

Inventory Criteria Comments

We divided the comments into the following categories:

Designated Categories

- Size
- Roads
- Improvements

Additional Categories

- Process
- Water
- Land Grants
- Vegetation and Landscape
- Other

Size

Following are all of the comments related to size:

1. What about wilderness expansion and additions?
2. How large or small does a clear cut area need to be to be excluded / included
3. Adjacent federal lands. Inventory must include systematic way to inventory roads on public lands adjacent to CNF where by combining unroaded areas on public lands regardless of federal land managing agency all areas or $\pm 5,000$ acres will be identified in inventory.
4. Defacto road closures after transportation plan. If a road crossing private property identified as open in the transportation plan has been closed thus creating an unroaded unit of more than 5000 acres that area should be identified as $\pm 5,000$ acres in inventory.

Roads

These comments listed considerations for excluding areas from wilderness designation.

1. Access to wood for communities
2. Fire management for communities accessibility
3. Grazing – access people use 4 wheelers
4. Accessibility is critical (for) ... water management.
 - a. Non-earthen dams.
 - b. Headgate maintenance.
 - c. Ditches
 - d. Need for fire thinning
 - e. Need for machinery for maintenance.
5. Additional roads should be considered versus the forest travel management decisions
6. Remove administrative access roads used by permittees and USFS personnel
7. Roads that are still on the ground but not used even 4-5 yrs ago
8. Fire management for communities accessibility

9. Roads prior to USFS should be preserved

Improvements

1. Buildings – what is a building? A structure with a permanent foundation? Does a Tuff Shed count? A yurt?
2. Include below ground pipelines – they need maintenance too
3. Vertical structures – a feature may be very tall – but small in diameter and not show up at this scale. GIS will show this.
4. Why is the acreage for buildings so different from the acreage for water developments and gas wells?
5. Fences, corrals, etc. and other grazing improvements
6. Structures that (were) used (for) pre-territorial water rights
7. Expand criteria in time to include listed improvements that happened in the past which have left legacy impacts.

Process

Some process comments relate to terminology or methodology.

1. Expect question – define “wilderness character”
2. Inventory phase is inclusive rather than exclusive
3. To follow the wilderness process I think that the list includes everything needed to continue with the process
4. It is a good start, and good information and lets us know next meeting (step)
5. Advertise meetings with enough time: Las Vegas Daily Optic, Post offices, Western Mora soil and water conservation District, Mora Independent schools, Superintendent and Principals
6. Evaluate impact of wilderness designation on local communities and uses and resources that sustain local communities
7. “Adjacent lands”, how are these lands designated in the expansion of wilderness?
8. What phase is the clear cut at? Succession / stage
9. Private lands connected by polygons (?) just like you did with the gas wells or towers – better described as private land complexes (?)

Some comments relate to locations, uses or impact that suggest exclusion in the wilderness evaluation process.

10. Management areas designated for specific uses need to be given significant consideration to be removed from wilderness recommendation.
11. Multiple use should be considered first!
12. Grazing, or any use, timber (?), mineral extraction, that requires existing technology to include mechanical tools as part of management should be excluded from wilderness
13. Should remove useful land around lakes, fuel wood areas that will serve stakeholders’ needs.
14. An additional criteria should be considered: Is the land in question federal or land grant property?
15. Federal other laws and existing agreements could affect management

16. Impaired stream conditions should be considered as criteria – it may impact the ability to do needed restoration that could improve conditions.
17. Streams and springs that are sources of water of acequias
18. Should include historical use areas, as analogous to ‘developed recreation sites’
19. Wilderness criteria and manageability as a wilderness area
20. Economic impact on area inhabitants
21. Noise (impact of)
22. Sense of civilization (proximity to local communities)
23. Burn scars
24. Fire dependent ecosystems should be excluded from wilderness to include wild land/urban interface
25. Buffer zone need to be considered between wilderness and common lands to stop wildfires.
26. Current land use agreements

Some process comments relate to individuals or groups who should have input to the process.

