**Cibola National Forest Mountain Ranger Districts**

***Comment Form for use with***

***Preliminary Draft Plan, Wilderness Process Paper, and all maps***

Name:\_MtAir Ranger District Permittee Meeting\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Phone:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Email:\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

| **Document Reviewed (draft plan, wilderness process paper, map)** | **Resource Section** | **Page #** | **Line #** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Groundwater Management Approach | 58 | 6-9 | The State Engineer controls adjudication all the waters in New Mexico. Forest Service has zero authority to issue water permits. |
|  | Terrestrial Species and Habitat Management Approach | 68 | 28-36 | Clarification of the Wildlife Action Plan – the authorization of the plan; Is this an authorized document? |
|  | Groundwater – Management Approaches | 58 | 7-9 | Question: Private land Water Rights on adjacent lands adversely affecting National Forest Lands? |
|  | Nonnative, Invasive Species | 69 | 11 | Monitor and work with public to identify present of feral hogs |
|  | Threatened and Endangered Species |  |  | No Comments |
|  | Air |  |  | No Comments |
|  | Fire and Fuels | 76-77 | 27-40 | Change standard for utility lines clearing corridor to increase the corridor to 50 foot 25/25 from center in order to create a wider fuel break. |
|  | Range and Grazing | 80 | 38-41 | Forage utilization – What is the fire fuel hazard with 31 – 40 percent cattle and wildlife in the Spring? |
|  | Range and Grazing | 82 | 29-31 | Take into consideration the wildlife forage usage on the allotments. This will address carrying capacity when elk and cattle are present on an allotment. May need coordination with NM Game and Fish to receive annual elk census information for planning. |
|  | Fire and Fuels Background and Description | 76 |  | Manzano & Gallinas – there are a lot of areas where there should be effective thinning (Historic levels) prior to prescribed burning because a fire would become a catastrophic wildfire |
|  | Fire and Fuels Background and Description | 76 |  | Forest should recognize brush encroachment is the biggest problem on the forest. |
|  | Resource Requirements for Integrated Plan Components | 16 | 18 | Add “and grazing” after range |
|  | Range and Grazing Standards | 80 |  | Discussion/Post catastrophic stand changing fire severally burned areas require immediate re-seeding and soil erosion measures to avoid the creation of in accessible shrub lands dominated by bare rock, Gambles oak and New Mexico locust. Delays in post fire vegetation treatment has intensified the negative impact of high intensity rain events on burned allotments. This has proven a hardship on permittees and other forest users. (Little Bear Fire) |
|  | Range and Grazing | 81 | 7 | And predominate warm season native grasses |
|  | Range and Grazing | 81 | 20 | Add wildlife |
|  | Range and Grazing Guidelines | 81 | 28 | Include clarification ground disturbing activities for maintenance on range improvements, trails, roads require heritage surveys before work may commence. |
|  | Range and Grazing | 82 | 1 | Everyone should be aware of this (informational) |
|  | Range and Grazing Management Approaches | 82 |  | There should be a standardized monitoring methodology across the mountain districts. |
|  | Range and Grazing Management Approaches | 82-83 |  | Work closely with permittees to re-establish the beneficial use of the permit after a catastrophic fire. |
|  | Range and Grazing Management Approaches | 82-83 |  | When you have a catastrophic (Fire) event it should not be the sole responsibility of permittee to coordinate funding and replacement of range improvements and re-seeding. |
|  | Range and Grazing Standards | 80 | 34-41 | Clarification on the NRCS standards or AMU stocking rates standards |
|  | Glossary |  |  | Define range, rangeland, grazing, carrying capacity, resilience, stakeholder, grazing permittee, inholding, private lands, ground disturbing activities, and soil and water conservation district |
|  | Range and Grazing Guidelines | 81 | 35 | Determination on location of range improvements is planned by FS specialist recommendations from hydrology, soils, heritage, wildlife, and range. |
|  | Land Ownership Adjustment | 93 |  | Consideration – 300+ acre private inholding (Pete Cordova, permittee on the Encino Allotment) in the existing Manzano Wilderness Areas does not have legal road access. This was not addressed in the 1982 Forest Plan, but needs to be addressed in the revision. This private inholding may change the consideration of the Tajique Creek W&SR because the perennial source of the Tajique Creek is on the private land. Also any consideration for any proposed wilderness may be affected by a newly created access road. |
|  | Recreation  Management approaches | 114 | 8 | Add: managing current erosion issues on roads and trails caused by recreation and accommodate livestock movement across allotments. |
|  | Roads  Desired Conditions | 122 |  | Making unnecessary roadless areas and proposed wilderness areas are discriminatory against handicapped and the elderly. |
|  | Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers | 136 |  | See comment in Land Ownership - Adjustment |
| Comments | Alternative “B” | 177 |  | The Juan Sanchez Family (Barranca Allotment permittees) have requested for 3 years a review of the EA on the Gross Kelly allotment for grazing. They are heirs of the Manzano Land Grant and would be able to graze cattle (no conflict with Big Horn Sheep) on part or all of the Gross Kelly Allotment managed as a pasture attached to the Barranca Allotment. |
|  | Alternative “B” | 179 | Line 16 | See comment in Land Ownership - Adjustment |
| Comment | Historical Observation |  |  | Big Horn Sheep were on the Sandia Ranger District in the 1950s – they became inbreed and died out. So this may occur also on the Manzano Mountains because there are no migratory routes to increase genetic diversity. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |