNF?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 I request that you perform an objective in depth analysis of use and provide an OHV travel system that more adequately meets present and future demand,

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1320
Comment#

Letter# 1320
Comment#

1 The only people who should be allowed I the National Forest in off road vehicles are the handicapped.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 9 Does not meet the purpose and need

2 I object to off road vehicles being allowed on Route 53 and 375LBB as per Santa Fe County Glorieta area Forest Service Map. These areas are pristine examples of New Mexico wildlife and plants, are susceptible to vehicle pollution and erosion, and there are homes nearby.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1321
Comment#

1 83C & 83CB: The road in question was closed by the Forest Service in 1980 and has remained closed to this day. My understanding from Forest Service personel I have talked to and from public meetings is that one of the goals was to eliminate duplicate roads in the forest and 83C is a duplicate of existing improved road.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1322
Comment#

1 We have submitted a draft document to Rob detailing many of the routes on the Santa Fe National Forest that are of the greatest importance to our club.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The routes in the Cuba District like San Miguel Mountain, La Ventana Mesa, and the Smokey Bear Hill loops, and are very important to our club. We are frequent visitors to the area in our vehicles and hope to continue this important tradition for many years to come.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1323
Comment#

1 I was pleased to learn that the Santa Fe National Forest was considering closing about half the existing roads and motorized trails to all motorized vehicles.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 My worry is that at the end of the process, many of the roads and trails proposed for closure will remain open.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1324
Comment#

1 Unmanaged motorized recreation leads to degredation of natural resources that this and future generations are entitled to
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 Managing motorized use can reduce user conflicts.
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1324
Comment#
3 As a land management agency, the Forest Service should be managing the land.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1325
Comment#
1 Your Travel Management Team has no members that have significant OHV training, experience or education. This is very unfair and is geared towards reaching a conclusion that will be very arbitrary.
Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1326
Comment#
1 The Seasonally Open Dates for 104 and 104A should be set so that the "Open Dates" for 104 and 104A are "Open All Year".
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1327
Comment#
1 The Seasonally Open Dates for 315T should be set so that the "Open Dates" for 315T are "Open All Year". This area of the forest is very special to us and we trust that this small request will be honored by the folks at the Coyote Ranger District.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1328
Comment#
1 The Seasonally Open Dates for 315J & 527J should be set so that the "Open Dates" for 315J &527J are "Open All Year".
This is one of the most breathtakingly beautiful areas in the Cuba District. We often take professional photos In this area that are used in our professIonal "Greeting Card" collection. I have never seen any evidence of damage to the environment or disturbance to wildlife by current human motorized use.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1329
Comment#
1 The Seasonally Open Dates for 93A should be set so that the "Open Dates" for 93A are "Open All Year". Each spring and through out the summer from time to time through the years our family has traveled to this part of the forest generally by vehicle since some of us are no longer able to walk to this area for a family gathering including picnicing and other special activities.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1330
Comment#
1 The seasonally open dates for 315 and 103 should be set so that the "open dates" for 315 and 103 are "open all year."
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1331
Comment#
1 The Seasonally Open Dates for 3158 should be set so that the "Open Dates" for 3158 are "Open All Year".
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1332
Comment#
1 Request that the Roads and Trails within the Cuba Ranger District be NO FURTHER RESTRICTED than shown on Map #7 Seasonally Open Dates Travel Management Proposed Action Plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1333
Comment#
1 Request that the Roads and Trails within the Coyote Ranger District be NO FURTHER RESTRICTED than shown on Map #7 Seasonally Open Dates Travel Management Proposed Action Plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1334
Comment#
1 Request that the Roads and Trails within the Cuba Ranger District be NO FURTHER RESTRICTED than shown on Map #7 Seasonally Open Dates Travel Management Proposed Action Plan
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1335
Comment#
1 Request that the Roads and Trails within the Coyote Ranger District be NO I FURTHER RESTRICTED than shown on Map #7 Seasonally Open Dates Travel I Management Proposed Action Plan.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1336
Comment#
1 The SFNF"s Proposed Action devastates the present single track trail system which has existed and has been maintained for over 30 years.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1337
Comment#
1 The"Best Management Practice" document refers to "road density"and does not apply to trails and therefore I request that the SFNF not use it for that purpose.
Public Concern # 1 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1338
Comment#

1 The SFNF has chosen to leave many if not most of the GPSd single track trails submitted by the BlackfeatherTrail Preservation Alliance at the request ofthe SFNF. No rationale was given for this action. This is a very arbitrary and capricious decision and should be rescinded immediately.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1339
Comment#

1 if national forest areas directly adjacent to the VCNP are open to crosscountry OHV travel, there is a high probability that OHV users will trespass into the VCNP. Though the VCNP is fenced, we are aware that OHV users have cut fences in places such as Glorieta Mesa and Guadalupe Canyon in the Jemez Mountains to gain access to closed areas.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Given the scarcity of law enforcement officers both on the VCNP and on the Santa Fe National Forest, we suggest that all areas adjacent to the VCNP'S boundaries be closed to cross-country travel to reduce the temptation to trespass onto the VCNP. The SFNF should restrict OHV use to established, maintained roads in all areas within five miles of the VCNP boundary.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

3 we also hope that the SFNF will join the VCNP staff in monitoring the Preserve's boundaries for OHV trespass and work to effectively eliminate any trespass routes.

