

**San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant adopted objection by the  
New Mexico Land Grant Council  
Objection to the Santa Fe National Forest Final Land Management Plan**

November 1, 2021

The New Mexico Land Grant Council submits the following objections to the final draft land management plan (and appendices, including EIS) for the Santa Fe National Forest. Since 2014, the New Mexico Land Grant Council has engaged with the three northern forests (Carson, Cíbola and Santa Fe) in the plan revision process and participated in anticipation and in the formation of the Planning Rule of 2012. The Council, with support from the Land Grant Studies Program at the University of New Mexico and the Merced Land Education and Conservation Trust (MLECT), and support from dozens of land grants, has arranged a number of listening sessions, which turned into MOUs, cost share agreements, and forest plan community collaboration. Additionally, Council staff has provided “Land Grant 101” sessions for new USFS employees of Region 3, as well as other education and outreach. The Council has served as a cooperative agency on all three forests, including the Santa Fe National Forest. Further, the Council has encouraged the participation of land grants throughout northern and central New Mexico in the plan revision process.

As a cooperating agency and government working group member, the Council has not wavered in its support of *protecting and restoring the traditional uses of the national forests by land grant-merced communities*. These traditional uses are of profound cultural, historical, social and economic importance to land grant heirs and the boards of trustees that represent their interests. It is paramount that this plan corrects the mistakes of the 1985-1986 forest plans, where little public engagement led to the inconsistency as many forest supervisors and districts rangers waived in their service to resource dependent communities that live amongst New Mexico’s national forests, of which thousands of acres are their former land grant commons.

Land grant communities did not choose to settlement amongst national forest systems lands: by and large, their proximity to national forest lands is the result of the federal government purchasing thousands of acres of former land grant common land from the very speculators that unethically stole the land grant commons from our communities in the first place. More than one million acres became part of the public domain as a result of the 1897 U.S. Supreme Court’s *U.S. v. Sandoval* decision, which erred in determining that the common lands remained under the ownership disposition of the sovereign (first the Spanish Crown, then the Mexican Republic and ultimately the U.S. federal government). This decision overturned a ruling of the Court of Private Land Claims, which, in line with previous decisions by the U.S. Office of the Surveyor General for New Mexico, held that the common lands were the fee simple property of the land grants to which they were granted. Though some lands were regained by individual heirs as homesteads, the bulk of these lands were included in the newly created forest reserves.

By the 1920s and through the Great Depression, the federal government began aggressively purchasing land grant common lands from the very land speculators that dispossessed land grant communities. This accelerated during the New Deal, where lands were purchased by several federal agencies before ultimately being transferred to the U.S. Forest Service and included in growing national forests. The result: 332,594.48 acres of the Santa Fe National Forest are now U.S. Forest Service lands. The Carson and Santa Fe National Forests also share 52,169 acres of the Mora Land Grant, which was partitioned

before portions were purchased by the federal government between 1931 and 1955. Overall, including both lands taken under the *U.S. v. Sandoval* decision and those lost through speculation, well over 900,000 of land grant common lands are now forest system lands (more than 100,000 acres of common lands are managed by the BLM).

Below is a narrative that discusses our reasons for objecting to the final land and resource management plan as presented. Attached are notations to the Council's November 2019 comments that we believe were not met by the U.S. Forest Service in neither their final draft plan nor in their responses to our comments.

## **Santa Fe**

### *Chapter 2. Forestwide Direction – Traditional Communities and Uses*

The NMLGC recommends that the Santa Fe National Forest, within its plan, outside of the general narrative and historic background, recognize the land grant-*merced* history within the Santa Fe National Forest, especially considering the aforementioned acreages of former land grant common land within the forest lands managed by the Santa Fe National Forest. The US Forest Service began purchasing land grant common land that became part of the Santa Fe National Forest in 1934 and 1935, when it purchased the Juan de Gabaldon Land Grant (8,001 acres) from the Thomas Catron estate and the southern half of the Juan Jose Lobato Grant (72,935 acres) from William S. Jackson, a member of the Colorado State Supreme Court, who bought it from George Hill Howard, a land speculator. These and other purchases under the auspices of New Deal Programs continued and were complemented by the 1960s exchange for the Cañón de San Diego Grant (98,614 acres), bringing the total of former land grant lands within the Santa Fe National Forest to 332,594.48 acres. The USFS also purchased the remaining private land (~1,400 acres) within the Cañón de Chama (Skull Ranch), which were miniscule portion of the San Joaquín del Río de Chama Grant that was patented (1,422 acres of the 471,756 acre San Joaquín del Río de Chama Grant). Adding this acreage increases the total to nearly 334,000 acres of land.

Additionally, land grant-*merced* communities maintain an interest in forest system lands that surround those communities to meet their traditional use needs, including, but not limited to, firewood (including ocote), plants, herbs and nuts for consumption and medicinal purposes, including piñón nuts, oshá roots, building materials, including vigas and latillas and gravel and sand, etc. Land grants-*mercedes* that maintain an interest in forest systems lands managed by the Carson National Forest include: Abiquiú, Anton Chico, Cañón de San Diego, Juan Bautista Baldés, Juan Jose Lobato, Las Truchas, San Joaquín del Río de Chama, San Miguel del Bado, Santa Cruz de la Cañada, Mora, Santo Domingo de Cundiyo, Sebastián Martín, and Tecolote.

## **Specific objections to the Santa Fe National Forest Final Resource Management Plan by the New Mexico Land Grant Council**

The New Mexico Land Grant Council submits the following objections to the Santa Fe National Forest Plan.

1. In general, the Council objects to the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses Section not including a separate section for Land Grant-Mercedes. The Council raised the importance of having a separate section relating to land grants-mercedes at the beginning and

throughout the entire planning process. This is evidenced by official comments submitted by the throughout the process. The National Forest instead chose to include the incorporate land grants-mercedes into the Rural Historic Communities Section, which lumps all non-tribal communities together. Like tribal communities, Land Grant-Merced communities not only predate the establishment of the U.S. Forest Service but also the establishment of United States of America sovereignty over what is now the U.S. Southwest. Settlement of land grant-merced communities occurred over a period of at least 168 years prior to 1848, with most inhabitants being *mestizo* (mix of Native American and Spanish European descent) and *genízaro* (full blooded Native American decent). The lack of separate recognition of these important, still existing communities, in the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses Section, denies historical accuracy and equity to these pre-existing indigenous communities whose property rights are protected by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The Plan can be improved by establishing a separate sub-section for land grants-mercedes under the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses Section, as previously suggested by the Council. For the demonstrated link between the Council's Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see previously submitted New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments.

2. Although the Council objects to the lack of a separate section for land grants-mercedes within the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses Section, since land grants-mercedes are included under the Rural Historic Communities (RHC), the Council also objects to the fact that there are no Standards or Objectives for the RHC section found in the plan. According to page 18 of the Final Plan, recognized plan components, "should (1) provide a strategic and practical framework for managing the Santa Fe National Forest, (2) be applicable to the resources and issues of the forest, and (3) reflect the forest's distinctive roles and contributions." Standards and Objectives in the RHC Section would in fact provide a strategic and practical framework for accomplishing the Desired Conditions under the RHC Section. In addition, Standards and Objectives in the RHC section would be applicable to the resources used and issues faced by RHCs accessing and utilizing National Forest resources. Without Standards and Objectives it makes it difficult to determine the Santa Fe National Forest's distinctive roles and contributions in progressing towards the Desired Conditions found in the RHC Section of the Plan. Further, "Objectives describe how the Santa Fe NF intends to move toward the desired conditions" and "Standards are technical design constraints that must be followed when an action is being taken to make progress toward desired conditions." Therefore, the lack of these essential plan components in the Rural Historic Communities Section again raises questions about how the Santa Fe National Forest will work towards accomplishing desired conditions without any measurable objectives to gauge progress towards those Desired Conditions or any technical design constraints that will guide individual land management activities toward accomplishment of Desired Conditions. The Council throughout the planning process submitted multiple suggested objectives and standards that were tied specifically to identified desired conditions and other plan components. None of these suggested standards and objectives found their way into the final draft of the plan. The Plan can be improved by incorporating the previously suggested or similar Standards and Objectives made by the Council. For the demonstrated link between the Council's Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection on pages 4 through 12-A.

