

Wilderness Evaluation Comments

- Index: 1. [General Comments](#)
2. [Comments about the Process](#)
3. [Wilderness Characteristic Comments](#)
4. [Other General Comments](#)
5. [Specific Area Comments](#)

1. General Comments

There were a number of general comments about the value of creating new wilderness areas. Comments related to specific areas are include in a later section of this document.

Attendees were opposed to creating any wilderness for the following reasons:

1. People asserted new wilderness would impact or inhibit historic and cultural uses. Some rely on these uses for sustenance or their income and referred to the hardship this would create. Concern was expressed for:
 - a. Forest dependent communities needing to meaningfully access fuelwood.
 - b. The ability for grazing permittees to actively manage livestock operations and maintain allotment improvements.
 - c. The ability to meaningfully access the forest for traditional building materials, i.e. vigas, latillas, posts, rocks.
 - d. Difficulty gathering herbs.
 - e. Difficulty in accessing hunting, fishing, and camping.
 - f. Some felt the size of the forest is currently insufficient for these needs and reducing the area further would diminish already scant resources.
 - g. Some wondered whether wilderness would limit grazing.
 - h. "Our tradition and culture is slowly fading ... don't shoot it dead!"
2. People felt new wilderness would impact or inhibit important forest management activities, such as:
 - a. The ability to access the headwaters of acequias, which communities rely on, and the ability to protect and maintain critical watersheds. "The FS will start controlling water flow to the communities!!"
 - b. The risk of high intensity catastrophic wildfires. Attendees referred to several catastrophic fires.
 - c. The ability to access sustainable timber harvesting (logging) for personal and commercial uses.
 - d. With the expansion of wilderness areas comes a heavier concentration of people and uses in smaller areas. "Concerns about putting more traffic (ATV, motorized) on a smaller portion of the forest if more wilderness is allowed."
 - e. Difficulty in maintaining dirt water tanks.
 - f. Activities like Collaborative Forest Restoration grants and other initiatives not allowing improvements on land. "All areas considered for local commercial forest projects creating jobs."
 - g. "Designated management areas need to remain designated and not be made into wilderness."
 - h. Precluding future land exchanges.
 - i. Precluding stream improvement work.
 - j. Does it prevent work on endangered (threatened) species? RCCTT?

- k. Some special use permittees have used an area for many years. Can current special use permittees continue their operations if the area is managed as wilderness?
 - l. FS doesn't have to budget funds for wilderness management.
 - m. "The land needs good management, something the USFS has never been able to do. Wilderness is not the answer for a working landscape. If our federal lands are in bad shape don't try to fix them with a wilderness."
 - n. Are fences allowed in a wilderness area?
 - o. "Wilderness is a permanent decision which does not allow new science to reverse practice. This eliminates necessary tools for management."
3. There were Access/Travel Management Issues:
- a. "Wilderness – very discriminating against the handicap, old timer, wounded military vets."
 - b. "Cannot hike long distances so need motorized assistance."
 - c. "Wilderness status means only wealthy people with horses and trailers can access the area. Lower income residents of the neighboring communities are excluded with no motor vehicle access. Let the people in. Improve access, do not restrict access."
 - d. "We (the town) depend on the \$ made from people riding jeeps, ATV, motorcycles in the forest. The town would die without these riders."
 - e. Some individuals stated they owned property in potential wilderness areas and were concerned about future access.
 - f. Permanent closure of roads and access to areas within the forest.
 - g. Difficulty accessing from adjacent properties if cattle wander into wilderness areas.
 - h. Restricting a fundamental "freedom".
 - i. "Any road marked as Forest Service road cannot be considered wilderness. Any unmarked road cannot be considered wilderness. Any trail, man-made or not, cannot be considered wilderness."
4. Other comments:
- a. "Hell no wilderness"
 - b. Some attendees were concerned about possible introduction of wolves, which they opposed.
 - c. "The people have spoken, and it is 'clear' that this move is not wanted. It is your responsibility to hear these voices and not shove this down our throats NO is 'NO.' We will remain united in this."
 - d. "The FS is already taxed by maintaining what they have. Adding any more wilderness areas would be adding unfounded liabilities to the forest service."
 - e. "This sounds again like manifest destiny."
 - f. "With the addition of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, and the designation of the Columbine-Hondo wilderness, and all of the other federal lands in Northern New Mexico (USFS, BLM), I don't see a lot of opportunity for new wilderness designations."
 - g. "Federal land belongs to all of the people, but when it becomes wilderness, 95% of the people (owners) will never see this land which they own."
 - h. "2/4 wheelers make no more impact than a herd of horses/pack mules. People that spend \$25-30K on ATVs are usually very responsible. They're not the ones carving their initials in aspens along the trail."
5. Historic land grant ownership and traditional ownership were brought up strongly, although this is outside the scope of the Forest Service's current planning mandate. Attendees asserted:
- a. "I think that land grant properties should not be considered as wilderness area, regardless of who manages it now!"
 - b. "Start honoring agreements made with land grant heirs when their lands were stolen."

