**Comments from Albuquerque Mountain Bike Association**

**Cibola National Forest Mountain Ranger Districts**

***Comment Form for use with***

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

| **Document Reviewed (draft plan, wilderness process paper, map)** | **Resource Section** | **Page #** | **Line #** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 1:  Roles and Contributions of the Cibola Ntn’l Forest RD’s, Sandia Ranger District | 10 | 5 | Sandia Ranger District (**Vision** *currently under development*): The Sandia Ranger District should create a vision statement before the next draft is published as this will guide the development of the plan for both the public and the Forest Service. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Background and Description | 106 | 19 | The range of opportunities should be modified to read “…quality recreation, **educational,** and tourism opportunities.” |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Background and Description | 106 | 19 | Benefits should include: Quiet mountain, forested, and high-desert places provide an escape and climatic relief from urban environments *while mountain tops, cliffs, rivers and trails provide challenges and opportunities for personal growth.* |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Desired Conditions | 106 | 32 | This facilitates an understanding of and participation in resource conservation, *maintenance and development* and promotes…  Comment: opportunities for educating the public on trail maintenance and development should be maximized to help reduce work load on FS employees and take advantage of volunteer opportunities. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Desired Conditions | 106 | 37 | To reflect the Cibola National Forest efforts to educate the public on Forest lands, modify the line as follows: “…recreation, **educational,** and tourism opportunities…”. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2:  General Recreation, Desired Conditions | 107 | 5 | Desired Conditions: User conflicts are minimized *under a pro-active conflict management plan* OR *user conflicts are pro-actively managed.* |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Desired Conditions | 107 | 21 | The condition should be modified as follows: “…for Forest users, **including those with disabilities.**” to acknowledge the need to be inclusive. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Management Approaches | 108 | 12 | Consider adding another management approach. Trail building, for some, is recreation. The FS would benefit from an educational program focused on trail maintenance and building. A more involved, educated public would increase buy-in and reduce unauthorized trail building and trail destruction. This program could be contracted out. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Management Approaches | 108 | 17 | Rather than define the draft management area for the Sandia Ranger District outlined in Alternative B, modify the line as follows: “…a sustainable recreation program **with educational opportunities**, including…”. This supports and can replace components listed in Lines 23, 25, 30, and 34. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Management Approaches | 108 | 12 | There is no Management Approach in this section that addresses user conflict. Develop and implement a conflict minimization plan based on the experience of the current management team and the experiences of other Forest management teams. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, General Recreation, Management Approaches | 108 | Add after 36 | Add another management approach: “**In all planning activities, consider the needs of the handicapped so the ecosystems at different altitudes and exposures and the wilderness qualities of the Forest can be experienced by all.**” Many handicapped persons, including a growing population of disabled veterans should have similar opportunities for enjoying the Forest, including wheeled access on sustainable trail systems. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Developed Recreation, Management Approaches | 111 | Add after 32 | Add another management approach: “**Consider installing features or devices to facilitate rapid closure of recreational areas to users in the event of a wildfire, during severe drought, or to minimize impacts to wildlife.**” Fencing, gates, and signage should be considered to prevent public entry when Forest closures are necessary. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Developed Recreation, Management Approaches | 111 | 32 | Another management approach should be added: “**Consider flexibility in accommodating changing trends in recreation when extending or modifying trail systems.**” Trail system uses are not static but are driven by the changing needs and desires of the recreating public. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation, Desired Conditions | 112 | 14 | The condition should be modified to state: **“…and are planned to develop or enhance trail networks when possible.**” Planning should always emphasize improving the connectivity of area trails. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation, Guidelines | 112 | 27, 28 | In addition, trail design or modification should always consider the potential to enhance area trail systems and develop or improve access points. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation, Guidelines | 113 | 3 | Not only should new trails “avoid traveling through” the listed areas of concern, new trails should avoid being extended in close proximity to these same areas. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation | 114 | 9, 10 | Planning for new trails or modifications to the trail system should consider any opportunities for networking with neighboring trail systems in addition to destination or loop opportunities. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation | 114 | 11 | For completeness, the approach should read as: “Consider analyzing, adding, **and/or closing** unauthorized trails…” |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Dispersed Recreation, Management Approaches | 114 | Add after 22 | The following approach should be added: “**Cooperate with local agencies and community organizations in planning extensions or modifications of trail systems.**” |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Special Uses, Desired Conditions | 118 | 7 | The condition should be modified to read: “Environmental, visual, and sound impacts of emerging forms of **recreation**, technology, communications sites, utility…”. This plan is intended to be in effect for fifteen years and forms of recreation in special use areas such as ski areas will evolve in that time. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Special Uses, Desired Conditions | 118 | 18 | The condition should be modified to read: “…experiences of other Forest users **or on developed recreation areas**.” Outfitter/guide activities should not negatively impact Forest picnic areas, trail heads, or trails. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 2, Special Uses, Guidelines | 120 | 13 - 16 | This guideline proposes constraints to minimize the impacts of groundwater pumping on surface water sources. Rather than a guideline, this should be a requirement for all special uses pumping groundwater. |
