

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW

Matt Schultz, Forest Planner, introduced the Gila National Forest planning process and summarized the current phase.

- The current forest plan, which was last revised in 1986, provides management guidance for the US Forest Service (USFS) and all the resources on the Gila National Forest.
- The planning process is embedded in an adaptive management framework that consists of assessing, planning, and monitoring. The revision is currently in the planning phase.
- The Gila National Forest planning team has completed the assessment phase and has posted final versions of the Assessment Report and Need for Change Document on the website. The Notice of Intent has also been published. This marks the beginning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.
- The Need for Change Document provides focus for the next phase of planning. The goal is to develop a Forest Plan that provides vision, strategy, and guidance. Components of the Forest Plan will be developed to meet desired conditions. Desired conditions are the drivers of the Forest Plan.
- The Forest Plan will also include:
 - Objectives
 - Standards
 - Guidelines
 - Suitability
 - Management approaches
 - Geographical areas
 - A monitoring plan
 - Timber suitability
 - Priority watersheds
 - An inventory of lands that may have potential wilderness characteristics
 - A wild and scenic river eligibility study
 - A list of significant issues and alternatives
 - An environmental analysis
- The plan components will be integrated to provide for multiple use, sustainability, ecological integrity, and ecosystem services. The plan components will provide a strategic and practical framework for managing the Gila National Forest that best meets the needs of the people while remaining within the inherent capability of the land and Forest Service authority/fiscal capacity.
- Stakeholder engagement is critical to developing a plan that can be successfully implemented. Engagement will ensure that the process is inclusive and transparent. For this phase of the plan, the Gila National Forest is planning to hold:
 - Community meetings

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

- Technical meetings
- Open houses
- Field trips
- Desired conditions workshops (early August)
- Review and comment periods
- The timeline is as follows:
 - Initial plan components: completed winter of 2017/2018 for feedback
 - Development of preliminary alternatives: early 2018
 - Environmental analysis (EIS): 2018/2019
 - Record of decision: 2019
- It is important that community members are active participants in developing a future vision for the Forest. Please tell the Gila National Forest planning team what is valuable about the Forest and offer ideas on forest management. The Gila National Forest planning team hopes to build on existing partnerships and explore new ways to accomplish land management goals throughout this process.
- For more information, visit the Gila National Forest Plan website: <http://go.usa.gov/h88k> or e-mail gilaplan@fs.fed.us.

MEETING PLAN OVERVIEW

- Participants were encouraged to provide field trip suggestions for areas, issues, management activities, or resources that they would like to visit with a Gila National Forest Service representative. There will be one field trip per district with multiple site visits.
- Participants rotated through three “stations,” each with a different focus related to the Forest Plan Revision.
 - **Station One** asked participants to write desired conditions for the Forest related to different topics (e.g., wildlife, infrastructure, vegetation, etc.).
 - **Station Two** asked participants to assess visual improvements based on whether they were “substantially noticeable.” “Substantially noticeable” is an important term for the Gila National Forest planners to define during the inventory of lands that may have potential wilderness characteristics.
 - **Station Three** asked participants to prioritize the benefits from the forest that are most important to them.

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

DESIRED CONDITIONS

Nessa Natharius, Forest Ecologist, described the importance of desired conditions in the Forest Plan Revision.

- Desired conditions will be the driver of the Forest Plan Revision. Framing forests in terms of desired conditions is a paradigm shift from the 1986 Forest plan, which was driven by standards and guidelines.
- Desired conditions are management outcomes (not actions). They must be achievable and within the inherent capability of the land. They must also be clear and concise and have enough detail to measure progress.
- Participants were first asked to individually write down several desired condition statements for the topic areas that mattered most to them (Section A, below). Participants then had a more in-depth discussion about their desired management outcomes (Section B, below).

A. DESIRED OUTCOMES PROPOSED BY INDIVIDUALS IN WRITTEN FORM

Participants were asked to write desired condition statements for as many or as few of the following topics as they preferred. Below are the participants' written statements.