3. The New Mexico Land Grant Council objects to the lack of a Desired Condition relating to a collaborative relationship between the Forest Service and Land Grant-Merced Communities that results in mutually beneficial educational programs. The National Forest language does speak to providing a space for educational opportunities with youth, but not in collaboration with land grant-merced and other traditional communities. As described on page 18 of the Final Plan “Desired Conditions describe the vision for the Santa Fe National Forest. They are the ecological, cultural, and socioeconomic aspirations toward which management of the land and resources of the plan area is directed.” The Council argues that collaboration with longstanding adjacent communities dependent on National Forest lands and resources for educating local youth should be an aspirational vision of the National Forest and it is directly related to the ecological, cultural, and socioeconomic aspirations for management of the land. The Plan can be improved by incorporating the previously suggested or similar Desired Condition relating to collaboration with land grant-merced communities and tribes made by the Council. For the demonstrated link between the Council’s Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection on page 3 and 3-A.
4. The New Mexico Land Grant Council objects to the lack of a Desired Condition relating to mitigating negative impacts to traditional use resources and protecting access to those resources. The Santa Fe National Forest in their response (Trad023) to our official comments state that federal laws such as the 1872 Mining Law prohibit this type of Desired Condition calling the protection of traditional use resources and access. The Council disagrees with this analysis as the language offered by the Council could be tweaked to qualify the protection of those resources with language such as: “where possible and in accordance with applicable laws.” As described on page 18 of the Final Plan “Desired Conditions describe the vision for the Santa Fe National Forest. They are the ecological, cultural, and socioeconomic aspirations toward which management of the land and resources of the plan area is directed.” The Council argues that protection of traditional use resources and access to those resources should be an aspirational vision of the National Forest and it is directly related to the ecological, cultural, and socioeconomic aspirations for management of the land. The Plan can be improved by incorporating the previously suggested or similar Desired Condition relating to protection of traditional use resources and access made by the Council. For the demonstrated link between the Council’s Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection on page 3 and 3-A.
5. The New Mexico Land Grant Council objects to non-inclusion of guidelines suggested by the Council to the 2019 Draft Plan, relating to: project specific analysis and mitigation of adverse impacts to traditionally used forest products; maintenance of shared infrastructure with land grant-merced government entities; local fuelwood collection opportunities; special use permits for land grant-merced communities when appropriate and allowable; and use of existing authorities to convey lands to meet certain community needs where appropriate (e.g. Small Tracts Act, etc). The Plan can be improved by incorporating the previously suggested or similar Guidelines relating to land grants-mercedes made by the Council. For the demonstrated link between the Council’s Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the

below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection on pages 12 through 14-A.

6. The Council Objects to language in the FW-RURALH-G guideline 1, which qualifies availability of traditionally used products as being subordinate to plans components found in other sections of the plan. This appears to be prejudicial to traditional communities since no other uses in the plan receives similar treatment. Below is the specific guideline of concern:

FW-RURALH-G – PAGE 107

1. Traditionally used products (such as fuelwood, latillas, vigas, piñon, osha, and clay) should be available on the national forest to rural historic communities, except in areas with resource concerns or in designated areas *where such uses are not allowed or otherwise restricted by standards or guidelines set forth in other sections of this plan.*

In the Council’s review of the Plan we found no other instance where such mandatory language was applied to other uses or management activities outside of their individual section of the plan. While there are instances where scenic integrity is applied to other sections of the plan such as Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Inventoried Roadless Areas, language there states “Management activities should be consistent with scenic integrity.” The use of “should” implying that it is discretionary, whereas the language in this guideline appears to purposely leave no room for the discretion with regard to traditional uses. While there are examples of the unqualified “consistent” language found in other sections of the plan, it is specific to that given section with no language making the activity or use subservient to any other plan component or resource concern. The Plan can be improved by removing such prejudicial language that makes this guideline subordinate to other plan components or resource uses. For the demonstrated link between the Council’s Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection on pages 12 and 12-A.

Additionally, the New Mexico Land Grant Council objects to the following portions of the Santa Fe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and maintains that the following areas of the plan be amended to ensure that forest resources important to land grant-*merced* communities are protected.

1. Plant communities of significant traditional and cultural use, such as oshá, poleo, oregano del campo, and other medicinal plants are protected and preserved, as are forest products such as timber, firewood (fuelwood), piñón nuts, vigas and latillas, trementina (sap), and capulín (chokecherry) berries. Native plant communities dominate the landscape and non-native and invasive species are non-existent or low in abundance and do not disrupt ecological functions. (pages 5, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 20 of the New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments, below).
2. Fuelwood collection opportunities, including fuelwood created as a byproduct of management activities, should be available for personal use by the public. (page 2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, and 20-A of the New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments, below).

3. Soil resources that support traditional, cultural and subsistence needs are available and sustainable. (page 1 of the New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments, below).
4. Grazing, particularly communal grazing, especially those on historically closed allotments, should be restored and at least managed so no net loss of grazing occurs. (page 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments, below).

The Plan can be improved by protecting of culturally, socially and economically important traditional resources within the Santa Fe National Forest. For the demonstrated link between the Council's Objection and formally submitted substantive comments, please see the below, New Mexico Land Grant Council Santa Fe National Forest 2019 Plan Comments linked to this objection.

---

**Page 95 - Soil Resources - Desired Conditions for Soil Resources (FW-SOIL-DC)**

Recommend adding a new desired condition relating to the use of soils by traditional communities

**Suggested New Desired Condition 8**

**Suggested Language:** 8. Soil resources that support cultural and traditional needs (e.g., micaceous clay) as well as those that support traditional and subsistence economic needs (e.g. gravel and soils used for building materials, including but not limited to those used to build adobes and those for traditional plastering on adobe buildings) traditional communities are available and sustainable.

**Comment:** Traditional land based communities (including federally recognized tribes and land grants) have for centuries relied on access to soils for traditional wares (i.e. pottery) and building materials. These resources are found within the former common lands of land grant communities or within adjacent traditional use areas.

---

Not Met. High-Critical Importance.  
see WRS 054 of FS reply

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

WRS054 Response: FW-RURALH-DC-3 and FW-TRIBES-DC-3 (Santa Fe Plan) discuss micaceous clay as an important resource for cultural and traditional needs. The use of soil and rocks for building materials is also listed as a traditional use in the narrative of the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses section. While this is not discussed again in the Soil section, the Plan is meant to be read in its entirety as it is an interdisciplinary approach with plan direction also relevant to this comment within the salable mineral resource section. No change is necessary to the soils desired conditions. This is addressed within the traditional uses section of the plan and the plan is meant to be interdisciplinary.

Plan Draft Location: Pg 95

---



**Chapter 2: Page 107, Desired Conditions for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-DC)**

**Desired Condition 2:** The long history and ties of rural historic communities and traditional uses (e.g., livestock grazing, fuelwood gathering, acequias, and hunting) to NFS lands and resources is understood and appreciated.

**Suggested Language for Desired Condition 2:** Traditional forest-dependent rural communities existed prior to the establishment of National Forests in New Mexico. The Forest Service respects the traditional and cultural relationship these communities have had with the land and its resources, and will provide opportunities for meaningful access to forest resources *for traditional uses (eg. livestock grazing, fuelwood gathering, acequias, and hunting)* on NFS lands to sustain their communities and cultural identity.