- c. "Our people, meaning land grant heirs, were given written permission to use this land, to get our wood, and resources. How can we do this if it becomes wilderness?"
- d. "If these land grants are to be managed at all, they should manage for the benefit of the 'local community' who 'own' them. These are 'NOT' federal lands so are outside the FS's jurisdiction to manage. "
- e. "Local folks have historical rights guaranteed under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo."
- f. "My forefathers heard this speech in 1846 ... people that make their living of the land have been losing ever since. ... The people on the land have no choice in the management. Give us our land grants back. We can't do any worse. Our watersheds are a mess. Wilderness will not fix that. Slowly your decisions are choking us out. "
- g. "Any and all former common lands that were part of a community land grant should be excluded from the wilderness."
- h. "Fees charged on grant land should be used by land grant boards."
- i. "I want my future guardians to be able to use and care for the land as generations past have done."
- j. "In my mind we have too much government control on our lands. We have survived for many years, decades, etc. With this designation you (USFS) will increase poverty, drugs, and most of all loss of culture. Our youth of today need our land to promote agriculture, stewardship and pride. More restrictions will only make people find ways to leave!"

Some people supported the idea of new wilderness areas. They asserted:

1. "Provide as much wilderness as possible, consistent with leaving adequate areas for traditional local uses in sustainable quantities."
2. "Preserve adequate wilderness to maintain intact a healthy, functioning web of nature that provides water catchment, seed dispersal by animals, breeding grounds for aquatic and land animals, nesting and roosting and feeding areas for birds. Also, places for solitude and inspiration for humans. Also, avoid any loss of current biodiversity."
3. "I am not an outsider – not a native, but I have lived in and loved this area for over 35 years – and I do support wilderness designation. I want my grandchildren to be able to see natural areas untouched by human activity. I would like to know what the land grant heirs consider to be the standing of the Picuris people, whose ancestors were using these lands when the King of Spain saw fit to grant them to his subjects."
4. "I support as much wilderness as possible."
5. "Already roadless areas should definitely be wilderness. Wilderness protects the land, water, ecosystem for future generations. It is sacred. Yes, there should be diverse usage of the forest – places for everyone, different usage."

2. Comments about the Process

There were a number of general comments about the wilderness evaluation process and the associated meetings.

1. Some questions related to definitions of terms.
 - a. "Are people going to understand what we mean by screening and by ROS."
 - b. "Define departure from natural conditions."
 - c. "Define improvements. Can a campground designed by LA be included."
 - d. "Please keep the wording of the original wilderness act with no interpretations."
 - e. Start with the correct definition 'untrammelled by man' is what the 1964 act reads – why dilute this working to suit your needs?"
 - f. "Locals will not know what a vehicle 'incursion' is and 'unconfined recreation'"
 - g. "Re-word some of the Considerations/Characteristics so everyone can understand."
 - h. "What defines a 'wild horse territories'?"