Vegetation

- Riparian areas are healthy and exclude livestock.
- A well-balanced forest requires the removal of invasive plant and animal species. Maintain or increase the biodiversity of plants and destroy invasive species.
- Preserve native vegetation (forests and grasslands).
- The Forest's free-flowing river is maintained in a natural state allowing for the preservation of the Gila trout population.
- Forests are healthy and reflect frequent low-intensity fires.
- Balance plant and animal diversity to ensure and/or sustain healthy habitat structures.
- Native species of plants aid in the decrease of pollution and issues of excess nutrients from run-off sources.
- There is high biodiversity with functional food chains (including predators).
- There are no substantial water diversions or control devices.
- Biodiversity and ecological stability are maintained with little human interference. However, limited access and experience to this can be influential drivers of public support and protection.
- Forests are clear of dead timber and underbrush is removed.
- There are very few trees on the grasslands.

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

Soils and Watersheds

- Soils are supported by limited use of long-lasting pesticide. Only use chemicals in the case of invasive species clearing.
- There are free-running rivers!
- Riparian areas are excluded from grazing to maintain canopy diversity and water quality.
- Watersheds are not damaged by erosion, roads, or grazing.
- The soils and watersheds are kept natural.

Timber, Fuelwood and Other Forest Products

- There is more timber management and mining access.
- Wildfires are quickly controlled.
- The Forest makes money through timber and other products and spends it on infrastructure. The Forest uses selective cutting of timber to make a profit.
- Resource harvesting of “majority” of USFS land are managed (but wilderness is maintained). Re-plant or re-landscape as part of contracted removal. Set aside areas for personal use harvesting.
- Do not clear cut.
- Logging is limited to selected trees for thinning and economically retrievable purposes.
- Usable timber and other forest products are sensibly harvested without damaging other resources.
- People are allowed to gather timber firewood.

Wildland Fire and Other Fuels Management

- Money is set aside for preventative management.
- There is a fire regime that mimics nature (prior to fire suppression).
- Wildland fires are too big and intense. The policy needs to change to better manage fuels.
- There are more controlled burns to maintain diverse forests with low fuel-loads.
- Bug infection problems are managed to prevent trees from dying.
- Use “small users” and indigenous tribes to do biomass harvesting in areas that need to be cleared instead of doing preventative prescribed fires.

Wildlife

- Native plants and animals are introduced and supported.
- Hunting access to elk, deer, bears, turkey, and wolves is provided.
- Special interests are prevented from over-managing native species—like wiping out the native brown trout to benefit the Gila trout.
- Wolves are important to the wildlife population.
- There are more wolf releases.
- Wolf recovery and coexistence is promoted.
- Endangered species classifications do not mess with natural balance.

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

- Wildlife is abundant and includes large predators.
- There is no special treatment.
- There are lots of wolves!
- The USFS helps the Mexican Grey Wolf Project.
- Wildlife numbers are directly related to watershed management and livestock management practices.
- There is no hunting permitted on natural forest land.
- Habitat is preserved and restored.
- Wildlife habitat matches pre-Columbian population to the maximum extent possible.
- Wildlife can adjust locations depending on climate conditions.
- Trappers are required to be certified as trained users. There is a regular check of all off-trail traps and signage to warn dog owners.
- Wildlife habitats are complex and function for high biodiversity.

Recreation and Scenery

- The USFS offers educational opportunities to designated locations in the forests for youth groups (private and public).
- Views and vistas are free of all cellphone towers and the skies are free of man-made light.

Livestock Grazing

- Livestock is limited.
- Grazing is carefully monitored and annual operating instructions are adjusted according to the conditions.
- There is an option for permanent voluntary permit retirement.
- There are restricted areas where livestock grazing is and/or is not permitted.
- There is open access to off-road vehicles on land with grazing permits.
- Livestock grazing is restricted to open areas only.
- Overgrazing and damage to riparian areas is avoided.
- It is okay to have grazing on grasslands but not on timberlands.
- Grazing is confined to ranches.
- Livestock grazing is at a low level to maintain grass resources and plant biodiversity.
- Grazing rights are “shorter;” there are no more lifetime (and beyond) leases. Permits rotate every ten years.
- Permit holders do not own the land. There should not be any gates; all roads should be open.