---

Not Met. Trad 020/024/032

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad020/024/032 Response: The final Plan includes the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses section, which describes traditional uses and the communities that rely on those uses to sustain themselves and their cultural identity (final Plan, chapter 2). Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RHC-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, Management Approaches for Rural Historic Communities-3, -7, and -10 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities. Land grants would be an equitable interested party that we scope with during the NEPA process for land acquisition. Access for traditional uses is addressed by FW-TRIBES-DC-3, DC-4, DC-5 and DC-5; FW-RURALH-DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3; and FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3. Land grants are a government body that we can work differently with compared to permittees. These entities are specific to New Mexico; we highlight the role of these unique entities in the final Plan.

Plan Draft Location: Pg 107

## Chapter 2: Page 107, Desired Conditions for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-DC)

**Desired Condition 6** The Forest provides a setting for educating youth in culture, history, and land stewardship, and for exchanging information between elders and youth.

**Suggested Language:** *The Forest provides a setting and culturally relevant programs in collaboration with Land Grant communities and Tribes for educating youth in culture, history, and land stewardship, and for exchanging information between elders and youth.*

**Comment:** We recommend that the forest service collaborates with land grant communities, particularly duly elected boards of trustees, to ensure that these intergenerational educational exchanges are culturally relevant. Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 46; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 11

## Chapter 2: Page 107, Desired Conditions for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-DC)

**Suggested Language:** *Forest Service projects, programs and activities do not negatively impact traditional-use resources, or access to and use of traditional-use resources for community land grants, acequias, pueblos, tribes, livestock grazing associations or permittees.*

**Comment:** We suggest the following Desired Condition (FW-RURALH-DC 7). Traditional communities use of the forest should have equal footing with the other resource management priorities of the USFS. This was expressed in the Hassell Report (M.J. Hassell, author, 1968) and the Regional Forester William D. Hurst's 1972 Policy memo. (Hassell Report Recommendations 42b, 53; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 11, 13, 17).

---

Not Met.  
Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 022

Changes made to Plan or EIS: Plan

Trad022 Response: FW-RURALH-MA-3 has been edited to read, "Consider identifying forest locations that can provide a setting for educating youth in culture, history, land stewardship, and the health benefits of outdoor activities (e.g., through cooperation with cultural youth programs such as the YCC or others). We also address how the forest can provide a setting specifically for youth education in FW-RURALH-DC-6 and FW-TRIBES-DC-7. We also address partnerships in general in the Partnership section of the final Plan.

Plan Draft Location: Pg 107

---

Not met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 023

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad023 Response: The suggested standard would conflict with Federal law. We prioritize the protection of places of significance to rural historic communities, including historic properties, as reflected in Rural Historic Communities, FW-RURALH-G-2, and Cultural and Historic Resources, FW-ARCH-S-1. However, there are cases where places cannot be protected when undertakings are required to proceed under federal law (for example, the 1872 Mining Law). For individual projects an interdisciplinary team is used to lay out the effects to all resources for the responsible official to make a decision. While it is common practice to try and mitigate adverse resource effects, this is not always possible and therefore is not a reasonable Forest Plan standard. In these cases, if the place is a historic property (including a TCP), we are required to work with governing bodies or representative organizations that identify as consulting parties in the resolution of adverse effects under 36CFR 800.6.

Plan Draft Location: Pg 107

**Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**General Comment:** As written, the **Rural Historic Communities** section of the plan has **no objectives**. Per the Santa Fe National Forest plan, “Objectives describe how the Santa Fe NF intends to move toward the desired conditions.” (p.18) Objectives are an essential plan component that ensures that the USFS manages forest resources with the resource needs local, forest dependent land grant-merced communities in mind. Partnering with local forest dependent land grant-merced communities to manage forest resources will not only help the USFS manage resources for local communities, but will also produce a net-benefit to the larger public.

**Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language:** *Objective 1. The Forest Service will meet with all active community land grants within or adjacent to the National Forest to negotiate agreements relating to access to traditional-use forest resources.*

**Comment:** The Council recommends adding an objective that requires meetings with interested land grant-merced governing boards to discuss their community access and natural resources needs and or mutually beneficial projects across shared boundaries. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 42a, 42b, 46, 57, 63, 64; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18)

**Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language:** *Objective 2. The Forest Service, in conjunction with the governing bodies of active community land grants, identifies religious and spiritual sites and areas of traditional use within the National Forest.*

**Comment:** Certain areas within the Forest may contain resources or sites of spiritual significance that land grant communities would not want to publicize to the general public in order to protect the resource/site. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 1; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18)

**Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language:** *Objective 3. The Forest Service, in coordination with the governing bodies of active community land grants, identifies forest resources important to traditional and cultural use.*

**Comment:** Land grant-merced communities dependence on forest resources predates the forest service administration of former common land and traditionally used lands. Because the authority for allowing forest products to be removed is supported by

---

Not Met Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 030, Trad 048

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Trad030: The Forest Service should make an effort to hire local community members and support local economies when implementing forest management projects and activities. Plan direction for local hiring should be added to the revised Forest Plan in the Rural Historic Communities section, with the following language:

Trad048 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

Plan Draft Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 030, Trad 048

See comments above

---

Not met.  
Critically High Importance  
see Trad 25

Trad025: The revised Forest Plan should increase its direction on identifying, protecting, and ensuring access to sites considered significant to traditional rural communities due to spiritual, religious, or historical significance; or due to the site being a significant source of traditional use resources. Language in the revised plan should reflect existing authorities ((i.e., Public Law 39, February 23, 1932- Color of Title Claims in New Mexico, Small Tracts Act) where appropriate. Plan components with the following language should be added to the Rural Historic Communities section as part of this direction:

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
Trad 026

Trad026 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities. FW-RURALH-G-2 ensures that Forest Service management activities have minimal to no impacts on spiritually or culturally important places.

Draft Plan Location: PG 107-108

separate congressional acts and Forest Service Manual directives, the intent to allow for use of forest products is clear. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 9; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 11, 13, 17)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 4.** *Fuelwood products derived from issuance of fuelwood permits (green and dead and down) along with forest restoration programs, projects and activities meet at least 90% of the local fuel wood demand.*

**Comment:** As demonstrated by the recent chaos caused by the injunction won by the Wild Earth Guardians, fuelwood is a socio-economically and culturally important resource. Meeting the fuelwood demand of traditional communities helps poor and rural residents, the micro-economics of villagers that work as *leñeros* (woodhaulers), and is sensitive to the traditional and culturally significant practice of harvesting fuelwood. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 9, 58, 59; Hurst Policy Memo 16)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 5.** *The Forest Service, in coordination with acequia governing bodies and relevant state and local governments and political subdivisions, map acequia infrastructure located on forest system lands.*

**Comment:** Mapping acequias, in conjunction with *comisiones, mayordomos, regional acequia associations, soil and water conservation districts, perhaps with the assistance of the Office of the State Engineer and the Interstate Stream Commission, will benefit the USFS perspective and ability to manage for local water needs.* (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 9; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 6.** *The Forest Service, in coordination with land grant governing bodies, will annually assess the maintenance needs of any shared infrastructure (fences, roads etc.).* (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 9, 30; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18)

**Comment:** Land grants and the USFS share miles of common boundaries, much of it deriving from the growth of USFS through both the rejection of legitimate claims during the adjudication process (which made these lands part of the public domain, to be incorporated into the national forest) and through the purchase of former land grant common lands from speculators that dispossessed communities of their patrimony. Working with these communities for the mutual benefit of FS and land grant lands may employ members of communities in desperate need for such opportunities

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
See Trad 027

Changes made to Plan: None

Trad027 Response: Access for traditional uses is addressed in the final Plan by FW-TRIBES-DC-1, DC-3, and DC-4; FW-RURALH-DC-1, DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3. Fuelwood availability specifically is addressed by FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3, as well as FW-FORESTRY-O-1. FW-FORESTRY-MA-7 and MA-8, and FW-RURALH-MA-10 describe strategies for increasing fuel wood opportunities. Disposal of wood is a project-level decision and outside the scope of the Forest Plan.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
Trad 028

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad028 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with acequia governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities. Specific projects, such as mapping acequias, is included under the umbrella of the more general language of the Plan.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 029

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107 -108



and will aid the forest service in providing local knowledge and familiarity with the landscape that only locals have, while also easing the budget constraints of USFS.