2. Some comments related the structure or organization of the process.
 - a. "Starting with wilderness characteristics listed for each parcel would give public more to comment on. "
 - b. "The water adjudicated question is confusing. I think every river had already been adjudicated for the most part. Maybe the more helpful question is related to acequia infrastructure, etc."
 - c. "These questions are subjective without quantitative measures."
 - d. "Work on a plan that will address management of common land year by year for 20 to 30 years."
 - e. "Give members of the public enough time to review characteristics and considerations."
 - f. "Go through each characteristic and explain each consideration."
3. Some comments related to the ability of the public to have a meaningful impact.
 - a. "TRUST NOBODY"
 - b. "The USFS knows perfectly well all about local residents' land use and do not need to hold 'town meetings' to obtain our input."
 - c. "When the USFS is considering and listening to the public, it should be mindful of the citizens who are not affiliated with associations who have larger financial resources that may have more opportunities to influence the wilderness designations. Benign dictatorship must be avoided."
 - d. "I feel that those of us who use the land have no voice, while environmentalists and hippies get what they want."
 - e. "I hope this meeting was not an exercise in futility."
 - f. "You have made your own rules here. Your process is rigged. Your outcome is already determined. You are not fooling everyone, maybe some."
 - g. "Vehicle incursion – most people will not understand this since we have not been effective in implementing travel management. People will have the attitude that you can make whatever designation you want and we will just continue to do our thing the way we have under all the other decisions you have made."
 - h. "FS employees, you are doing Udall and Heinrich's dirty work alongside other people backing you up."
 - i. "David had the complete technical questions, which he has been trying to get an answer for, for months. Why do you think these people do not believe you when you say this will be considered?"
4. Some commenters referred to the inclusion of public groups or public notice.
 - a. "The FS said there are 54 communities within the CNF, but only MEETING with 14 of them. This is less than 24%, not even a quorum."
 - b. "I was in the Carson plan primer meeting and I don't remember hearing about the wilderness inventory meetings. ... This is the first time I have heard about wilderness (meetings)" "How could heirs be involved with inventory assessments. How will you include heirs?"
 - c. "Please get the input of Indian reservation."
 - d. "I am 12 years old. I am the future so you need to listen."
 - e. Several participants expressed a desire to be involved in the continuing development of the plan. Some also asked to be involved in specific areas such as NEPA, WUI, and fuel inventories.
5. Attendees asked the following questions:
 - a. "Congress has the power to designate wilderness. Who in congress directed the FS to consider more wilderness?"
 - b. "Do these lands belong to the USFS or are they public lands, being taken care of by the FS or BLM or others?"

- c. "I want to know what happen to our rights to water that flows in the forest. The water flow in a ditch to private property?"
- d. "Does it preclude stream improvement work?"
- e. "Does it prevent work on endangered (threatened) species? RCCTT?"
- f. "Does wilderness designation preclude future land exchanges?"

3. Wilderness Characteristic Comments

Attendees were asked to comment on five groups of characteristics used by the Forest Service in evaluating potential wilderness areas.

1. Apparent Naturalness

- a. "Historic activity like railroads has changed natural characteristics forever and should cancel wilderness consideration."
- b. There were a number of comments related to the term "apparent naturalness":
 - i. "Apparent' is highly subjective, dependent on the observer."
 - ii. "Natural 'appearing' vegetation is not necessarily the historic vegetation because of historic alteration. Evaluate naturalness on both current 'appearance' and 'historic' potential." Also "Invasive species; what is natural vs unnatural"
 - iii. "What is a "natural" condition departure? Historic condition?"
 - iv. "Reseeded areas – natural?"
 - v. "Climate change, which is a manmade phenomenon, has changed the forests and land so the premise that land is 'natural' is not valid. "
 - vi. "Apparent naturalness – FS should consider the appearance to average visitor rather than the conditions as evaluated by scientific criterion"
- c. "I am very supportive of the inclusion of 'departure from natural conditions' as a consideration, and agree with your framing of departure in characteristic 1 and 5."
- d. "Evidence of fire suppression?"
- e. "Evidence of high-grade logging?"
- f. "Improvements – do you mean toilets, facilities?"
- g. "Are there areas where ecological characteristics are close/near to reference conditions?"

2. Opportunities for Solitude or Unconfined Recreation

- a. "Unconfined recreation is limited to young and healthy and eliminates a large portion of the population."
- b. "Shouldn't have to be both (solitude either/or unconfined rec)."
- c. "Opportunities for solitude or unconfined recreation: evaluate opportunities for solitude separately from opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation."
- d. "Solitude might include evaluation of the view shed for alterations of the landscape. Likewise solitude evaluation should consider soundscapes – highway noise."
- e. "Does it provide refuge from nearby human activity – does it function on a landscape level?"
- f. "They will need help understanding 'solitude' and what constitutes an opportunity for solitude."
- g. "Need to define or use other words to communicate what recreation opportunity spectrum ROS is."

3. Size

- a. "When a designation area is too small, the impact to neighbor land is more significant and management should and needs to be applied on a landscape basis."
- b. "Several – if not all – areas are much less than 5000 acres. So you get around that by saying it is next to existing wilderness."