Infrastructure (Roads, Trails, Campgrounds, etc.)

- Duplicative roads (i.e., roads within one mile of each other) going to the same basic area are closed. Maintain the remaining roads.
- Trails are maintained and signage is updated.

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

- Roads are improved.
- The Travel Management Rule (TMR) is scrapped.
- The USFS provides access to private land.
- The USFS improves signage on wilderness trails.
- There are only trails; no roads.
- Camping opportunities are expanded. Not everyone has a camper and wants to camp in a parking lot.
- Campgrounds are small and undeveloped.
- Hiking trails are maintained away from water ways.
- The USFS encourages clean campsites by putting up signs by the campground.
- The USFS expands trail width and cleans brush from trails.
- Existing roads are maintained to the best extent possible.
- Do not pave roads. Keep the roads dirt (not gravel).
- It is fine that trails are numbered now, but bring back the traditional names of the trails as well. For example, the DeLoche Trail, Hummingbird Spring, etc.
- There are more tent campgrounds.
- The forest contains acres for camping in riparian areas that are free from excessive noise and traffic.
- There is clear signage of uses and access at trailheads and visitor access areas. Some signs have fallen down or are hard to find. Signage should clearly identify areas for recreation, hunting/fishing, etc.
- There are sign-in sheets at the trailhead with posted rules and restrictions and a map of the area.
- Trails are extensive, resistant to erosion, and open to all non-motorized use (including bikes).
- Areas with varying levels of access are provided: car camping for the less adventurous, backpacking (carry-in, carry-out) in the wilderness areas, and other options in between (i.e., camps set up on trails).
- All public land is accessible by four-wheel vehicles. No grazing or other permit holders should deny public access. These are not private lands.
- Trails are re-routed around creek bottoms. There is access to water from trails approximately every six miles.
- There are interconnected OHV trails.
- The existing trails are restored or re-routed to enhance connectivity and sustainable design.
- The USFS considers how forest trails connect to other trails outside of the forest.
- Trails are built and maintained using sustainable techniques.
- The USFS continues to engage the public and provide opportunities for volunteering and training for trail maintenance, building, and planning.
- The USFS encourages the use of contour swales and “one-rock” dams in developed camping areas for erosion control.

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

- Multiple types of users are considered when planning recreation and trails.
- Make sure bikers are considered in wilderness designation. Routes around the area are planned so that mountain bikers are not restricted from long-distance riding.
- Road closures are considered for other uses such as trails for non-motorized users, including mountain bikes.
- The USFS considers trails and routes around potential conflict areas such as private inholdings, wilderness, and locked gates.
- There is a system of motorized trails sufficiently large enough to be of interest. The Lincoln National Forest has an area with approximately 75 miles of trails interconnected with Forest Service roads.
- All public land that has grazing permits should still be accessible to all vehicles. There should not be any vehicle access restrictions due to grazing permits.

Designated Areas

- There is more wilderness acreage.
- There are designated and enforced sites for specific uses (i.e., motorized vehicles, RVs, or camping).
- The USFS recognizes private property owners adjacent to and within forest boundaries.
- Wilderness areas are expanded.
- The “absolute wilderness” is preserved in significantly large enough areas to be self-sustaining. This belongs to our future children. We have no right to destroy their inheritance.

Cultural Resources

- Archaeology sites are protected, preserved, and monitored. Outreach, interpretation, and education are provided, if needed. There should be education for visitors about native people in places other than cliff dwellings.
- There are more interpretive signage and information.
- Cultural resources are protected but accessible for viewing.
- The USFS encourages proposals from “historical users” that replicate early cultures as models for education.

Traditional Cultural Uses

- Gathering of firewood is a long-standing tradition tied to the culture.
- Livestock grazing is part of the cultural practices of the community and is a tool which can be used for fire fuels management.