Public Concern # 52 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 Visitors to the VCNP come for high-quality, non motorized recreation, solitude and quality wildland experiences such as fishing. Since OHV noise is unregulated and many of these machines are loud, noise carrying onto the Preserve from OHVs outside the Preserve could degrade the public experience within the VCNP.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1340
Comment#

0 Not a comment. Correspondence.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1341
Comment#

1 (spur off 105 at Gascon ranch) At that time and up to date, it was not a public access property- just private. They have opened their own road and access o their own expenditures. The county, state and federal goverments did not contribute or maintain this access.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1342
Comment#

Letter# 1342
Comment#

1 A public road would devastate them (Antonia and Teo Vigil). They enjoy their privacy and have worked hard for that privledge [Do not designate their access road as open to the public]

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1343
Comment#

1 Keep FR106 open fromThompson Ridge to FR144 so that those people that live there will not have to load up their motorcycles and drive to access the north Jemez.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1344
Comment#

1 I noticed Carl Shipman was OPEN only from Sept to Dec. Realistically, because of winter that trail would be open about 8 weeks for the entire year! Secondly, Sept-Oct is the hunting season and doesn't mix well with motorcycles.How about Carl Shipman being open longer and during a more user friendly time of year?

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1345
Comment#

1 Your Travel Management Team has no members that have significant OHV training, experience or education. This Is very unfair and is geared towards reaching a conclusion that will be very arbitrary. I request that your Team Include at at least two members that understand OHV recreation and are supportive of It. This action would provide some reasonable balance of views.

Public Concern # 39 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1346
Comment#

0 No Comment Correspondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1347
Comment#

1 I applaud your efforts to remove motorized vehicles from our forests.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

1 My outdoor excursions have been impacted by the noise, smeel, trash and trail degradation by our thoughtless fellow citizen's unregulated behavior in the back country.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1348
Comment#

Letter# 1348
Comment#
0 Not a comment. Email returned.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1349
Comment#
1 Raod 89 and 113 is a watershed, not to mention that it houses many sacred sites, ancient ruins, and the watershed is home of medicinal plants that do not grow and are now disappering in other places in New Mexico.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The past few years have impacted the area [Cochiti Canyon] with road erosion, oil spills into the pristine creek that runs through the canyon and noise that disturbs campers and vision questers who have been coming to this land for millennia, to make prayers and to do deep soul work and Native Americn Indian Ceremony. If the Cochiti Canyon continues to be impacted by off road motor and biker vehicles the effects would be the following: Pollution of the pristine creek, from oil and gas of motor vehicle extensive use, road erosion, the road is presently care for by the grandfathered inhabitants of the canyon. The road is not cared for by the Park, disruption of the medicinal plants growing in this readion, animal habitat interruption, sacred land infringement for native american indian practices, camping for people who wish to have quiet space to enjoy nature.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 So many parks and natural resources are being taken away. There is a larger future we all must take into account at this time. This is to preserve wilderness, to stand for ancient ruins and practices and bioregions that need to be saved.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1350
Comment#
0 Form Letter.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1351
Comment#
1 I would like to see Rd 106 open from Thompson Ridge to Forest Road 144.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1352
Comment#
0 Form Letter: See Wedding Comment Letter
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1353
Comment#

Letter# 1353
Comment#
0 Request for info.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1354
Comment#
1 I think the study is intriguing and certainly indicates the potential "good" that comes from popular, well-signed, well-maintained trail systems. And, it really is important to small communities such as Los Alamos, Jemez Springs, La Cueva, Ponderosa, etc. that tourist dollars flow to them from popular attractions such as a well-planned, well-mapped motorized trail system which the SFNF (hopefully) will eventually be.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1355
Comment#
1 I am concerned that the designated system will not propely designed to serve the recreational needs of motorized users. User compliance and ease of enforcement goes up when the system is well designed and meets the needs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1356
Comment#
0 Form letter
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1357
Comment#
1 I firmly believe that it is in the best interest of the state and citizens of NM, the Forestry Service, and the communities and businesses local to the NF to accept the Blackfeather Motorcycle Clubs proposal concerning trail usage for OHVs.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1358
Comment#
1 Tresspassing has suddenly increased on his private property both b pedestrians and motorcycles, and that this has concerned him and his family. Yet, he also mentioned that he was an avid motorcycle rider and maintaining trails through designation was very important to him.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design
critera and mitigation measures

2 Steven mentioned that he strongly supported the idea of travel management and was fairly impressed with the proposed action map.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1359
Comment#

Letter# 1359
Comment#

0 No Comment Correspondence

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1360
Comment#

1 I can't see banning single-track motorized travel from large areas of the Santa FE National Forest.The simple use of trails outside of the range of day hikers by motorcycles, bicycles, and equestrians is what keeps them open and accessible- not only for recreation but for emergency personnel. It is my observation, throughout the Mountain West, that the USFS does not have the resources to actively maintain many of the hundreds of miles of trail that are currently kept open through the volunteer efforts (formal and informal) of various user groups. While I understand the importance of habitat protection, maintaining our National Forests as recreation resources adds to their value (and the value of the USFS) in the public eye- something that seems undervalued. I am in favor of restricting inappropriate forms of backcountry travel and recreation, but have seen the damage underuse can cause to a trail network. it's much, much more difficult to repair than to maintain.

Public Concern # 51 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1361
Comment#

1 I'm a horseback rider, hiker, mountain-biker. I can't even use most of the trails out west of Cochiti Mesa any more for several reasons--the trails are in such bad shape, so deep with terrible footing. Not only are the trails themselves treacherous, but the chances of encountering motorcyclists who don't even stop for a horse have increased

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 Additionally, it's extremeley DANGEROUS to meet up with motorcyclists on narrow single-track trails.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 being bombarded by the constant buzzing of the motorcycles and ATVs is not the way I want to spend my "quiet" time out in the Forest.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 MOtorcyclists' enjoyment of these trails have had a direct and indirect NEGATIVE impact on my own enjoyment of the mountains.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The FS should consider the density of trails as well as roads, as the motorized trails use also impact the wildlife

Public Concern # 2 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 All trails off of 282: 188JA (Frazier Canyon) is so eroded at the top with exposed roots and rocks. As the trail follows this narrow, wet canyon, erosion continues and makes it hazardous for other users. Is this really coded as an ATV trail?? This is a beautiful canyon that has already been raped by motorized abuse.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Bruce Ridge, from 188JA to 282. This trail is unusable since it's so deeply eroded into the soft soil

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 Bruce Place--trails off of 188; this goes to Upper Horn Mesa and out the Tin Cup trail. Holy smokes, this trail is absolutely eroded and unmaintainable. (By the way, last year some yahoo on an ATV cut down 2 beautiful free-standing ponderosas in the meadow near Bruce Place. These trees were left on the ground.)

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 The trail that connects 281 with 270DA should not be there AT ALL. It's a cut from 281 down a long, soft, steep hill. It's trenched the whole way thanks to the ATVs and dirt bikes. This "trail" is cut straight up and down.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 From 268 cattle guard to 268AB/188B--(188B is actually FS284 on the regular map). Again, the knobby tires have torn up this once pleasant trail to where it's gotten dangerous to ride on. This trail is TOO SOFT to be sustainable for motorcycle use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 Crosstown--this trail is a favorite, but I've watched this one deteriorate also over the last ten years from the motorcycle abuse.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

12 Cochiti Mesa--286F,FA,FAD--there are hundreds of miles of user-made trails accessible from this stretch that there's no way the dirt bikers will stay off of them. This area is so badly eroded on pumice that it's hard to drive a law enforcement vehicle down that way to enforce this.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

13 Trail 113 -- this is partially in Mexican Spotted Owl habitat. It is also eroded badly enough that it was recommended to be re-routed as the damage was too bad to repair.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

14 Forest Service roads showing up on the map should be removed because they are either redundant or lead right to private property. If you insist on keeping these roads open, then you MUST, MUST, MUST place signage and ENFORCE the no-trespassing. Our gates have been torn down, fences cut, signs tossed.

Public Concern # 45 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1361
Comment#

15 One motorcyclist told me that if we were to enforce the gate & fence where FS 284 (on your map, 268AB) meets private property, "there would be ramifications." He may have been referring to hunters and other OHV-ers besides himself. Where is the law enforcement?

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

16 Especially FR 268A does NOT need to be open. It parallels 268 and leads directly to private property. Legal and better road access to this particular piece of private property is provided from the south, via 286.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

17 We absolutely need egress for fire. If these roads were kept open, would the Forest Service keep these roads passable? Or would we still have to clear the trees as we've done in the past whether or not the roads are open or closed?

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 5 Addressed through implementation of Forest Plan

18 There is a spur road from private property along FS 268 that looks like it crosses Forest Service west to more private property. This road as shown on the map DOES NOT EXIST.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

19 The map shows pieces of open road, FS 268 south connecting 2 pieces of private property, but no open road south of private property until Bland. This just does not make sense. Again, we need fire egress, but this road is in such horrible shape it is almost (but not totally) unpassable.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

20 The forest service has provided absolutely NO signage of where private property is, unlike near Magdalena, NM where I encountered a FS road that went through private inholdings. Thanks to the signs placed appropriately, I always knew where the private property was.

Public Concern # 45 **FS Response:** 3 Address through project-specific design critera and mitigation measures

Letter# 1362
Comment#

0 Add to mailing list request

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1363
Comment#

0 No comment / response to information request

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1364
Comment#

Letter# 1364
Comment#

0 Not a comment / Response from Julie B.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:**

Letter# 1365
Comment#

1 All landowners affected by the road change have discussed the matter and are in agreement that the road should not be designated an "Open to all vehicles yearlong" route. It should not be shown on the map at all. There is no access to the property for anyone other than landowners and their guests. We respectfully request that the road which only services private land be removed from the SFNF map.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

Letter# 1366
Comment#

1 It has been commented by representatives of the Forest Service that this limitation in the current proposed plan for any use by motorized behicles north of Thompson Ridge is due to the need to protect endangered species. These comments have no basis by any rational analysis as presented above, formal scientific environmental impact studies, and are not supported by the "N" areas identified on the planning maps.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 I request the inclusion of routes and loops in the area north of Thompson Ridge to be iuciuded in the motorizedd routes of the new driving direction for the Jemez district of the Sanh Fe National Forest travel management plan. These requested routes can and should be dedicated to off road (motorcycles and ATV) activity as the main route in the area identifed (NF 106) is in serious disrepair past Thompson Ridge and it would be expensive for no apparent benefit to make routes accessible again for cars and trucks. Use of this area as requested is a traditional use area mainly and especially for the home and cabin users at 'Thompson Ridge. This area is used very limitedly and probable exclusively by Thornpson Ridge residents due to its lack of easy access from main roads through the forest and lack of extended trail paths fiom the ridge. The NF 106 access to Thompson Ridge and within and past Thompson Ridge enclave is and has been processed for "Fire Wise" programs. This speaks to the added safety factor in including trails in the comnented area of this submittal. The area mentioned is currently and also traditionalliy used for open grazing. The areas of these comments have a signcant buffer to near areas currently cataloged as "N - restricted for endangered species". These currently "N" restricted areas are accessible and violated by NF 144, 3 14, 360 and 3788. From the NF 106 area of this comment to these restricted areas there is a signficant barrierdue to the spacing and the topography, namely an un-navigable ridge which precludes access to the new plan for NF 376.Access to the proposed plans continued use of NF144 at the north end of the commented area would be beneficial to the Thompson Ridge residents and probable off load (lessen) the violation of the proposedplans continued use of N 144 thorough the "N" areas.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1367
Comment#

Letter# 1367
Comment#

1 By closing the road 52H, we would not be able to get to our property, Section 17, in Township 16 North, Range 11 East (Ruiz Canyon). Currently, this is only accessible using this road. The property is 2 miles up this road and has always been been accessed using this road. The road is protected with a gate and pad lock of which we have the combination in order to access the road.

If this road is closed, we would appreciate a written agreement that we may be use this road to access our property only.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1368
Comment#

1 I respectfully request that ALL the supporting documentation used in the in the analysis and decision making for the DEIS be posted on the website as .pdf files as soon as the DEIS is published. Timely posting all of the underlying documentation for the DEIS helps support and foster the public participation which the FS is alleged to embrace.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 The Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996 requires the FS to post electronically, any documents that are believed to be in the public interest and/or documents that the FS believes that the public may request.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 1369
Comment#

1 my understanding that the land has been used this way for many years. Please protect the land for not only this use but for it's plant life and ecological gifts. Do not allow the motorized vehicles access because the nature of this kind of land usage destroys plant life, crates erosion, and decreases water and air quality. It would also interfere with the ceremonial nature that is in place in the canyon.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1370
Comment#

1 If “Endangered Species” is given as a reason for rejection of a trail, I would like information made available as to what spices, where it is located, and when it was declared endangered.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1371
Comment#

1 In the interest of preserving a loop road, please consider keeping open FR 268BC between the Media Dia Canyon road (FR 268) and FR 188A. Although the road crosses private property, OHV traffic has been tolerated to this point by the property owners.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1372
Comment#

1 want the following trails included in the scope of the DEIS analysis. These are trails that I have used in the past for OHV recreation purposes in the Jemez. 377, 376 which is the main access road I use to explore the other trails listed, 656 including the connection to 376, 608, 653 loop, 239 and 488.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 In addition I want the user submitted routes from individuals and organizations such as the New Mexico Four Wheelers and New Mexico OHV Alliance included in the scope of the analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Lastly I would like to see all motorized routes included in the full analysis both system and non-system routes. The routes that have been screened out using the TAP process also need to be included in the full analysis.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1373
Comment#