- c. "Examine contiguous lands on BLM – don't stop analysis at forest boundary but include contiguous BLM parcels that may have wilderness character."
 - d. "Can a smaller size provide critical landscape scale function?"
4. Ecological, Scientific, Educational, Scenic, or Historical Values
- a. "Supplemental values: these, while important, their absence should not diminish an area for consideration as wilderness."
 - b. "Acequias should be respected and consulted with respect to historical head waters."
 - c. "Are there any high quality water resources or important watershed features?"
 - d. "Historical values: ... there are more communities in Carson than any of the other NF in nation. Extra consideration needs to be made of the historic values associated with these communities. Analysis should include a community 'catchment area.'"
 - e. "Characteristic 4 – considerations 2 and 6 can be combined."
 - f. "The CNF must consider the economic benefits of traditional uses such as outfitting, grazing, timbering and firewood cutting and the impacts wilderness designation would have on those uses by restricting motorized use."
 - g. "OK."
5. Manageability
- a. "Trespassing (intentional or encroachment) due to historic roads and access affects wilderness characteristics in much of Carson. This includes mining and grazing."
 - b. "Some special use permittees have used an area for many years. Can current special use permittees continue their operations if the area is managed as wilderness?"
 - c. "Manageability should focus on whether there are any legal requirements that might curtail wilderness management"
 - d. "OK".
 - e. "The ability to use proactive forest management, such as thinning and prescribed burning, must be considered when considering designating wilderness."
 - f. "ESA restoration capability."
 - g. "Fire management consideration: It's nice if you can let wildfires burn in wilderness, if it's ... a small area, or it's near a resource that requires suppression, then I think it's a problem."
 - h. "Fire management is very broad – do you mean ability to fight wildfire? Or Rx potential?"
6. Other Criteria
- a. Consideration: % of land already designated in each district.

4. Other General Comments

Attendees made comments that they felt were important, but not necessarily related to wilderness evaluation.

1. Several attendees expressed concern about fire management in general.
 - a. "I am a grazing permittee and I know that grazing keeps fuel grasses from becoming a disaster in fire."
 - b. "I think that fuel wood gathering helps to control wildfires by clearing out dead and down fuel."
 - c. "Wildfire almost destroyed the CNF above Canjilon. A wind change saved the village and some of the surrounding forest. Dead and dying now provides wildfire fuel and proper management, including rearrangement to help check erosion, not only in the forest, but also in lands below, including acequias and irrigated fields and pastures."
2. Some attendees expressed concerns about water management.
 - a. "Water belongs to permittees in each allotment, regulation in Hidalgo Treaty!"

- b. "If there is a sustainable future in NM, it will be based on the irrigated acreages. "
3. Some attendees expressed made statements about grazing.
 - a. "How are you going to allow permittees to check on cattle once the area is turned into wilderness? They can't use the access roads. Is the FS going to reimburse ranchers when livestock is harmed? They will put wolves in!!"
 - b. "Livestock in the forest helps our wilderness in many ways. Some wild animals are fed by livestock, they help the land, and they also look beautiful when you pass by on the highway in the US hill."
 - c. "Research shows grazing and timber cutting keep the ecology of the forest support wildlife and livestock."
 - d. "Will the FS designate staff to have a more hands on approach to managing grazing permittees?"
 4. Several comments referred to concerns related to potential fracking in the Carson, as well as the effects of fracking in nearby areas. These included contamination of Carson water supplies and potential depletion of ground water.
 5. Some attendees made general management comments about the Valle Vidal. These included:
 - a. Stop bringing cattle to the VV in the summer months. Cattle and cattlemen on horses in summer push the over abundant elk / deer down to our valley where tear down our forests and eat our crops.
 - b. Cull the elk herds to bring the elk population down to a manageable level.
 - c. Stop cougar hunts in VV.
 - d. Keep track of all permits sold to hungers for elk, bear, deer, bobcat, and have information available for public review.
 6. Some attendees made suggestions about forest management in general.
 - a. "All efforts should be jointly and strategically managed."
 - b. "Fuel wood permits should be allotted and distributed by the boards of the two 'land grants' in this district."
 - c. "Need other agencies within grant to sponsor, SWWF, crew, youth corp."
 - d. "The community need to address invasive species, i.e. juniper thistle, mistletoe – consider areas to strategically identified for joint management."
 - e. " Stop having permittees do stupid work – ex. Fencing off plants that kill cattle – larkspur – plants did not get the message not to pass the fence."
 - f. "Watershed protection continues to be a topic of discussion and the availability to harvest the product continues to be discussed. My opinion is the timber harvesting should take place in places that allow harvesting. Other areas such as those having wilderness character should go through its natural process. Whether it be fire, disease, natural disasters, Mother Nature will cleanse herself. Let the process happen naturally. No new roads."
 - g. "Development of methods for thinning existing wilderness with minimal impact. There must be ways of thinning without extensive road building."
 - h. "Carson Hotshots were originally created in Peñasco to create and partially employ economically depressed areas."
 - i. "Get rid of Federal law enforcement! [poster]"
 - j. "A great deal of the Carson is in need of forest management activity to inure forest health. If left potential major wildfire or insect destruction increase."
 - k. "I love Smokey Bear."