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

Other

- National lands must be made available to tourists. Encourage tourism from the cities. Let people experience it. Bring disadvantaged youth out for summer conservation camps. When they help to build it, they will value it.
- Geologist rock enthusiasts should be allowed to bring some rocks found on the trails home.
- Permitting for non-commercial trips with small numbers of participants should be simple.

B. GROUP DISCUSSION

The group discussed desired conditions for infrastructure. The themes from their discussion are captured below.

Infrastructure

- Pavement often gets washed out and creates potholes. The patches do not help. Instead of using gravel, use dirt for roads.
- Many roads that were closed for fires have not been reopened, like 159. Closed roads should have a sign to explain the reason for the closure.
- There is a lack of clarity about road ownership. Who has the authority to reopen the roads?
- Build more trails that are further away from water sources.
- Eliminate debris on trails.
- Construct durable signage.
- Redesign and re-route trails using sustainable techniques and standards that control erosion, protect wildlife corridors, etc.
- Rules for developed and undeveloped camping designation should be more accessible. Campers should have to obtain permits at the trailhead.
- The USFS should have to consider trail connectivity. Mountain bikers should be considered so that they have an option to ride around designated wilderness areas. The USFS should consider regional trail connectivity and try to connect Gila National Forest trails to trails on adjacent land, whether that land belongs to the Bureau of Land Management, the State, etc.
- Toilets should be cleaned and open for public use.
- Water access should be set up on the edge of undeveloped areas for hikers. The website and trailhead should specify that hikers should bring water.
- There should not be any roadblocks on the Continental Divide Trail (CDT).
- The USFS and ranchers should not be permitted to put locks on the gates. Ranchers should lose their permit if found using locks.
- Continue engaging different users and do field trips.
- Develop innovative ways to maintain the trails. Consider using volunteers.

Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING

Livestock Grazing

- Grazing should be controlled in designated areas. There are issues with overgrazing when ranchers remove allotments.
- There is a trust issue between ranchers and the USFS. Many ranchers have been engaged in planning processes but have felt as though the USFS has not been truthful.
- There should be a drought plan.
- Grazing should be restricted, especially on wildlife conservation areas. It is not about aesthetics.
- Leave accessible water out for cattle.
- Grazing leases should rotate every few years (two years, ten years?). Adjacent landowners do not have access to the grazing rights that their neighbors have.
- Private grazing on public lands should not be permitted. The system needs to be fair and prevent overgrazing.
- Grazing has increased and has impacted the health of the forest.

Wildlife

- It is important to have wolves and predators in the forest.
- There should be a certification process for running traps.
- Sustain rivers and streams to ensure the maintenance of aquatic and riparian wildlife.
- Use fences that have the pole in the middle to allow for wildlife migration.
- Notify the public about wildlife-user issues, e.g., when there is a nest near the trail.

Other

- Update the USFS Gila National Forest website. Include current conditions and free maps. Self-printed maps cost money on the website.
- There are too many restrictions on sampling for personal use.

INVENTORY OF LAND WITH POTENTIAL WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Eric Flood, Recreation Planner, explained the process for identifying and evaluating lands that may be suitable to recommend to Congress for Wilderness Designation. When Congress passed the original Wilderness Act in 1964, they instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to periodically assess wilderness characteristics on national forests.

- It is required by law and policy that every national forest undertaking forest plan revision must undergo this process, which involves four steps. Each step in the process reduces the number of acres being evaluated:
 - **Step one:** The USFS performs a broad and inclusive inventory of lands that may have potential wilderness characteristics.