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 7.** *Within 5 years of acquiring any land within the historic/traditional use boundaries of an active community land grant the Forest Service will amend the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan to include traditional uses for land grant and acequia community users.*

**Comment:** The USFS continues to expand at the expense of community land grants (see Miranda Canyon purchase of former Cristóbal de la Serna Land Grant common land, 2012). We recommend that the USFS ceases acquiring former land grant common land, particularly land that from active community land grants as this land is most often seized from land grants through spurious means (both illegal and extra legal). If the USFS does acquire former land grant common land, then the recommended Objective 7 is necessary. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 34, 41, 52; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 9, 11, 17)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 8.** *At least 70% of the workforce for forest and watershed restoration projects come from adjacent local forest dependent communities.*

**Comment:** Land grant communities local economies are dependent on access to USFS managed lands, including former land grant common land. Local contractors that are likely to hire local laborers often cannot compete with larger companies that win these federal bids and local laborers that are more often than not land grant heirs are excluded from workforces that are restoring their community land grants former land grant common land. This objective would work to ensure that whether a contractor is local, regional, or national, local laborers have the opportunity to work on these projects, bringing their local knowledge of the landscape into restoration projects, thus benefiting the local economy and the restoration project itself. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 17a, 78; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 9, 10, 14)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Objective for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-O)**

**Suggested Language: Objective 9.** *The Forest Service will manage forage resources for fluctuations to ensure that there is no net loss in grazing capacity within the historic / traditional use boundaries of land grants or on grazing allotments affecting communities associated with land grants.*

---

Not Met Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 030, Trad 048

See comments on two pages previous

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance  
Trad 030

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad030 Response: Hiring procedures and policies are not within the authority of a forest plan, but the plan does provide desired conditions in the "Partnership" section that aims to maintain and expand partner and volunteer networks (final Plan, FW-PARTNER-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3).

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance  
see Trad 031

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad031 Response: See RNG072 for how we manage grazing on the forest.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

**Comment:** Grazing has been a shrinking part of the local economy for decades arguably because of a systematic effort on the part of the USFS to reduce the dependence of local land grant on resources that they historically depended on. By example, free-use permits on the Santa Fe NF were reduced from 217 (two-hundred seventeen) in 1940 to 0 (zero) in 1980 (see William deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation: The Life and Hard Times of a New Mexico Mountain Range* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985), 248; free-use permits in the Carson National Forest were reduced from 461 (four hundred and sixty one) in 1940 to zero (0) in 1980 (William deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation: The Life and Hard Times of a New Mexico Mountain Range* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985), 248; free use permits figures on the Cibola are not immediately available, but heirs and forest service documents demonstrate the systematic removal of community grazing allotments from local land grants, citing access to local labor markets as a justification for removing access to forest resource dependent and traditional land grant communities (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 27, 42b; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 15)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**General Comment:** As written, the **Rural Historic Communities** section of the plan has **no standards**. Per the Santa Fe National Forest draft Land Management Plan, standards are “technical design constraints that must be followed when an action is being taken to make progress toward desired conditions,” (p.18) and are, therefore, essential plan components that ensure the resource interests of local, forest dependent land grant-merged communities are protected.

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 1.** *The Forest Service meets periodically with governing bodies of active community land grants and acequias adjacent to/within the National Forest to discuss access to and management of forest resources.*

**Comment:** We recommend that the forest service collaborates with land grant communities, particularly duly elected boards of trustees to access resource needs of their communities. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 1b, 1c, 42b, 44, 52, 68, 78; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 9, 10, 14, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 2.** *Projects and activities do not adversely impact identified religious and spiritual sites or Forest resources important to traditional and cultural use.*

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 048

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Trad048: The revised Forest Plan should add objectives and standards to the Rural Historic Communities subsection of the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses section to ensure collaborative management and protection of forest resources that meet the needs of forest-dependent, traditional communities.

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad048 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 048

See above comment

---

Not Met Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 023

Trad023: The revised Forest Plan's Rural Historic Communities section should include plan direction on avoiding and mitigating impacts to traditional use resources and access to traditional resources and sites from forest management activities. The following plan components should be added to reflect this concern:

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad023 Response: The suggested standard would conflict with Federal law. We prioritize the protection of places of significance to rural historic communities, including historic properties, as reflected in Rural Historic Communities, FW-RURALH-G-2, and Cultural and Historic Resources, FW-ARCH-S-1. However, there are cases where places cannot be protected when undertakings are required to proceed under federal law (for example, the 1872 Mining Law). For individual projects an interdisciplinary team is used to lay out the effects to all resources for the responsible official to make a decision. While it is common practice to try and mitigate adverse resource effects, this is not always possible and therefore is not a reasonable Forest Plan standard. In these cases, if the place is a historic property (including a TCP), we are required to work with governing bodies or representative organizations that identify as consulting parties in the resolution of adverse effects under 36CFR 800.6.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

**Comment:** The protection of spiritual sites (calvarios, shrines, etc.) is important to the maintaining the cultural integrity of forest dependent land grant communities. Additionally, certain areas within the Forest may contain resources or sites of spiritual significance that land grant communities would not want to publicize to the general public in order to protect the resource/site. (Ties to Hassell 1; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 3** *Land Grant governing bodies are given the right of first refusal on grazing permits for vacant allotments within the patented or historical/traditional use boundaries of a land grant-merced.*

**Comment:** Grazing has been a shrinking part of the local economy for decades arguably because of a systematic effort on the part of the USFS to reduce the dependence of local land grant on resources that they historically depended on. By example, free-use permits on the Santa Fe NF were reduced from 217 (two-hundred seventeen) in 1940 to 0 (zero) in 1980 (see William deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation: The Life and Hard Times of a New Mexico Mountain Range* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985), 248; free-use permits in the Carson National Forest were reduced from 461 (four hundred and sixty one) in 1940 to zero (0) in 1980 (William deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation: The Life and Hard Times of a New Mexico Mountain Range* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985), 248; free use permits figures on the Cibola are not immediately available, but heirs and forest service documents demonstrate the systematic removal of community grazing allotments from local land grants, citing access to local labor markets as a justification for removing access to forest resource dependent and traditional land grant communities (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 27, 42b; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 15) (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 27; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 15).

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 4.** *When a shared infrastructure assessment determines a need for maintenance or improvement the Forest Service shall work collaboratively with the appropriate land grant governing body(ies) to address the need.*

**Comment:** Land grants and the USFS share miles of common boundaries, much of it deriving from the growth of USFS through both the rejection of legitimate claims during the adjudication process (which made these lands part of the public domain, to be incorporated into the national forest) and through the purchase of former land grant common lands from speculators that dispossessed communities of their patrimony. Working with these communities for the mutual benefit of FS and land grant lands may employ members of communities in desperate need for such opportunities and will aid the forest service in providing local knowledge and familiarity with the

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 033

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad033 Response: The Forest Service Range Management Manual (FSM 2231.3 Grazing and Livestock Use Permit System) states that, "Qualified applicants may be issued permits with term status through prior use, the grant process, purchase of base property or livestock with waiver, or interchange of permits with other agencies."

The Grazing Permit Administration Handbook (FSH2209.13\_92.13) states that, "The Forest Supervisor may issue grazing permits with term status by grant or increase existing term grazing permits to entities recognized as the logical applicants for new range, transitory range, or additional range, provided that the applicants meet requirements, and are otherwise qualified, and provided the range resource can support increased use." The Forest Service uses the grant process, which is the procedure designed to identify preferred applicants for a grazing permit to be issued, when unobligated grazing capacity becomes available. This is policy that is required to be followed.

Additionally, Management Approach for Rural Historic Communities-3 describes a strategy of coordinating with land grants to understand their needs and develop collaborative proposals and projects of mutual benefit.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 029

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

landscape that only locals have, while also easing the budget constraints of USFS. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 34, 41; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 4, 9, 10, 14, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 5.** *Prior to acquiring former land grant common land the Forest Service shall meet with the appropriate governing bodies of any active community land grants and acequias within the acquisition area in order to determine the communities' traditional uses for the area for inclusion into the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.*

**Comment:** The USFS continues to expand at the expense of community land grants (see Miranda Canyon purchase of former Cristóbal de la Serna Land Grant common land, 2012), an action that also threatens watersheds that feed acequia communities. We recommend that the USFS ceases acquiring former land grant common land, particularly land that from active community land grants as this land is most often seized from land grants through spurious means (both illegal and extra legal). (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 30; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 10, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 6.** *As Forest Land and Resource Management Plans are implemented the Forest Service shall consult with community land grant and acequia governing bodies and with livestock grazing associations and permittees to maintain continued access to traditional resources.*

**Comment:** Land grants, acequias, and grazing associations / permittees have been a part of the planning process for the Carson, Cibola, and Santa Fe NFs for more than four years, strengthening the plan and advocating for the resource needs of their local communities. Maintaining these collaborative relationships between the FS and these associations (land grants, acequias, and livestock associations) will be paramount in implementing the plan for the benefit of local communities that are most effected by the management of the resources that surround their local communities, particularly those that are a part of their stolen patrimony. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 42b, 42c; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 7.** *When Forest Land and Resource Management Plans are revised, updated, or amended the Forest Service shall consult with community land grant and acequia governing bodies and with livestock grazing*

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 048

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Trad048: The revised Forest Plan should add objectives and standards to the Rural Historic Communities subsection of the Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses section to ensure collaborative management and protection of forest resources that meet the needs of forest-dependent, traditional communities.

Associated Comments: #12528-34, #12528-44, #12698-39, #12698-49

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad048 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met see  
Critically High Importance  
see Trad 025

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad025 Response:

1. The importance of religious and spiritual sites for rural historic communities, such as land grants, is addressed through FW-RURALH-DC-4 and FW-RURALH-G-2. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

2. Access for traditional uses is addressed by FW-TRIBES-DC-3, DC-4, DC-5 and DC-5; FW-RURALH-DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3; and FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3. Land grants are a state-recognized governmental entity that we work with differently in comparison to permittees. Permittees do not have the same standing as the acequia associations and the land grants since these entities are state-recognized entities. The grazing and range management approach FW-RANGE-MA-1 states that we will cooperate, coordinate and collaborate with permit holders to respond to changing resource conditions.

3. The introduction to the Lands Special Uses section of the final Plan discusses lands special use authorization and lists some examples of permitted uses on the Santa Fe NF. Community water systems have been added to this list. Any special use permit would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, consistent with FW-LANDSU-DC-1 and DC-2. New cemeteries, liquid waste disposal areas, and solid waste disposal sites are not permitted on National Forest System lands (FSH 2709.11 section 19, exhibit 3).

4. In the final Plan FW-RURALH-G-2 requires the protection of spiritually or culturally important places. FW-RURALH-MA-1 and MA-6 emphasize coordination with land grant governing bodies to understand their concerns and develop proposals of mutual.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 048

See two comments up



landscape that only locals have, while also easing the budget constraints of USFS. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 34, 41; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 4, 9, 10, 14, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 5.** *Prior to acquiring former land grant common land the Forest Service shall meet with the appropriate governing bodies of any active community land grants and acequias within the acquisition area in order to determine the communities' traditional uses for the area for inclusion into the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.*

**Comment:** The USFS continues to expand at the expense of community land grants (see Miranda Canyon purchase of former Cristóbal de la Serna Land Grant common land, 2012), an action that also threatens watersheds that feed acequia communities. We recommend that the USFS ceases acquiring former land grant common land, particularly land that from active community land grants as this land is most often seized from land grants through spurious means (both illegal and extra legal). (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 30; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 10, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 6.** *As Forest Land and Resource Management Plans are implemented the Forest Service shall consult with community land grant and acequia governing bodies and with livestock grazing associations and permittees to maintain continued access to traditional resources.*

**Comment:** Land grants, acequias, and grazing associations / permittees have been a part of the planning process for the Carson, Cibola, and Santa Fe NFs for more than four years, strengthening the plan and advocating for the resource needs of their local communities. Maintaining these collaborative relationships between the FS and these associations (land grants, acequias, and livestock associations) will be paramount in implementing the plan for the benefit of local communities that are most effected by the management of the resources that surround their local communities, particularly those that are a part of their stolen patrimony. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 42b, 42c; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 7.** *When Forest Land and Resource Management Plans are revised, updated, or amended the Forest Service shall consult with community land grant and acequia governing bodies and with livestock grazing*



*associations and permittees to ensure access to traditional resources important to these forest dependent communities.*

**Comment:** Land grants, acequias, and grazing associations / permittees have been a part of the planning process for the Carson, Cibola, and Santa Fe NFs for more than four years, strengthening the plan and advocating for the resource needs of their local communities. Maintaining these collaborative relationships between the FS and these associations (land grants, acequias, and livestock associations) will be paramount in implementing the plan for the benefit of local communities that are most effected by the management of the resources that surround their local communities, particularly those that are a part of their stolen patrimony. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 42b, 42c; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 8** *All Forest Service signage for forest system lands within or adjacent to historical/traditional use boundaries of community land grants, pueblos and tribes should be written in native languages (i.e., Spanish, Tanoan, Keres, Athabaskan) as well as in English. Signage should include traditional names for these areas as identified in consultation with local communities, as well as names currently found on Forest Service maps and other literature. All relevant applications, informational brochures, pamphlets, and other Forest Service literature should be presented in English, Spanish and native languages to ensure equal access to all local traditional use communities.*

**Comment:** Members of both federally recognized tribes and other Indian nations, land grant heirs, whose bloodlines include significant genizaro (detrribalized and Hispanicized indians) ancestors, have a historic connection to the landscape that is unique to the southwest and should be valued through sentiment **and action**. The publication of documents, the increase of signage in native languages, including Spanish, will not only assist these communities in retaining their cultural integrity and recovering a culture that was lost or stolen, but will increase their access to forest resources. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 43, 72; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 8, 10, 11, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 9.** *Forest Service manages for prior existing uses recognized under public laws, memorandums of understanding or agreements established prior to the Forest Service acquisition and management of former community land grant common lands.*

**Comment:** Land grants are protected foremost by international treaty law. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo explicitly protected the property rights of land grant heirs (Articles XIII and X); the Protocol of Queretaro affirm these protections; the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution (Article VI) affirmed that international treaties such as the Treaty of

---

Not Met. High-Critical Importance.  
see Trad 034

Trad034 Response: We address the use of Spanish and native language on Forest Service interpretive materials in FW-RURALH-MA-9, FW-TRIBES-MA-12, and FW-REC-MA-11.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically high importance.  
see Trad 029, Trad 048

See Comments on previous page

Guadalupe Hidalgo, which was affirmed by the Protocol of Queretaro, are the “Supreme law of the land.” The 1854 Act establishing the Office of the Surveyor General of New Mexico (10 Stat. 308) included a provision (section 8) that the Surveyor General decide the validity of grants “under the laws, usages, and customs of the country before its cession to the United States.” This provides the legal basis for the land grant ejido to be protected as common land. Later federal laws, MOUs and agreements include, but are not limited to, Public Law 39, Public Law 419, February 23, 1932 - Color of Title Claims in New Mexico. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 52; Hurst Policy Memo Paragraphs 9, 10)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 10.** *Forest Service will utilize wood generated from forest restoration and utility easement maintenance projects to help meet fuelwood needs of adjacent local forest dependent communities.*