5. Specific Area Comments

People in almost every meeting also made specific comments about specific areas that were depicted on maps as potential wilderness areas. The majority of comments—in the first part of each section—indicated that the writer was opposed to further wilderness designation.

Comments in favor of increasing wilderness designations in the Carson are included in the second part of each section. The following are all direct quotations.

NB: Included are a few comments which, while not directly related the question of inclusion/exclusion as wilderness, nevertheless may be useful information for Carson managers.

1. Abiquiú 2 (4 May 2016)

- a. W-1, W-5, W-9, W-32, W-32—I am against it!
- b. Also W-2—Gather medicinal herbs for use throughout the year
- c. Also W-23, W-24—Need firewood—only source of heat
- d. Also W-16— Has many roads, private land areas, and development that would deem it unsuitable for wilderness.
- e. I am in the T district, Ojo Caliente. I am concerned about access to firewood.
- f. My property is in section C-32 (G?) and you the forest service are telling me that if you make surrounding areas and adjacent areas wilderness I will have to take a horse to my property.
- g. The geography of the El Rito and Canjilon districts do not lend themselves to grazing and firewood permits without mechanical assistance.
- h. The Jarita Mesa has been logged thin from one corner to corner. We need to clean our stock tanks! There are roads all over.

2. Amalia (11 April 2016)

- a. ChW6
 - i. Human activity evidence in form of roads and 4x4 traffic; Too close to town and ski area for solitude
- b. Q1
 - i. Absolutely the most heavily vehicle accessed site in the Valle Vidal is Shuree Ponds
 - ii. Lacks solitude – heavily used by OHV and snowmobile and important to Red River's economy
 - iii. Stay for wood cutting, piñon picking, hunting, grazing, fishing, our watersheds, head gates
- c. Q3
 - i. I think it should be left out because of Cabresto Lake, which is a source of water for the acequia, and the village of Questa.
- d. Q4
 - i. Need access for hunting activities!
- e. Q5
 - i. Eastern half is highly departed ecosystem--legacy impact of historic logging
 - ii. We own land in Midnight area and we don't want to be on wilderness or next to wilderness
- f. Q1,4,5
 - i. Forest management is needed in each of these areas to insure forest health. Though fire is allowed in a wilderness, the impact on neighbors is potentially significant. The smaller an area is the more likely the impact on neighbor lands will occur
 - ii. Tremendous residential use and the economic impact that has on Red River. Would also limit access to my family ranch up Mallette Canyon.
 - iii. Widespread noxious weed infestations