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

- **Step two:** Sites are evaluated for wilderness characteristics. They are evaluated for apparent naturalness, opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation, and manageability to protect wilderness characteristics.
- **Step three:** A range of alternatives are analyzed. Inclusion in alternatives is based on the compatibility with the “theme” of each.
- **Step four:** The Forest Supervisor decides which, if any, lands to recommend to Congress for designation. Congress may or may not act upon this recommendation.
- The Gila National Forest planning team is currently in the first step of the process. First, any areas that contain any open roads are excluded, with a 300-foot buffer (which can be adjusted on a case-by-case basis). The planning team will then identify and remove all areas with “substantially noticeable” improvements and installations. Finally, the planning team will remove areas that are “unmanageable as wilderness areas due to their size.” Areas less than 5,000 acres that do not border an existing wilderness area are not generally considered manageable unless they have unique circumstances due to terrain, location, natural barriers, etc.
- As part of the inventory of lands with potential wilderness characteristics process, the Gila National Forest must determine what existing structures and improvements are “substantially noticeable” and exclude them from the inventoried areas.
- Participants were asked to write their responses to the following 3 questions on a sticky note for each of 11 pictures with a manmade structure or improvement in it:
 - Do you think the structure or improvement in this picture is substantially noticeable?
 - Why or why not?
 - Can you think of any change in circumstance that would change your answer to question number one?

RESULTS OF GROUP EXERCISE (Letters before responses do not connote meaning or value; they have been added to facilitate reading the table below. Each letter corresponds to a single person’s response for that picture.)

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
Wildlife Guzzler (with bear)	a. Yes	a. Materials are unattractive	a. Use different materials and improve the natural landscaping
	b. Yes	b. It is obvious	b. It is not likely to be removed unless grazing is excluded

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	<p>c. Yes</p> <p>d. Yes</p> <p>e. Yes</p> <p>f. Yes</p> <p>g. Yes</p> <p>h. Yes if for a campground, but no if it is for wildlife</p> <p>i. Yes</p> <p>j. No</p> <p>k. No</p> <p>l. No</p> <p>m. No</p> <p>n. No</p> <p>o. No</p> <p>p. No</p>	<p>c. It can be maintained by pack animals</p> <p>d. The system of collecting water is not natural</p> <p>e. Rubber tire detracts from surrounding area.</p> <p>f. Metal is not acceptable for wilderness</p> <p>g. Metal and rubber look out of place in the wilderness</p> <p>h. Not okay if it is a campground</p> <p>i. But it is okay if it provides water for wildlife</p> <p>j. Water is good for wildlife but not for wilderness</p> <p>k. It is small enough without windmill or fence</p> <p>l. It is small</p> <p>m. It is a wildlife drinking station</p> <p>n. Necessary for wildlife</p> <p>o. It is a watering hole</p> <p>p. It is only noticeable up close</p>	<p>c. What is the USFS policy?</p> <p>d. If it was broken down</p> <p>e. Use different materials or remove it</p> <p>f. Use organic materials if needed</p> <p>g. Use rocks and wood structures to water wildlife if needed</p> <p>h. No</p> <p>i. If it does not require servicing</p> <p>j. N/A</p> <p>k. Good to provide water for wildlife</p> <p>l. No</p> <p>m. No</p> <p>n. Bigger facility would be significantly noticeable</p> <p>o. If it dried up</p> <p>p. If it was never full or not functional</p>
Wildlife Guzzler	<p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. Yes</p> <p>c. Yes</p>	<p>a. Materials detract from the surrounding</p> <p>b. It obviously belongs to a ranch</p> <p>c. It is not natural</p>	<p>a. Use different materials</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Remove the structure</p>

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	d. Yes	d. Remote water collection reservoir is used by local wildlife and livestock	d. Good example of a mutual benefit
	e. Yes	e. Water collection system is designed to increase captured rainfall	e. Loss of grazing or loss of wildlife
	f. Yes	f. It is metal and not part of the "natural view"	f. Remove it
	g. Yes	g. It is ugly	g. Remove it
	h. Yes	h. Reservoir or livestock around the fence	h. Remove fence
	i. Yes	i. It is shiny and metal and obviously man-made	i. Remove it or reconstruct it below ground using natural materials
	j. Yes	j. It is a man-made structure	j. There is no problem without the fence
	k. Yes	k. It is man-made	k. No issue because it benefits wildlife
	l. Yes	l. The color does not fit	l. Paint it
	m. Yes	m. It is used for grazing	m. No
	n. Yes	n. It is not of historical or cultural significance	n. No
	o. Yes	o. It is durable and obvious	o. Remove it
	p. Yes	p. It is too new	p. If a rainwater collector is needed, make it more organic looking
	q. Yes	q. Strong visual impact	q. Remove it if it is not in use
	r. Yes	r. It is noticeable	r. Use other materials
	s. No	s. It is required for wildlife	s. It would be significantly noticeable if it was in the wrong place
	t. No	t. It is a water collection system	t. It is like a windmill