27. Concern of other groups wanting wilderness. This could result in more wilderness than anticipated.
28. Local people should absolutely have input – thank you for this opportunity
29. Local people need to contact congressional delegation to fund our FS in such a way that we, GFS and community can help make the forest as healthy and useful (resource) as possible. This would help our local economy.
30. Private land – Owners need to be identified and advised of proposal designation or that the surrounding is being proposed as wilderness during the inventory process.
31. Input from community’s needs, need to be considered.
32. The people of Mora need to be better educated as to the role of the FS in relation to its communities. This meeting shows that the FS is for once being inclusive. Mora being that it is a part of two national forests has for too long been ignored. I appreciate being a part of the meeting. I learned a lot!

Water

There were a number of comments from people who felt that water sources and infrastructure would be better served by excluding them from wilderness consideration. Also see the water comments under the Roads section.

1. Water developments – some trick tanks use shiny metal to collect the rainwater without a windmill.
2. Acknowledge established water rights, originating in watersheds.
3. Should include areas where diversions and acequias have altered the natural flow of a watershed.
4. Large scale altering of hydro systems: channeling; irrigation ditches
5. Acequias and their conveyance should be excluded from wilderness
6. All water should be considered and taken off.
7. High country wetlands – no degradation or mitigation of degraded wetlands
8. Spring boxes and developed springs

9. Watershed improvements to address watersheds at risk

Land Grants

There were several comments asking that land grant or former land grant lands be removed from consideration as wilderness.

1. Exclude any land grant lands – can't get back later if wilderness
2. Land grants should not be considered or should be excluded, i.e. Pecos Wilderness, as a criteria, because they are private lands, not public lands
3. The land grant area serve as a buffer for fire protection
4. I think I believe that land grants that are presently managed by forest service should be excluded from inventory.
5. Should remove from inventory all common lands of land grants. They should be managed, not set aside.
6. Land grants are not federal land and should not be considered
7. Land grants as originally mapped when established should be excluded

Vegetation and Landscape

Some comments were about invasive species.

1. Shall include areas planted with crested wheat grass or other nonnative vegetation
2. Should include areas where human-induced sagebrush manipulation allowed

Other comments related to results of human activities and subsequent need for restoration.

3. Should include areas showing evidence of widespread overgrazing such as: chronic erosion issues (head cutting, soil movement, etc.)
4. Clear cut forests – in what kind of time frame
5. i.e. historic clear cuts which altered landscapes unnaturally
6. Nothing talks above landscape level disturbance levels ... examples: deforestation at turn of the century; large settlement / farming; large scale manmade alterations
7. Forest restoration within wilderness area should be allowed to restore and protect wilderness characteristics.

Other comments related to results of natural conditions and subsequent need for restoration.

8. Tree crashed areas of P.J. (piñon-juniper)
9. Forest health – areas of overgrown and unhealthy forests in need of stewardship thinning should not be excluded, but should be considered in this process for a different level of protection that allows for robust restoration activities.
10. Conditions of the forest (over growth) should be considered and instead of creating more wilderness maybe proposals should be made for funding to hire groups like Rocky Mountain Youth Corps to thin. This would also improve economic conditions in the area. The danger of a catastrophic fire is becoming more of a threat every year. By increasing the acreage of the Pecos Wilderness the danger increases.

Other

1. Relocate OHV trails
2. Several related to desire for no more wilderness in general
 - a. Ultimately NO MORE WILDERNESS!!
 - b. I think there is already too much wilderness areas (designated)
 - c. At the end of the evaluation process I feel that the CNF should "NOT" recommend additional wilderness areas.
3. From Canjilon Mountain north to hwy 64 is about 7 peaks through which a wilderness trail could be developed.
4. There are volcanic cones just north of 64 and scenic views farther to the north