

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/11/2015 8:34:05 PM

First name: vincent

Last name: sanchez

Organization:

Title:

Comments: D5-ADJ6--Is a district that has been impacted by humans and is almost completely surrounded by the "...permanent improvement or human habitation, Section 2(c) wilderness act" this area and its current usage is very appropriate; it allows access to mix of nature and humans. Wilderness consideration of this area does not make sense.

D5-ADJ5--This area in question is a buffer to the impact of humans, it also allows for people to get into the forest but still be near the transportation of Crest road Hwy 536, but this road is loud, one can hear cars, trucks, and motorcycles going up and down the road all times of the day. Someone cannot have an "outstanding opportunity for solitude, Section 2(c) wilderness act" this road is a constant distraction to solitude making this area inappropriate for wilderness consideration.

D5-ADJ4--Is an area of the Sandias poorly suited for wilderness conversion for many reasons. It is adjacent to a loud paved highway and a dirt roadway, with a power line joining both through it. This power line requires maintenance. This is in stark contrast to the original idea of the Wilderness Act and its definition.

"...undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions... Wilderness Act section 2(c)". Access to this infrastructure will at some point will require maintenance by mechanized means "...there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area. Wilderness Act section 4(c)". All denotations taken into consideration, area D5-ADJ4 is a buffer to and for the wilderness, but not in and of itself the "wilderness" as defined by the Wilderness Act.

Areas D5-ADJ 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 are small areas that do nothing to preserve wilderness. The features, infrastructure and proximity are what make them different from wilderness. Instead the reclassification of these enjoyed areas will restrict access to nature and trails that people are now currently able to enjoy. The reality is, some people like the ideology of wilderness and believe it is their responsibility to be good stewards and increase its size, a commendable endeavor. But reclassification to wilderness is exclusionary to others (mainly cyclists), while they themselves, (primarily hikers) reap all the benefits of this segregation. I would love to ride the Sandia Crest Trail or La Luz, but I cannot; but I don't feel it would be right to change its designation to a cycling trail only for my benefit. In essence this is the inverse of what could be happening to the districts in question. People need to share the lands that are open to all human powered transportation; wilderness is not open to all forms of transportation and its statutes shouldn't be used to exclude people just because it doesn't fit their preferred way of leisure.