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> u. No v. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> u. There are many in wilderness v. The structure is used to water wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> u. No v. This may be within 300 feet
Aging Cabin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes i. Yes j. No k. No l. No m. No n. No o. No p. No q. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is great to see historic items b. It is an example of vernacular architecture c. Mankind has been here d. There is an established trails and signs e. Interpretive site f. It is an obvious structure of recent construction g. It is man-made h. N/A i. It is a man-made structure j. It is authentic and historic k. It is insignificant l. It is historical m. It blends into the environment n. Archeological site o. It blends into the natural setting p. It looks historical q. The structure looks very old 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If it is totally destroyed and an eyesore b. Hitching post, curtain doors, etc. c. Maybe once all human existence is gone d. If it burned down e. Remove the kiosk and let the structure blend into the landscape f. More age or wear g. Remove it h. It will go away i. If it was of historic value j. N/A k. No l. No m. No n. No o. No p. No q. No

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> r. No s. No t. No u. Possibly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> r. It is not permanent and looks historic s. It has little to no impact on the land. No one inhabits it t. It is not a modern development or installation u. Does it have major historical connections? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> r. If it was new and inhabited s. Let it decay t. If it is historically significant, it would not be substantially noticeable u. N/A
Lookout Tower and Communication Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes i. Yes j. Yes k. Yes l. Yes m. Yes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tower needs maintenance and therefore access b. It is ugly c. It is not culturally significant d. It could be used as a cell tower to make money for the forest e. It is man-made f. It detracts from wilderness g. It is very modern looking h. It is conspicuous i. It is not a native color j. It is out of place in a forest k. It looks like it is on the top of the mountain so hardly anyone would notice it l. It is a historic building but has towers m. Fire lookout is okay but get rid of towers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remove it b. No c. If it is needed for communication d. It is fine if it is necessary for spotting e. Remove it f. Camouflage, bury, or remove it g. Set it in away from trees h. If it is used for safety i. If it was in a meadow it would need to be camouflaged j. Get rid of the towers so it looks historic k. More infrastructure or vehicular access l. N/A m. No

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	n. No	n. Building could be a historic lookout that is important and characteristic of wilderness. Antenna is distracting	n. N/A
Solar Panel	a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes i. Yes j. Yes k. Yes l. Yes m. Yes n. Yes	a. It is obviously man-made and modern b. It is okay to allow it for remote power of a water pump c. It implies a nearby road d. There must be human access to this point to service it e. It is a human-made structure f. It is a good source of power g. It appears unnatural and detracts from the forest h. It is a modern development i. Why is this in a wilderness? j. Solar systems are new k. It does not fit into the “wild” landscape and is clearly man-made l. It is too new m. Modern technology placed purposely to provide power n. It is man-made	a. It may be the best alternative (lower visual impact area than power lines) b. It is equal to the windmill in “value” c. Remove all serviceable equipment d. Relocate it e. Remove it f. No g. No h. No i. Remove it or explain why it is there j. No k. If it is crucial to provide a power to a well or community l. Take it down m. Yes if it is needed for communication n. Cover it or hide it