1 The New Mexico 4 Wheelers hereby formally submit the attached document requesting a network of 4WD trails in the Santa Fe National Forest be included in the Travel Plan being developed in accordance with the Travel Management Rule, Part IV, 36 CFR. The enclosed document has been updated since an earlier version was submitted in October 2007. We encourage you to read, study, and ultimately to include its recommendations within your upcoming Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 We are severely disappointed that not all the routes included in our October 2007 submittal were included in the Proposed Action. We are even more disappointed that the Forest Service has seen fit to dismiss some of the identified routes prior to the EIS analysis. These routes are not even included on the "Existing System' maps in spite of their obvious on-the-ground presence including a plethora of official Carsonite signs with Forest Road numbers on them. We encourage the Forest Service to include ALL of the existing Forest system routes and all of the user created routes in their full EIS analysis and not dismiss them through pre-analysis decision making. Such early filtering does not meet the requirements of CEQ regulations regarding the need for a 'No Action' baseline.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 The route systems described within this document represent the type of networks necessary to provide quality motorized recreation experiences for a typical group of 4WD enthusiasts. It is not meant to imply that the designation of the networks described within this document would constitute a complete and appropriate 4WD route system on the SFNF. Unlike the corresponding Black Feather/NMTA proposal, current 4WD use of the SFNF is almost all on existing system roads or routes that were, at one time, part of the established SFNF road system.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

4 As the southwestern portions of the SFNF are closest in proximity to the urban area where most NM4W members reside, the use of the club tends to be more concentrated in that area. That is not to imply that the rest of the SFNF doesn't see similar use by NM4W and many other users, it simply means that most of our intimate knowledge of the SFNF is in the southwest part of the Forest. It is reasonable to assume that same use pattern is common among other users in the Albuquerque area.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1373
Comment#

5 Almost all of the included routes are currently included within the existing Forest Service system of roads and are used by a multitude of other users including hikers, hunters, bicyclists, ATV users, motorcyclists, and cross country skiers.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

6 The Travel Management Rule is intended for "revising regulations regarding travel management on National Forest System lands to clarify policy related to motor vehicle use, including the use of off-highway vehicles." It is not intended as another means to eliminate motorized recreation as a legitimate use of public lands!

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

7 the National Environmental Policy Act requires that a range of alternatives be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated within the EIS or EA. A range of alternatives spanning the continuum between severely curtailed motorized recreation opportunities and no motorized recreation opportunities at all is not an appropriate range and will not be recognized or tolerated by the motorized recreation community as a legitimate analysis.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 6 Already decided by law, regulation or policy

Letter# 1374
Comment#

1 I would like to see the following routes closed to motorized traffic:
Routes 286D, 268A, and 268AB. These routes dead-end at private property lines. These routes are not used to access this property as the property owners already have access via legal easements across private property. Thus, providing access is not an issue. These three routes also continue as roads across private property. The dead-end nature ofthese routes would encourage trespassing on private property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 Routes 188B and 188D. These roads connect only to roads that dead-end in private property.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

3 Trails 188 and 188JA. These are trails that were illegally constructed by off-road vehicle groups in an area designated as an area where off-road vehicles are prohibited on National Forest maps.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

4 I do not think that the Travel Management Plan should be used to give legalized motorized access to areas where motorized travel was previously prohibited. In addition, I do not think that the Plan should give legalized status to any illegally constructed trails. These trails are usually in bad condition, often little more that eroded ruts in the ground useless for other wilderness activities (i.e. hiking, mountain biking) and damaging to the environment.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Trails 286F, 286FA, and 286FAD. These trails were also illegally constructed. In addition, this area contains a veritable maze ofillegally constructed trails in addition to those marked on the Plan map. Allowing only certain trails to remain open will create a situation where enforcement of the Plan is all but impossible. I think that the best solution is to simply close all trails in this area (lower Cochiti Mesa).

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1374
Comment#

6 Trail connecting 268 and 268AB. This trail was illegally constructed and is in bad condition.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 Trail 113. This is a historic trail, in use for more than a hundred years, which has recently been badly damaged by motorbike use.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

8 In addition, there is a small piece of road (location highlighted on map next page) which does not exist. There is a nearby road which may have been mistakenly placed in the wrong location, but this road exists entirely on private property and is behind a locked gate.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1375
Comment#

1 The SFNF has not included all these trails on the open/closed maps for the west side.

Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1376
Comment#

1 Caja del Norte - It appears at least one mile of road will be closed that we now use to drive in and park before hiking another mile or so to Caja del Norte. Request continued access to closed road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Esponola

2 Agricultural and Archaic Sites – About two miles of road from County Road 24 (or old Route 66) would be closed. Request continued access to closed road.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 20 Esponola

3 The road to Los Aguajes off County Road 24 will be closed. This road closing should reduce traffic to Los Aguajes, and we support this closing. The hike will be relatively easy from County Road 24.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Punta de la Mesa de San Jose – request access east from FR 325F

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

5 006 (sec. 22) – request access on existing road west from Co. 34 for ½ to 1 mile

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

6 011 (sec. 4) – request access north of FR594 and west of Co. 34

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1376

Comment#

7 -336/365 – request access on existing road west of Co. 34. The intersection is 5.8 miles south of the intersection of Co. 34 and FR326. The road runs west and then north, roughly paralleling an upper tributary of Ancho Canyon.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