| Draft Plan | Chapter 3, Management Areas & Designated Areas, Management Areas | 127 | 22 - 24 | This is a critical section and should have been developed prior to the inclusion of proposed management areas. No management areas should be discussed until this section has been documented and completely defined by public input. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix C: Plan Revision Core Themes | 171 |  | Modify the section “Managing for Sustainable Recreation” by adding: “…a recreation program that is **flexible,** resilient, and relevant…” |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 11 - 19 | The “East Mountain Outdoor Education/Recreation MA” does not have a clear, substantive, or defensible basis. While some of the components listed are worthy activities, the education, recreation, and interpretation activities could be applicable anywhere in the National Forest. This should be shelved until the the goals, objectives and need for a special MA is made clear to all users and the MA management guidelines and constraints are vetted by public input. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 11-19 | This section is extremely ambiguous and needs to be further defined. It will potentially increase user population conflict if it is not more specific. Additionally, all MAs should be omitted from the plan until the section that defines MAs is completed. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 13 | The basis for including this component is unclear. From hang-gliding on the western slopes to skiing or hiking on the eastern side, to motorized recreation in the Manzanitas, the Sandia Ranger District must manage special uses throughout their jurisdiction. Rather than emphasizing the land, the component may be better defined as supporting diverse education and recreation opportunities while sustaining Forest resources. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 14, 15 | This component is very important and worthwhile but again should not be bounded by a specific geographic area. The USFS should foster and facilitate these opportunities within the bounds of their operational constraints throughout the entire Forest to preserve and protect Forest resources. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 16, 17 | This component is poorly defined and appears to repeat the component stated in Lines 14 and 15. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Sandia Ranger District | 181 | 18, 19 | This component does not add value or basis for a management area in the Forest as stated. While the USFS can, has, and will foster education and recreational opportunities to the extent possible, private organizations must develop and manage these programs within USFS guidelines. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative B, Recommended Wilderness | 181 | 24 - 31 | Recommending additional areas for wilderness serves to exclude handicapped persons, including many disabled veterans whose mobility depends on wheeled access, whether by wheelchair, hand-cycle, or other non-motorized device. These areas are better defined as management areas where hunting, mining, timber-harvesting, or other development are not permitted rather than as wilderness. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative D, Sandia Ranger District | 184 | 9, 10 | The recommended wilderness area D5\_ADJ9 west of Canon de Carnuel is not an appropriate choice for recommended wilderness. Proximity to the high volume of traffic on I-40 and private property degrade the wilderness characteristics in the area. The area is described as a “northern buffer” but instead should be managed as National Forest acting as a necessary buffer between private property and the wilderness. This area currently allows and should continue to allow local residents the opportunity for wheeled recreation, including those with handicaps requiring wheeled methods of conveyance. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix D, Description of Alternatives, Alternative E, Sandia Ranger District | 186 | 35 - 37 | The recommended wilderness areas D5\_ADJ9 west of Canon de Carnuel and D5\_ADJ4 east of 10k Trail and north of Las Huertas Canyon are not appropriate choices for recommended wilderness. Area D5\_ADJ9 is discussed above. D5\_ADJ4 should be managed as other Forest areas outside of the wilderness. Proximity to the 10k North Trail and Ellis Trail, currently open to wheeled, non-motorized means of conveyance, including those of handicapped users, make this area a potential location for a connector trail down to Sandia Man Cave. Providing for future sustainable trail network improvements for public access and recreation should be an important component of the Forest Plan. Most of the Sandia Mountains are already designated as wilderness with trails that cannot be used by mountain bikers or the handicapped in wheeled conveyances, either wheelchairs or handcycles. |
| Draft Plan | Appendix E, Proposed Management Areas and Draft Alternatives Mapping, Sandia Ranger District | 188 | See SRD map | The management area defined on the Alternative B map is in close proximity to relatively densely private land, a well-travelled road, a ski area, USFS facilities, and communications towers. The special designation could reduce the ability of the USFS to adopt flexible management practices for the area. For example, the area should remain open to routine mechanized Forest thinning as needed to reduce the potential for wildfire, improve Forest health, and provide a buffer between private land, public resources, and wilderness. |
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