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. No p. No q. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. It is not wilderness p. It does not disrupt the setting q. It provides renewable energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Open to public p. No q. No
Clear-Cut Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes i. Yes j. Yes k. Possibly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clear-cut logging is not pleasing b. Harvest of timber c. Do not clear cut in wilderness d. Large-scale logging encourages damage to the forest (erosion, invasive species, etc.) e. Bare soil and the disturbance is not natural f. It is obvious destruction by man g. It scars the land growth h. Trees have been removed i. A huge grandmother tree and all surrounding growth have been clear cut j. It is obvious now k. It needs logging roads but is good for timber sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Selective logging that retains forest biodiversity, canopy, and understory b. Smaller area (i.e., selective harvesting) c. Leave it alone so it can be included after it grows back d. In 20 years after regrowth has happened e. Allow the trees to come back f. Protect and allow the land to heal and regrow g. Will reforestation happen? h. Stop cutting trees here i. There are few old trees in the area. They provide host space different from new growth j. But time may take care of it k. N/A

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	l. No	l. It us modified but recoverable	l. With regrowth it could recover
Fish Barrier	a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. No i. No j. No k. No l. No m. No	a. The fish pond is man-made b. Erosion control is okay c. Because it is rare in New Mexico. Water here is different from water in other parts of the US. d. It is used for fish containment e. It depends where it is f. Preserve endangered species g. It is a great waterfall h. It does impact the view i. The structure is not obvious j. Structure is not noticeable k. It looks to be natural l. It is necessary for developing riparian areas m. It is a suitable modification that maintains function	a. Allow access, but protect it b. Demolish it c. If it was destroyed by a flood d. Remove it e. If it dried up f. It will eventually erode g. If structure impacts upstream or downstream ecosystem or resources h. If it was diverting water i. No j. N/A k. Not Needed l. No m. N/A

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
Windmill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes i. Yes j. Yes k. Yes l. Yes m. Yes n. No o. No p. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It shows significant human impact b. It is a water resource, but is it hard to find and use? c. It is substantially noticeable but it should be allowed due to the benefit to livestock and wildlife; it is a “green” solution d. It stands out relative to the surroundings e. It is not natural f. Water source is installed for both domestic and wild animals g. It is a mechanical windmill h. It is a new windmill and stock tank i. It is a recently disturbed site j. Cattle grazing and man-made structures k. Watering animals in wilderness? l. It is man-made m. It is a windmill n. It is historical and may be useful to wildlife o. It is relatively unobtrusive p. There are already many in wilderness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No b. Not sure c. It is bad if it is overgrazed and muddy d. Removal e. Remove it f. Would need a better understanding of the policies g. Remove it h. Remove cows. Cows should not be in wilderness i. Use different materials or remove it j. If cattle were removed k. Remove it l. Remove it m. Do not remove it unless there is livestock removal n. Placement will determine it o. Remove it if it is not necessary p. No

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	q. No r. No s. No t. No u. No v. No	q. It is not objectionable. It is doing a service to wildlife r. It is a small area. The water will benefit native wildlife s. It is man-made t. Windmills are common and historical and contribute to the area's history u. It is already managed v. It has little to no impact on the land and is easily removed	q. No r. Hide it s. If it is continually serviced t. Open it to the public u. No if it is historical and not presently being used v. N/A
Range Fence	a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Yes h. Yes	a. It is distracting b. Fence goes for a long way and gives a sense of closedness c. Fence protects and divides private land from public lands d. It is a scenic landscape e. It looks like a ranch business is established there f. It shows human separation by fencing g. It is an open range h. It is divisive	a. Take it down b. Remove it c. N/A d. If it was more developed; i.e. more buildings or cell towers e. It depends on who owns the land. Exclude the ranch f. Remove it g. Remove the man-made structures h. Remove it

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	i. Yes j. Yes k. Yes l. Yes m. Yes n. Yes o. No p. No q. No r. No s. No	i. It is an open range j. It is obviously man-made k. It could not be used as old western movie background l. Barrier to wildlife corridor m. It divides the land n. It looks like a private ranch o. It is made of natural materials and blends into the landscape and will eventually rot away p. It does not have a significant visual impact on the larger landscape q. It is small relative to the area r. It is not permanent s. Fence has no impact on the land and can easily be removed	i. N/A j. If it is removed, it would not be noticeable k. Remove man-made structures l. Build a break or bridge so that wolves can cross m. Remove it n. No, unless it can be removed o. If the fence restricts wildlife p. If it presents a danger to wildlife q. If there were other structures r. No s. N/A
Aging Corral	a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. No	a. It is a cattle facility b. It has an obvious visual impact c. Decomposition is possible d. It is a typical structure with no historical significance. It is only important if it is "famous" or long-lasting	a. It depends on the future of grazing b. Time may take care of it unless it is repaired c. Remove it all d. If it was still used or if there was heavy traffic