- iv. Relatively high density of administrative access roads required for successful execution of several special use permits.
- g. Valle Vidal
 - i. The entire Valle Vidal is not eligible for a wilderness designation because of improvements: e.g. Shuree Lodge, Shuree ponds, corral for cattlemen, two lane road from Amalia to Cimarron, evidence of human activity, cemeteries.
 - ii. VV is surrounded by non-federal land, RCCLA [Rio Costilla Cooperative Livestock Association], Red River and Cimarron.
 - iii. We need the Valle Vidal to be the engine of our local economy. Improve access and increase visitors. More visitors would help economy of Amalia, Costilla and Cimarron.
 - iv. Wilderness status conflicts with Rio Grande cut throat trout management and creek restoration.
 - v. Keep track of all permits sold to hunters for elk, bear, deer, bobcat, and have information available for public review. There is an overabundance of wildlife in the Valle Vidal, elk in particular. The FS is in a better position (management) to deal with these issues than would a wilderness area!
- h. WpW6, w8Wp
 - i. W6
 - 1. Lacks solitude due to heavy hiker traffic
 - ii. WpW6
 - 1. The Questa district lacks areas to create hut hopping opportunities for non-motorized recreational activities (hikers, cross-country skiers, horseback riders). By leaving this area not designated as wilderness we have the opportunity to construct huts in this area – thereby creating hut-hopping between Red River and TSV.
 - iii. WpW8
 - 1. Lacks solitude due to proximity of homes, ranches, highly populated trails.
- 3. East Side Districts (29 March 2016)
 - a. C4
 - i. Traditional uses are true of the majority of lands adjacent to any of land grants, Cristóbal de las Jerna (C4), Trampas (C5), etc.
 - ii. Traditional use by Santa Barbara Grant
 - b. Q1, 4
 - i. There is evidence of human activity – roads, old railroad beds, logged areas, etc.
 - ii. Lots of range improvements--i.e. windmills and earthen water tanks--that need to be maintained with mechanical equipment
 - c. Q2
 - i. There are roads abundantly used for traditional uses such as firewood removal, piñon picking, etc.
 - d. Q3
 - i. The area has a unique ATV, OTV trail that is easily accessible and a place to view molybdenum mine areas. This is an educational trail and should remain open to the public.
 - e. Q5
 - i. The Midnight area and the Greenie Peak are used by various snowmobile groups. Children and adults can get an educational experience and an awesome recreational experience. This should not be designated as a wilderness area. Keep this one open for hiking, ATV use, horseback and snowmobile use!

- f. WpW5
 - i. This is a great place to take ATVs, ORVs or take a hike. This one should not be designated as a wilderness. It can be managed by the FS and should not be a 'problem area.'
 - ii. With heavy recreational use (ATVs) – roads needed to access traditional uses
 - g. There were a few comments in favor of expanding Wilderness designation:
 - i. *C14--Around existing Pecos wilderness there is a good amount of roadless area that would likely meet characteristics – quiet, remote*
 - ii. *C4--Warm Springs area is appropriate – remote, limited access, adjacent to Picuris pueblo lands*
 - iii. *C10--N side is limited access (but area is of limited size) – may help prevent encroachment to Taos pueblo lands (though the pueblo may still want some vehicular access)*
4. Manassa, CO (13 April 2016)
- a. W4
 - i. Wild horses present; Man-made dirt tanks
 - b. W11
 - i. Cell phone towers / close to highway and heavily used roads / easy access
 - c. W14
 - i. Rio Grande, Lucero Lakes – lots of down and dead – poor and debilitated enclosures not maintained for years. Broke-off – not good hiking – very rocky would not be desirable – stock tanks fenced between Broke-off and Lucero Lakes.
 - ii. Heavily accessed by vehicles and ATVs / man made structures / private land (corral units)
 - d. W17
 - i. Allotment we need to use back hoe to clean stock tank. We have the Toltec train goes right through it. We have a lot of ATV use. The railroad track crew. There camping ... fishing
 - e. W29, 30
 - i. Evidence of human activity – roads and past logging Man-made water tanks Heavy ATV use Noisy highway through area Access to private land Numerous mining claims
 - f. Wxs 723, 710 ADD
 - i. Riddled with logging roads and are used extensively by hunters and wood gatherers in pickups and ATVs.
 - g. Rio Tusas, lower San Antonio area
 - i. Should not be considered due to the wood harvest The private land that is checker boarded throughout
5. Peñasco 15 April 2016
- a. C5
 - i. Should not be considered because:
 1. Many landowners use vehicles to gain access to their private land
 2. Traditionally it is used for firewood, grazing, hunting
 3. Much power saw and four wheeler usage happens here.
 - ii. Just as important for the irrigation sections to El Valle-Trampas area.
 - b. C7
 - i. Needed for wood cutting
 - ii. Hodges camp area to include acequia headgates.

1. Hodges campsite: Boulders, pointy, small and large rocks throughout campsite-- unable to park a camping trailer. Campsite not leveled. Two culverts exposed – 1st right middle, 2nd top half. No tables, no grills. A pond of water at entrance. Entrance getting flooded.
- c. C11, C14
 - i. Also to harvest hay from Hodges Meadows and to harvest wood for heating and vigas to maintain our barns and homes ... and our acequias and hunting in our back yard. We were born and raised here, and this is our livelihood. We don't need no more wilderness.
 - ii. No wilderness added within land grants of Santa Barbara and Las Trampas
 - d. Camp Summer Life now known as the Monastery: Concerned about the acequia head gate which starts above. If this part becomes wilderness, what access will there be to get there.
 - e. Ell Valle Campsite – It's not posted on hwy 76. campsites not leveled, need more tables, more grills, more restrooms, road that leads to campsites is sloped to the left and the right with ruts and deep holes and boulders, small pointed large rocks.
 - f. La Junta campsites: Entire road needs to be scraped – road is very bumpy with holes and pointy rocks. Campsite needs more restrooms – more tables – more grills – solitude area.
 - g. Sipapu ski area need area to expand management area in purple needs to be eliminated from consideration, as does roadless area surrounding ski area.
6. Taos 8 April 2016
- a. Land along Hwy 150 is critical for fire mitigation, along with land for the village of Taos Ski Valley, and along the Bull of the Woods trail.
 - b. Another consideration should be fire probability and spread into areas that have Wildland Urban Interface communities and important water sources for communities, such as Hwy 518 north to Pueblo Ridge
 - c. All motorized trails around Red River must stay as is. If these go wilderness, it will seriously impact RR economically. A possible trail along the big Ditch needs to stay open for that consideration.
 - i. For Red River town and corridor Hwy 434 need a big buffer (not 1 mile, more like 10 miles)
 - ii. Red River area and Valle Vidal do not need any more wilderness areas. This will have an impact on \$ made in Red River. The town will die out. More than ½ the \$ made is from jeeps, ATV and motorcycles.
 - d. There is a robust set of mountain bike recreational trails throughout the C4, C10, C13, C12 areas, including Picuris Peak.
 - e. Valle Vidal considerations--
 - i. Because of fire potential if wilderness area this could affect the Rio Costilla Cooperative Livestock Association properties, 88,000 acres of mountain producing timber.
 - ii. If Valle Vidal remains Forest Service there is a possibility that we could get a paved road from Cimarron to Amalia that would bring opportunities, jobs to an area that has suffered economically, especially now that the mine in Questa has closed.
 - iii. If considering wilderness designation for Valle Vidal, CNF should consider current riparian restoration projects currently underway on neighboring private land. Specifically: Middle Ponil Creek
 - iv. Specifically in the Valle Vidal: USFS land for trade: Upper Leandro Creek, Upper Allen Creek, Upper P_?__house Canyon
 - f. There were some comments in favor of expanding Wilderness designation:
 - i. *Add extra 'buffer zone' acreage to the wilderness to protect Serpent Lake*
 - ii. *I recommend the Middle Fork Road remain decommissioned permanently. For that road to be reopened would destroy the access that people can go as a day hike to experience wilderness beauty.*

- iii. *I think the north end of the Pecos Wilderness needs to be expanded.... When considering wilderness designation, the CNF must consider the potential for future beneficial land trades adjacent to the forest and inholdings that would correlate property boundaries with watersheds to improve ecologically based management, as well as the potential to trade for inholdings, motorized trail. There needs to be more enforcement of motorized travel rules, even in existing wilderness. The NM Wilderness Alliance has defined a proposed boundary that would expand and protect the wilderness, as well as protecting acequias and traditional uses.*

7. West Side Districts (1 April 2016)

- a. W6
 - i. [There are] hunting and fuelwood / grazing / gathering area (electric line) Near Mesa de Las Viejas, Echo Amphitheater, private ranches
- b. W15
 - i. [There are] range grazing and water structures development
- c. W23, 24
 - i. El Rito Canyon ... Stone Canyon ... ongoing large-scale restoration projects
- d. W25
 - i. Land grant issues?
- e. W28
 - i. Sustained yield unit
- f. W32
 - i. Canjilon Lakes – campgrounds and water source, fishing
 - ii. Contains Canjilon water association spring and development for potable water
 - iii. It is adjacent to Trout Lakes, which is a popular recreation site
 - iv. Manageability is not feasible due to access and use between Trout Lakes and Canjilon Lakes
 - v. Snowmobiling occurs on the entire unit
 - vi. There are several inholdings that are adjacent to this unit