8 147 – may be accessible from FR326EB. Not certain

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

9 242/243 – accessible from FR47AA, but may need access to west rim of Pena Canyon to park, or hike 1/3 to ½ mile.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

10 062 – request access north from FR47AD along forest boundary for approximately ¾ mile

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

11 081/002 – request access east of FR85 for about ½ to one mile to park. Turnoff is approximately one mile north of the south 85/45 junction.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

12 Forest Road 422 goes off to the west of route 27 as it climbs to the north and onto Polvadera mesa. Road 422 goes to the Polvadera Pictographs, but it does not extend far enough as proposed. We request access to this road over the section proposed to be closed so we can park and hike in the rest of the way.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1377

Comment#

1 I feel the plan is still far too expansive for OHV use management and that use is planned for inappropriate areas. Notably, there is a lack of statistical or survey data on use to support the proposal and its intended results as they have been described.

Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

2 A number of theories were strongly promoted by the Forest Service at the public meeting I attended for Glorieta/Canoncito/Canyon de Los Alamos meeting held at the Hondo fire station. First, the style of the meeting limited public comment to a few people. the responses of Forest Service personnel seemed more in line with a promotion of the proposal/plan than a full and open public meeting designed to respond to public concerns.

Public Concern # 41 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

3 Internet-accessible maps of OHV routes that will result. It was stated by personnel at the meeting that having maps available on a national basis will not bring people from other areas and states to our local areas. I can find no reasonable basis for this theory. New Mexico's economy is strongly based in tourism, and national access to map routes is bound to bring people here. As a Recreation Officer in charge of an active OHV area for a number of years, I am well aware that people do come from out of state, and in fact often in large organized groups to use OHV routes.

Public Concern # 6 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

4 Some attendees were so frustrated by the Forest Service responses to the questions about maps that they left the meeting.

Public Concern # 12 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

5 I am also aware that the establishment of OHV routes leads to law enforcement problems in less accessible and rural areas like LaCueva Canyon. I do not mean only the tremendous fire danger in this extremely dry forest with significant dead and down and insect infestations. Nor do I mean only property damage and environmental damage from OHV use where the Forest Service has little capacity for law enforcement, especially in rugged and remote areas like this where OHV users go off the route. I mean alcohol use and drug dealing in remote areas where local law enforcement, fish and wildlife agencies and state police cannot easily reach violators.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

6 a state where small rural Hispanic and tribal communities can be seriously impacted by OHV use and its associated problems.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

7 The likelihood of enforcing important safety and law enforcement regulations at all is extremely low: the Forest Service simply lacks the budget, law enforcement staff and capacity to manage a program of this size, whether it is in LaCueva Canyon or the Jemez Mountains.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

8 I would suggest the OHV routes be reduced significantly from the present plan, especially in more remote areas like LaCueva that provide temptations to go off trail and be moved to areas closer to major roads with more visibility and less sensitive natural and cultural resources so the use can be controlled and regulated for public safety.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 I have discussed this with many of my neighbors who have shared their concern about the heightened fire risk, property damage, law enforcement problems including alcohol and drugs, damage to the current lighter recreational uses for hiking, horseback riding, hunting, mountain biking,, family picnics and various naturalist activities that take advantage of the natural environment, the forest and its riparian areas, and the many historic and cultural sites in the canyon.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 10 Irrelevant to decision

10 I strongly oppose the Proposed Action which still designates trails and dispersed camping in Critical Habitat, cultural and archeological sites and high-fire danger areas at the top of the LaCueva drainage and designates the addition of a motorized route which drops into the Canyon as it depends, crosses the creek and riparian area and designates camping in the meadow by the creek. I also oppose the labyrinth of proposed routes in the Jemez Mountains, where similar problems with local communities and similar historic uses would be impacted by OHV use and trails.

Public Concern # 71 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

11 I have not heard that any tribal consultation, archeological assessment or other activities to protect historic and cultural sites have taken place and yet the impacts to these sites could be devastating.

Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1378
Comment#

1 We are generally supportive of the plan, in particular the restriction agaisnt cross-country trael which is destroying the forest.

Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

Letter# 1379
Comment#

1 The PA map shows the lower part of 488 on the old road bed . The attached maps shows where it should be on the new road. It has been maintained and is usually in good condition. It should be seasonally closed when it is wet, as it gets very muddy and rutted if driven then.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 The PA map shows the lower part of 488 on the old road bed . The attached maps shows where it should be on the new road. It has been maintained and is usually in good condition. It should be seasonally closed when it is wet, as it gets very muddy and rutted if driven then. The old road should be closed to motorized travel. It has one section that is almost always wet from a spring and the water runs down the roadbed. 537 has been out of use for many years. 537G is in the bottom a sizeable canyon. It is only in the last few years that a few ATVs have been using this road occasoinally. I realize this would make a nice connection for a motorized route, however my hope is that this road not be designated for motorized use. 488J - 488JA makes a good loop for motorized use and is a good area for elk hunting. The road is suitable for full size vehicles, except for a short section where the two roads have been connected together. The road going north off of 488 in the NE quadrant of section 16 climbs very steeply to an old log derrick truck. This road crosses the stream in Joaquin Canyon. Because of erosional issues and for the protection of the old truck, I feel this road should not be left open. The piece of 488 in section 17 going west to the reservation is only lightly traveled. Leaving this segment open invites trespass on to the Indian land which is posted. I don't feel this segment should be left open. 488KA climbs very steeply to an old log derrick truck. This road crosses the stream in Joaquin Canyon. Because of erosional issues and for the protection of the old truck, I feel this road should not be left open. 488ND has heavy deadfall . The loop at the end of 488ND does not exist .These roads don't really go any where or offer any special characteristics. I feel these roads should be allow to continue to revert and not be used for motorized travel. There are plenty of other roads that make more sense to keep open instead. 488M was impassable a few years ago. It was reopened by ATV users for a while. Some large trees, were cut to make it passable. When I checked it in September 2007 it was not being travel past this fallen tree. This road is in a steep canyon and not the best candidate to keep open. Maps and photos are attached

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1380
Comment#

1 Per our discussion, this letter is to request the US Forest Service [Forest] designation of a road located off San Miguel County Road B44C to permit access to my property in Lower Colonias. The following are terms discussed and agreed upon this date:
* The road will be a Forest system road.
* There will be no gates to interfere with access to the Forest road.
* Easements will be provided to adjacent family property.
* No other access points will be created from this road.
* Power will not be accessed over the Forest property.
* The road will be accessible to the public.
* The road will not be an easement, but a system road only.
Thank you for your consideration in this request.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 19 Pecos / Las Vegas

Letter# 1381
Comment#

1 My husband and I fully support the Forest Service plan to limit access to motorized vehicles on Forest Service lands.
Public Concern # 42 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

2 the environmental damage done by motorized vehicles is destructive ofthe values for which our national forests were created and preserved. There are still many roads open to vehicles, so they are not being excluded, merely limited.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

3 Second, in this time of awareness of over-dependence on oil, we should not encourage recreation that is based on oil. People who feel the need for challenging nature can mountain-bike or rockclimb, both ofwhich are much healthier than riding a vehicle.
Public Concern # 67 **FS Response:** 15 Opinion

4 Third, we should all be thinking ofways to reduce our carbon footprints. We are trying to take the bus and carpool more often, and surely this cutback of motorized trails would help the planet's survival.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

Letter# 1382
Comment#

1 Why can't their be any camping on Road 376. It is day use only from 126 North.
Public Concern # 70 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

Letter# 1383
Comment#

1 I want the Blackfeather Citizen's Proposal trail known as "Dragon Cutoff" (Lat/Long: 35.78979 106.52435) in it's entirety to be included in the Santa Fe National Forestry's 2010 Final Motorized Travel map for bidirectional usage between May 1 to November 1. This trail is critical for having the ability to ride a single-track loop through the Forest. Therefore I request that a full EIS impact analysis on this trail be completed for the trail's inclusion in the final map.
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1384
Comment#

1 Mr. Frazier stated that there were no closed areas or trails in the Jemez Ranger District, JRD. He also stated that no restrictions were present prohibiting cross country travel. In fact, the JRD has several trails wholly and partially closed to motorized use, including FT 109, FT116, FT 118, FT 126, FT 132, FT 424, FT 427, FT 428-and until recently, the Cochiti Canyon leg of FT 113. Non-motorized status of this portion of the trail was recently rescinded without any opportunity for public comment or participation.
Public Concern # 68 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

2 The purpose of this correction is to shed light on current and developing issues within the JRD. Presently, the JRD is lacking on the ground action to enforce current closures and restrictions.
Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 17 Cuba

3 The Forest Service has set into motion a policy of encouraging motorized recreationalists to drive wherever their vehicles will take them. The policy of accepting user provided routes, and publishing these routes without edit or critical review, lent an air of legitimacy to motorized trespass, disregard for closure and restriction, and an arrogant disdain for private property.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 publishing routes through closed and restricted areas does encourage motorized use in these areas. In order to begin controlling the use of off road vehicles, the forest service must begin by conceptually controlling their access as well.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 Saturday, 10/04/08, we discovered a recent trespass upon the Upper Horn Mesa. Most of this mesa is private property. No property owner has ever granted any permission for off road vehicle access, yet this route is published on the SFNF website. Trees were chainsawed. Mud was churned up, resident wildlife was chased off. This is not an isolated incident. This type of trespass needlessly places stress and conflict on local residents. We are no longer asking, we are now demanding that the forest service remove user provided routes from all private property, all restricted areas, and all closed areas on the entire southern portion of the Jemez Ranger District from the web, from any future maps, and from any other media materials related to routes and trails.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

6 The SFNF can be proactive in reducing conflict, and can lead in conflict resolution by escheWing illegal routes right now.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

7 Together with this route removal, the SFNF must stop accepting user provided routes. Off roaders have had since 2002, and officially since 2005 to submit their routes to the forest service. In these years, almost every concievable route has been submitted. Those routes that remain are wholly or partly on private property, areas prohibited to motorized vehicles, wilderness, or road less areas.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

8 Remove user routes that traverse private property, such as Upper Horn Mesa, closed areas, such as FT424, and restricted areas, such as the north leg of FT132.

Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

9 We understand that the final map will be an enforcement tool, and that areas off the map will not be open to the general motorized public. However, ruined fences, broken gates, and missing signs illustrate widespread failure on the part of the SFNF to manage anything. This calls into question the forest service' ability to enforce the travel plan, and erodes public confidence in the viability of that plan. In order for the travel plan to work, and be effective, the general public must have confidence that the forest service is able to implement, enforce, and explain the plan in plain language.

Public Concern # 9 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1384
Comment#

10 The reality on the ground is that the lack of maintenance is perceived by motorized elements as a green light to trespass and ignore the law.
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

11 While valid reasons may exist for the current lack of presence in the field, no accountability exists to enforce current closures and restrictions
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

12 Finally, it is the mandate of the SFNF to manage the land, both for resource and habitat protection, and for the ethic of multi-use. The SFNF will not open trails in private property, in road less, non-motorized areas, so these routes can and should be removed from all SFNF media, including the website.
Public Concern # 3 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

13 Pave the way for enforcement and acceptance of the incoming travel plan with proper maintenance and upgrades now. Repair the gates on FT424, on FR 268 at the FR88 Junction, on f-k288, and fix the boom on FR289 at SR4 so that off roaders can't simply duck under it and ride. Repair and upgrade the fences at FT424, at FR268 and FR89. Post the Dome Wilderness trailheads. Post the non-motorized area around Bearhead peak, trails 126,132, and 140.Work with local people to identify and tackle these problems now and lay the ground work for a successful TMP
Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 7 Beyond the scope of the project

Letter# 1385
Comment#

1 As we get older, motorized travel is the only way to get to some of the beautiful backcountry scenery and wildlife. Please don't close these areas to where they would only been scenic grazing grounds for the multitude of cattle that are loose during the summer months. [Roads 70 ,93 ,315]
Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 16 Coyote

Letter# 1386
Comment#

1 As a result the Proposed Action is flawed and should be re-considered because the agency improperly "prefiltered" and removed from consideration ths, and other, existing routes and areas.
Public Concern # 66 **FS Response:** 2 Address through alternative design

1 The area identified as Barley Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the Proposed Action… I formally request this area be included in the range or alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. The Travel Management Rule provides for consideration of limited for motorized thravel and this area meets the criteria for consideration. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already graned permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.
Public Concern # **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

2 It appears that the Forest Service is not considering existing routes and areas identified by OHV users for incorporation in the travel system simply because because they coincide with a so-called "sensitive polygon.. Not because of any site specific analysis regarding the impact of the area or route on soils or other natural resources. Such "planning by polygon" is not consistent with Forest Service planning regulations and does not comply with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA.

Public Concern # 69 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

3 All the supporting documentation used in the analysis and decision making for the DEIS should be posted on the website as .pdf files as soon as the DEIS is published.

Public Concern # 7 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

4 I formally request that the SFNF consider on a site-specific basis the potential environmental impacts of specific routes, areas, and alternatives presented to the agency by those directly affected by the decision, including this one. I also request that, when considering potential environmental impacts, all alternatives consider potential mitigation measures as an alternative to closure.

Public Concern # 30 **FS Response:** 1 Address during analysis regularly conducted by IDT

5 The area identified as Bear Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the Proposed Action… I formally request this area be included in the range or alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. The Travel Management Rule provides for consideration of limited for motorized thravel and this area meets the criteria for consideration. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already graned permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

6 The area identified as Bland Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the proposed action.I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. Historically, the area has benn used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already granted permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

7 The area identified as Cochiti Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the Proposed Action. I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already granted permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

Letter# 1386

Comment#

8 The area identified as Dome Road in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails association was not included in the Proposed Action. I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already granted such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

9 The area identified as Guadalupe Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the Proposed Action. I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping uder the NEPA process. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already granted permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has eliminated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

10 The area identified as NMTA Laguna Tio Andres Pump Trails Sites is being submitted as an alternative on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association. I formally request this area be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez

11 The area identified as Spruce Canyon in the alternative submitted on behalf of the New Mexico Trails Association was not included in the Proposed Action.I formally request this area to be included in the range of alternatives required for consideration during scoping under the NEPA process. Historically, the area has been used for staging motorcycle observed trails events. Documentation shows that the Forest Service has already granted permits for such use, yet now the Forest Service has elimineated the area from consideration before Scoping has begun.

Public Concern # 0 **FS Response:** 18 Jemez