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. No f. No g. No h. No i. No j. No k. No l. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. It is not a permanent structure f. It is part of history g. But it should stay there and be restored h. This could be useful to pack animals. It could be substantial with pack animals i. Wood is natural and will be reclaimed by the land j. It is not visible from far away k. It looks historical l. It is organic and gives time for thought about past generations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. If it was made from metal f. If fence protects a resource g. N/A h. Let it decay over time i. N/A j. Fix it up for future use k. It is good to see signs of history in the wilderness l. No
Aging Range Fence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes e. Yes f. Yes g. Possibly h. No i. No j. No k. No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is a fence b. It is a remnant of ranching c. It depends on whether the fence was installed for confinement of animals or erosion purposes d. N/A e. It is man-made f. It is man-made g. It may be historical h. It provides rustic scenery i. It is old and decaying j. It is not durable k. It is a man-made structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Total collapse b. If it allowed wildlife access via breaks c. Removal of old fence material d. It will go away e. Provide wildlife crossings f. Let it decompose g. If will decompose h. N/A i. No j. No k. It is of historic value

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

Improvement or Structure	Do you think this picture is substantially noticeable?	Why or why not?	Is there any change in circumstance that would change your answer to #1?
	l. No	l. It is made of natural materials and is characteristic of wilderness	l. Interpretive kiosks, wayfinding, etc.
	m. No	m. It is old and blends in	m. It is organic and will rot
	n. No	n. It is made of natural decaying materials	n. No
	o. No	o. It has a low visual impact and does not require regular maintenance	o. If it was a safety hazard
	p. No	p. An old ranch may have donated it. There is nothing that needs upkeep	p. If there was a road there
	q. No	q. It is being reclaimed by nature	q. Natural deterioration will take its course
	r. No	r. It is not important enough to preserve and worth leaving in place	r. If there was history attached to it
	s. No	s. It looks like an incomplete project	s. It would be significantly noticeable if it was made of pipes or was a recent installation
	t. No	t. It looks like fallen trees	t. If there were improved interpretive facilities, wayfinding kiosks, etc.

**Gila National Forest
Las Cruces, NM
June 16, 2017
FOREST PLAN REVISION PUBLIC MEETING**

VALUES AND PRIORITIES ON FOREST SERVICE LAND

Chris Armatas and Bill Borrie from the University of Montana led a prioritization exercise. Participants were asked to prioritize the benefits from the forest that are most important to them. The final report from Chris Armatas and Bill Borrie will present the diversity of opinions as well as the similarities among participants.

PUBLIC COMMENT CARDS AND MEETING EVALUATION

On a scale from “not good” to “very good,” 15 people indicated that the meeting was “very good.” Written public comment is below.

- I was not able to attend the third station as it was full. Maybe there should be a way to regulate stations? Thanks!
- The “substantially noticeable” poster session part was difficult to follow. It was said that the rules came out that way “vague,” but I doubt the results in this session have statistical reliability.
- Thank you! Interactive process was well designed. Host team very good. Questions super!
- There should be no additional wilderness designation.

FIELD TRIP SUGGESTIONS

Participants provided the following feedback and suggestions for field trips.

- The trail west of Little Creek (off the map) that goes down from Lilly Park needs work.
- If Turkey Creek Hot Springs are part of the wilderness, they would make a great field trip.
- Road #157 should, but no longer exists? The road through Ladder Ranch.
- On sustainable trails. Need to re-route and plan in Black Range.
- Good connectivity with trails and community Silver City and the Continental Divide Trail (CDT)
- Lack of connectivity on trails, especially for mountain bikers in the Black Range due to private land, locked gates, blocked roads, and wilderness. The CDT is well built.