**Comment:** The USFS has a great opportunity to help meet the fuelwood demand of the local forest dependent populations, especially land grant communities, when clearing rights-of-way, easements, etc. The chaos caused by the injunction won by the Wild Earth Guardians demonstrated not only the volatility of the fuelwood issue, but also the real dependence of land grant communities on this resource. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 9, 58, 59; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 4, 8, 10, 16, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 11:** *Forest Service collaborates with community land grant, acequia and tribal governing bodies to ensure that access is maintained on forest system roads critical to traditional use.*

**Comment:** We recommend this standard as it ensures that the Forest Service meets with interested land grant-merced and acequia governing boards and tribal governing bodies to discuss their community access and natural resources needs and or mutually beneficial projects across shared boundaries. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 65, 66; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language: Standard 12.** *Coordinate with land grant governing bodies to develop a permitting process for traditional use forest products.*

**Comment:** Land grants are political subdivisions of the State of New Mexico, duly elected by their membership, and represent the needs of their local communities. They possess the on the ground knowledge necessary to ensure that fuelwood permitting will be successful and equitable, representing the interests of heir-members of community

---

Not met.  
Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 027

Changes made to Plan: None

Trad027 Response: Access for traditional uses is addressed in the final Plan by FW-TRIBES-DC-1, DC-3, and DC-4; FW-RURALH-DC-1, DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3. Fuelwood availability specifically is addressed by FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3, as well as FW-FORESTRY-O-1. FW-FORESTRY-MA-7 and MA-8, and FW-RURALH-MA-10 describe strategies for increasing fuel wood opportunities. Disposal of wood is a project-level decision and outside the scope of the Forest Plan.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 036

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad036 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 037

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad037 Response: The Forest Service does not prejudice its recognition of the need for the collection of traditionally used forest products by members of rural historic communities based on their contemporary affiliation with a Spanish or Mexican era grant confirmed by Congress or the Federal courts. In FW-RURALH-G-1, the language referring to restrictions imposed by standards or guidelines required by other sections of the plan must be retained because those restrictions can exceed those imposed by existing law and regulation. The restrictions imposed by other plan components do not supersede existing laws and regulations, as plan components that are inconsistent with existing laws and regulations are prohibited, 36CFR 219.1(f).

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

land grants who are dependent on forest products for both economic and cultural reasons. They are uniquely positioned to work with the USFS to meet the fuelwood needs of their local communities through a locally informed permitting process. (Ties to Hassell Report recommendation 9, 10, 63b, 66; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18; Desired Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11)

## **Chapter 2: Page 107, Standard for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-S)**

**Suggested Language:** *Standard 13. The Forest Service consults with grazing permittees when planning and prioritizing programs, projects and activities that may impact livestock grazing.*

**Comment:** Grazing has been a shrinking part of the local economy for decades arguably because of a systematic effort on the part of the USFS to reduce the dependence of local land grant on resources that they have historically depended on. For grazing to remain a viable economic practice and a meaningful cultural one, grazing permittees must be a part of the process. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 23; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 15)

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

**Comment:** Edit Guideline 1 - The NMLGC suggests the removal of the conditional phrasing of Guideline 1 (“except in areas with resource concerns or any areas otherwise restricted by standards or guidelines set forth in other sections of this plan”) as it unnecessarily and unjustly subordinates traditional use of forest products to other resource considerations of the plan.

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

**Suggested Language:** *Guideline 5. Management activities should be analyzed and mitigated to prevent or minimize adverse impacts to forest resources important for cultural and traditional needs of rural historic communities.*

**Comment:** We propose a new guideline, Guideline 5, to ensure that Land grant-merced communities dependence on forest resources, which predates the forest service administration of former common land and traditionally used lands, is recognized in management activities and projects on former common land and within the traditional use areas adjacent to land grant communities. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 9; Hurst Policy Memo paragraph 11, 13, 17)

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 038

Changes made to Plan or EIS:

Trad038 Response: A management approach in the Sustainable Rangelands and Grazing section of the Plan covers this topic. FW-RANGE-MA-3 states, "Coordination with livestock grazing permit holders should occur at the early stages of planning and project design to include local perspectives, needs, concerns, and traditional knowledge."

Draft Plan Location: Pg 107-108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 039

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad039 Response: The Forest Service does not prejudice its recognition of the need for the collection of traditionally used forest products by members of rural historic communities based on their contemporary affiliation with a Spanish or Mexican era grant confirmed by Congress or the Federal courts. In FW-RURALH-G-1, the language referring to restrictions imposed by standards or guidelines required by other sections of the plan must be retained because those restrictions can exceed those imposed by existing law and regulation. The restrictions imposed by other plan components do not supersede existing laws and regulations, as plan components that are inconsistent with existing laws and regulations are prohibited, 36CFR 219.1(f).

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 023

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad023 Response: The suggested standard would conflict with Federal law. We prioritize the protection of places of significance to rural historic communities, including historic properties, as reflected in Rural Historic Communities, FW-RURALH-G-2, and Cultural and Historic Resources, FW-ARCH-S-1. However, there are cases where places cannot be protected when undertakings are required to proceed under federal law (for example, the 1872 Mining Law). For individual projects an interdisciplinary team is used to lay out the effects to all resources for the responsible official to make a decision. While it is common practice to try and mitigate adverse resource effects, this is not always possible and therefore is not a reasonable Forest Plan standard. In these cases, if the place is a historic property (including a TCP), we are required to work with governing bodies or representative organizations that identify as consulting parties in the resolution of adverse effects under 36CFR 800.6.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108



**Suggested Language: *Guideline 6. The Forest Service will support the maintenance of infrastructure shared with community land grants based upon assessed needs and budget.***

**Comment:** We propose a new guideline, Guideline 6. Land grants and the USFS share miles of common boundaries, much of it deriving from the growth of USFS through both the rejection of legitimate claims during the adjudication process (which made these lands part of the public domain, to be incorporated into the national forest) and through the purchase of former land grant common lands from speculators that dispossessed communities of their patrimony. Working with these communities for the mutual benefit of FS and land grant lands may employ members of communities in desperate need for such opportunities and will aid the forest service in providing local knowledge and familiarity with the landscape that only locals have, while also easing the budget constraints of USFS.

(FW-RURALH-G) (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 30; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 10, 18)

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

**Suggested Language: *Guideline 7: The Forest Service will provide local fuelwood collection opportunities (green and dead and down) to meet the demand of traditional forest dependent communities on an annual basis.***

**Comment:** We propose a new guideline, Guideline 7. As demonstrated by the recent chaos caused by the injunction won by the Wild Earth Guardians, fuelwood is a socio-economically and culturally important resource. Meeting the fuelwood demand of traditional communities helps poor and rural residents, the microeconomics of villagers that work as *leñeros* (wood haulers), and is sensitive to the traditional and culturally significant practice of harvesting fuelwood. (FW-RURALH-G) (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 9, 58, 59; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16)

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

**Suggested Language: *Guideline 8. Forest Service works with community land grant associated forest dependent communities which are surrounded by federal lands and which have little or no vacant land for community facilities and uses (i.e. cemeteries, dumps, community water, wastewater, community centers) to issue and maintain special use permits for such uses when doing so is in the best interest of public health, safety and general welfare.***

**Comment:** We propose the creation of a new guideline, Guideline 8. Unlike other *Rural historic communities*, and like American Indian tribes, land grant-merced communities predate the establishment of forest reserves, the founding of the US Forest Service, and homesteads that created non-American Indian and non-nuevomexicano settlements. Many land grants even predate the founding of the United States of

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
Trad 029

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad029 Response: We address collaborative work with traditional communities, including implementing "projects of mutual benefit across shared boundaries and with shared infrastructure," in FW-RURALH-MA-1.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 027.

Changes made to Plan: None

Trad027 Response: Access for traditional uses is addressed in the final Plan by FW-TRIBES-DC-1, DC-3, and DC-4; FW-RURALH-DC-1, DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3. Fuelwood availability specifically is addressed by FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3, as well as FW-FORESTRY-O-1. FW-FORESTRY-MA-7 and MA-8, and FW-RURALH-MA-10 describe strategies for increasing fuel wood opportunities. Disposal of wood is a project-level decision and outside the scope of the Forest Plan.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108

---

Not Met. Critically High.  
Need in guideline.  
see Trad 040

Changes made to Plan or EIS: Plan

Trad040 Response: The introduction to the Special Uses section of the final Plan discusses lands special use authorization and lists some examples of permitted uses on the Santa Fe NF. Community water systems have been added to this list. New cemeteries, liquid waste disposal areas, and solid waste disposal sites are not permitted on National Forest System lands (FSH 2709.11 section 19, exhibit 3). Any special use permit would be evaluated on a case by case basis, consistent with FW-LANDSU-DC-1 and DC-2.

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108

America and forest system lands grew at the expense of land grants through the acquisition of former land grant common lands. This has landlocked land grant communities and they lack vacant land on which to locate or build important community facilities that support the general welfare of the community. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 50; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 9, 13, 18).

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Guidelines for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-G)**

**Suggested Language:** *Guideline 9 Forest Service will work with existing authorities (i.e. Public Law 39, February 23, 1932- Color of Title Claims in New Mexico, Small Tracts Act) to convey land or provide block easements for community land grant associated cemeteries, and other culturally significant sites (i.e. moradas, chapels, churches)*

**Comment:** We propose a new guideline, Guideline 9, which will ensure that the USFS to responds to the cultural needs of land-locked land grant communities, many of whom are deprived of necessary vacant land because of the federal acquisition of common land. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 50, 51, 73; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18).

## **Chapter 2: Page 108, Management Approaches for Rural Historic Communities (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Page 108 - Management Approach 7.** Recommend rewriting Management Approach 7: Consider developing approaches for rural historic communities to continue to practice occupational- and subsistence-based activities that are sensitive to environmental and cultural concerns.

**Suggested Language:** *Consult with land grant governing bodies to assess the impact of Forest Service programs, projects and activities on the cultural integrity of forest-dependent nuevomexicano communities that are sensitive to traditional and subsistence based activities and consider environmental concerns.*

**Comment:** *The wording of Management Approach 7 suggests that the “occupational and subsistence based activities” are not sensitive to environmental concerns and, if followed to the letter, may unnecessarily place this management approach junior to environmental concerns. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 1, 2, 30; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 10, 18).*

---

Not Met.  
Critically High Importance  
see Trad 25

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad025 Response:

1. The importance of religious and spiritual sites for rural historic communities, such as land grants, is addressed through FW-RURALH-DC-4 and FW-RURALH-G-2. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

2. Access for traditional uses is addressed by FW-TRIBES-DC-3, DC-4, DC-5 and DC-5; FW-RURALH-DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3; and FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3. Land grants are a state-recognized governmental entity that we work with differently in comparison to permittees. Permittees do not have the same standing as the acequia associations and the land grants since these entities are state-recognized entities. The grazing and range management approach FW-RANGE-MA-1 states that we will cooperate, coordinate and collaborate with permit holders to respond to changing resource conditions.

3. The introduction to the Lands Special Uses section of the final Plan discusses lands special use authorization and lists some examples of permitted uses on the Santa Fe NF. Community water systems have been added to this list. Any special use permit would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, consistent with FW-LANDSU-DC-1 and DC-2. New cemeteries, liquid waste disposal areas, and solid waste disposal sites are not permitted on National Forest System lands (FSH 2709.11 section 19, exhibit 3).

4. In the final Plan FW-RURALH-G-2 requires the protection of spiritually or culturally important places. FW-RURALH-MA-1 and MA-6 emphasize coordination with land grant governing bodies to understand their concerns and develop proposals of mutual

Draft Plan Location: Pg 108

---

Not met Critical Importance.  
see Trad 041

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad041 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109

**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language:** *Management Approach 12: Coordinate with land grant governing bodies to protect religious and spiritual sites and forest resources important to traditional and cultural use.*

**Comment:** Certain areas within the Forest may contain resources or sites of spiritual significance that land grant communities would not want to publicize to the general public in order to protect the resource/site. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendation 1; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18)

---

Not Met.  
Critically high importance.  
see Trad 025

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad025 Response:

1. The importance of religious and spiritual sites for rural historic communities, such as land grants, is addressed through FW-RURALH-DC-4 and FW-RURALH-G-2. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

2. Access for traditional uses is addressed by FW-TRIBES-DC-3, DC-4, DC-5 and DC-5; FW-RURALH-DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3; and FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3. Land grants are a state-recognized governmental entity that we work with differently in comparison to permittees. Permittees do not have the same standing as the acequia associations and the land grants since these entities are state-recognized entities. The grazing and range management approach FW-RANGE-MA-1 states that we will cooperate, coordinate and collaborate with permit holders to respond to changing resource conditions.

3. The introduction to the Lands Special Uses section of the final Plan discusses lands special use authorization and lists some examples of permitted uses on the Santa Fe NF. Community water systems have been added to this list. Any special use permit would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, consistent with FW-LANDSU-DC-1 and DC-2. New cemeteries, liquid waste disposal areas, and solid waste disposal sites are not permitted on National Forest System lands (FSH 2709.11 section 19, exhibit 3).

4. In the final Plan FW-RURALH-G-2 requires the protection of spiritually or culturally important places. FW-RURALH-MA-1 and MA-6 emphasize coordination with land grant governing bodies to understand their concerns and develop proposals of mutual.

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109

**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language: *Management Approach 14:*** *When establishing priorities for projects on the Santa Fe National Forest choose those projects which will employ local people and/or contribute to the local economy while meeting resource management objectives.*

**Comment:** Land grant communities local economies are dependent on access to USFS managed lands, including former land grant common land. Local contractors that are likely to hire local laborers often cannot compete with larger companies that win these federal bids and local laborers that are more often than not land grant heirs are excluded from workforces that are restoring their community land grants former land grant common land. This objective would work to ensure that whether a contractor is local, regional, or national, local laborers have the opportunity to work on these projects, bringing their local knowledge of the landscape into restoration projects, thus benefiting the local economy and the restoration project itself. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 14, 16, 17a, 78; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 5, 9, 14)

**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language: *Management Approach 15:*** *When implementing projects (fence construction and maintenance, trail construction, thinning projects, etc) hire local seasonal staff where practical or split projects into units small enough to be within the grasp of small local contractors*

**Comment:** Land grant communities local economies are dependent on access to USFS managed lands, including former land grant common land. Local contractors that are likely to hire local laborers often cannot compete with larger companies that win these federal bids and local laborers that are more often than not land grant heirs are excluded from workforces that are restoring their community land grants former land grant common land. This objective would work to ensure that whether a contractor is local, regional, or national, local laborers have the opportunity to work on these projects, bringing their local knowledge of the landscape into restoration projects, thus benefiting the local economy and the restoration project itself. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 15, 16; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 5, 9, 14)

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
Trad 030

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad030 Response: Hiring procedures and policies are not within the authority of a forest plan, but the plan does provide desired conditions in the "Partnership" section that aims to maintain and expand partner and volunteer networks (final Plan, FW-PARTNER-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3).

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
Trad 030

See comment above

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109



**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language:** *Management Approach 16: When implementing projects that cannot be practically split into smaller jobs (road construction, buildings, etc.) require in the contract that a specified percentage of the labor be hired locally.*

**Comment:** Land grant communities local economies are dependent on access to USFS managed lands, including former land grant common land. Local contractors that are likely to hire local laborers often cannot compete with larger companies that win these federal bids and local laborers that are more often than not land grant heirs are excluded from workforces that are restoring their community land grants former land grant common land. This objective would work to ensure that whether a contractor is local, regional, or national, local laborers have the opportunity to work on these projects, bringing their local knowledge of the landscape into restoration projects, thus benefiting the local economy and the restoration project itself. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 14, 16, 17a, 78; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 5, 9, 14)

**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language:** *Local Ranger Districts make every effort to invite the appropriate land grant and/or acequia governing body(ies) on field trips related to the planning or implementation of projects and activities with the potential to impact traditional use resources, culturally and historically significant sites, adjacent community land grant common lands or community land grant and acequia infrastructure.*

**Comment:** add **Management Approach 17** to ensure that land grant and acequia governing bodies are included in site visits to understand and inform management actions on their former common land or land that affects their communities. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 1b, 1c, 8, 14, 30, 44, 52, 66, 68; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 8, 9, 10, 18)

---

Not Met. Critical Importance.  
see Trad 030

See above comment

---

Not Fully Met.  
Critically High Importance.  
see Trad 042

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad042 Response: The Northern New Mexico Traditional Communities and Uses sections of the final Plan contains plan components and strategies that focus on coordination with interested and affected communities at the early stages of planning and project design. Coordination with land grant governing bodies during the early stages of planning and project design is covered by FW-RURALH-G-4 in the final Plan. In addition, FW-RURALH-MA-1, MA-2, MA-6, and MA-9 describe an emphasis on working collaboratively and integrating perspectives of land grant communities.

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109

**Page 109, Rural Historic Communities - Management Approaches: New Management Approaches (FW-RURAL-MA)**

**Suggested Language:** *Management Approach 19: Coordinate with community land grant governing bodies to develop permitting and/or wood collection processes for fuelwood derived from former land grant common land.*

**Comment:** Land grants are political subdivisions of the State of New Mexico, duly elected by their membership, and represent the needs of their local communities. They possess the on the ground knowledge necessary to ensure that fuelwood permitting will be successful and equitable, representing the interests of heir-members of community land grants who are dependent on forest products for both economic and cultural reasons. They are uniquely positioned to work with the USFS to meet the fuelwood needs of their local communities through a locally informed permitting process. (Ties to Hassell Report Recommendations 8, 59, 63, 64; Hurst Policy Memo paragraphs 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16)

---

Not Met. Critically-High Importance.  
Trad 037 and Trad 27

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

Trad037 Response: The Forest Service does not prejudice its recognition of the need for the collection of traditionally used forest products by members of rural historic communities based on their contemporary affiliation with a Spanish or Mexican era grant confirmed by Congress or the Federal courts. In FW-RURALH-G-1, the language referring to restrictions imposed by standards or guidelines required by other sections of the plan must be retained because those restrictions can exceed those imposed by existing law and regulation. The restrictions imposed by other plan components do not supersede existing laws and regulations, as plan components that are inconsistent with existing laws and regulations are prohibited, 36CFR 219.1(f).

Trad027: The Forest Plan's Rural Historic Communities section should add more plan components concerning providing and maintaining access to appropriate levels of fuelwood to support the needs of rural communities. These include the following plan components:

Changes made to Plan: None

Trad027 Response: Access for traditional uses is addressed in the final Plan by FW-TRIBES-DC-1, DC-3, and DC-4; FW-RURALH-DC-1, DC-3, DC-4, and DC-5; FW-RURALH-G-1 and G-3. Fuelwood availability specifically is addressed by FW-FORESTRY-DC-1, DC-2, and DC-3, as well as FW-FORESTRY-O-1. FW-FORESTRY-MA-7 and MA-8, and FW-RURALH-MA-10 describe strategies for increasing fuel wood opportunities. Disposal of wood is a project-level decision and outside the scope of the Forest Plan.

Draft Plan Location: Page 108-109

---

**Page 117 - Standards for Forest Products (FW- FORESTRY-S)** - Recommend adding a new standard relating to removal of permit requirement for certain forest products collected for cultural and personal use.

**Suggested Language:** 7. *Collection of the culturally significant forest products of piñón nuts, trementina sap, chapulín berries, and medicinal plants, in small quantities for personal traditional use shall not require a permit. Collection of these products for commercial purposes shall require a permit.*

**Comment:** In order to help meet Desired Condition 6, it is important to exempt the permitting requirement for certain culturally significant forest products. The collection of these products for personal traditional use has been going on for centuries in a sustainable manner that has ensured the persistence of the forest products. Removing the requirement for permitting the collection of these products will go a long way to build goodwill with traditional communities. Permitting of these forest products for commercial use should be required.

---

**Page 118 - Guidelines for Forest Products (FW-FORESTRY-G)** - Recommend adding a new guideline that directs management activities that result in the byproduct of fuelwood to include fuelwood collection opportunities for traditional and local communities.

**Suggested language:** 4. *When management activities result in generation of fuelwood, opportunities for collection by traditional and other local communities will be made available where appropriate.*

**Comment:** This guideline is important because it provides direction to project managers to utilize fuelwood byproducts generated from management projects/activities for distribution to local communities. This would go a long way toward creating goodwill amount communities dependent on forest resources, like fuelwood, for their survival.

---

**Page 119 - Management Approaches for Forest Products (FW-FORESTRY-M)** - Recommend adding a new management approach relating to reasonable distances for local fuelwood collection opportunities.

**Suggested Language:** 10. *Provide annual fuelwood collection opportunities for forest dependent communities, that are adjacent to the National Forest, within a reasonable distance to the community. Comment: Providing annual fuelwood collection opportunities as near as practicable to local communities is critical, particularly for traditional communities that are still reliant on fuelwood as a primary heating source.*

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance.  
see FP004

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

FP004 Response: Permitting processes facilitate sustainable management to ensure resources will be available long into the future. We cannot provide forest product free use permits to land grants the way we can with federally recognized tribes due to the Forest's trust responsibility. Personal-use permits can be issued for free, depending on circumstances. For instance, federally recognized tribes can collect special forest products for free under Section 8015 of Food and Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, provided collection is done in sustainable manner and does not violate other laws. The Forest Service permitting process allows all members of the public to collect special forest products for on-site use, such as firewood for a campfire or eating berries while on a hike. When a person wants to take forest products home, then they should have a permit, either free use or charge. The issuance of free use permits is guided by Section 82 - Free Use (see 36 CFR 223.8). The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a, section 14(a)), authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell trees, portions of trees, and other forest products at not less than appraised value (FSM 2401.1, paragraph 8). Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2400, Chapter 2430, sec. 2431.31c., establishes minimum charges for small sales.

Draft Plan Location: Page 117

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance  
see FP005

Changes made to Plan or EIS: None

FP005 Response: FW-FORESTRY-DC-3 directs that, "Forest products that are a byproduct of management activities are available for personal use (e.g., fuelwood) by the public." Furthermore, projects on the Santa Fe NF are based on resource objectives not geographic locations -- we cannot guarantee distance from communities as not all thinning projects are needed near communities. In the Plan's Partnership section, however, desired conditions support partnerships as management tools. The Rural Historic Communities section also has a guideline dictating that fuelwood will be made available (FW-RURALH-G-1).

Draft Plan Location: Page 117

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance  
see FP005

See comment above

Draft Plan Location: Page 118-119

**Page 119 - Management Approaches for Forest Products (FW-FORESTRY-MA) -**

Recommend adding a new management approach relating to local community partnership blocks as a management tool.

**Suggested Language:** 11. *Consider using fuelwood partnership blocks around traditional communities as both a restoration treatment option and a way to meet local fuelwood demands.*

**Comments:** Partnership block projects in the Carson National Forest have proven to be quite successful as a restoration treatment tool, at meeting local fuelwood demands and strengthening relationships between the Forest Service and local communities.

---

Not Met. Critically High Importance  
see FP005

See comment above

Draft Plan Location: Page 118-119

---