

Creating a Prescott Landscape Vision - Survey for Community Feedback

Survey Comments

Total number of participants: 392

Combined survey responses from Online (310) and Hardcopy (82)

Overall, Forest Health, and Fire

a) The Prescott community values the Prescott National Forest (PNF) for the many recreational, economic and ecological services that it provides. The natural beauty and rural character of the surrounding public lands are a vital part of this community.

- Land trades to wealthy people!
- Stop all the building.
- The natural beauty of our NF is very important because most of the private land has been developed.
- Three minutes to wilderness.
- Closest pine trees to Phoenix.
- I see the vision changing; I'd like to see it keep the values.
- Ecological services??
- So important.
- Its part of why I feel that I can live in Prescott.
- The beauty of these forests is a big reason why people want to live here.
- PNF is great.
- Its just beautiful.
- Maintain the small town, rural character of Prescott, and maintain one's sanity..

b) Our vision of those lands 50 years from now is that they remain in the public domain, a resource shared across generations.

- We hold the land/forest in trust for future generations.
- As long as others respect the area and keep it safe.
- Need to protect from painting and trash.
- With some legal guarantee that the forest won't be bought.
- People have to respect it more.
- Depends on how much control and who.
- So important; cattle people and all hunters - recreation - miners etc. need these forests.
- Important.
- Yes this is critical.
- These lands should be kept safe from people who will exploit it.
- I hope so.
- Please don't get rid of them.
- Let the people continue to use the land.
- 50 years from now all private land will be developed and we will need these beautiful islands of green to escape from development.
- Public domain means public--not for just a few.
- A public resource that needs to stay available to the public.

c) We envision a forest with diverse, primarily native vegetation that protects soil from erosion, both in upland and riparian areas. Healthy wildlife populations play an integral role in these ecosystems.

- We should limit use of motorized vehicles because they cause erosion and disturb wildlife and destroy vegetation.
- More designated wilderness is needed to ensure habitat preservation so that there will continue to be wildlife.
- Needs cattle to help play a role in ecosystem.
- Primarily is the keyword.
- The wildlife is very important.
- We need this so much.
- Preserving species diversity is extremely important for the native ecosystem.
- I do not feel like Prescott community as a whole shares these feelings.
- Prevention of erosion is more important than native vegetation--things change in nature. In this case, the animal "man" is the most important.
- I feel that vegetation management must be a high priority. Not only to reduce forest fires, but control and reduce invasive weeds, and maintain forest areas forested and grassland areas grasslands.
- The diversity of a complete ecosystem needs to be maintained.

d) The risk of forest fires is reduced in the urban-wildland interface where the Forest and community partners actively work to reduce hazardous fuel loads. Ecologically, socially and economically sustainable uses of forest products support these projects.

- Too many controlled burns that wreck land and sometimes get out of control.
- Select cut and not so much.
- Yes we need to provide for the economic side that might help small business such as ranching and logging which will reduce fuel loads.
- Key word is that this is done in the wildland urban interface and we do not expand this area.
- I don't know. There needs to be more public education regarding this.
- Bring back logging to thin trees for a healthy forest.
- So important that the wood could be used and the grass and trees protected.
- If they did; control burns haphazard - the one along White Spar Rd a joke.
- don't know.
- Very complex issue--move slowly, limit the "socially" part and improve the "science" part. I agree with the "active" part.
- It is difficult to find any companies that are interested in the slash build up for economic gains. What they are primarily interested in are the trees that

will be cut, and rarely are they interested in removing brush or downed timber.

- This is a good idea but is not practiced. Instead of using (prescribed burns, no longer even mentioned as controlled burns) the FS should be auctioning off this timber and collecting a fee for its removal instead of turning it to smoke! The only money spent is to protect wealthy homeowners who won't spend their own money or time to protect themselves and build where they should not be in the first place. Local governments are only interested in the fees they get from the developers and the following property taxes.
- If the products can be developed and marketed sustainably.
- Completely removing all "dead and down" interrupts an important component in that natural processing (decomposing vegetation) regenerates the soil, providing important nutrients and biological processing within the ecological system. Also, property owners who put themselves in the position of being part of the urban-wildland interface should be willing to take responsibility for making that choice and not hold land management agencies responsible for the results of naturally occurring fire regimes.
- Problematic because if the timber industry gears up to use the cut timber, they always want TOO MUCH and they TAKE TOO MUCH and ruin the soil. So, I had a problem with that one.
- Non-motorized and primitive use economic benefits are often overlooked in looking at the economic benefits of public, wild and/or roadless lands. I hope this is factored into this statement.

e) Active forest management, with an emphasis on restoration of natural ecological processes, developed through agency-community collaborative efforts, help maintain forest health and reduce the risk of stand-replacing wildfires forest wide. All of this, in turn, promotes healthy watersheds where storage of water in the soil, stream courses and local aquifers is maximized.

- Sounds good but there is nothing done except after the fact!
- The use of prescribed fire and careful grazing help to improve the natural ecological process.
- Community should decide.
- Science based forest management...
- The forest doesn't need that much help!
- Protection of the trees and vegetation so important as well as the water, so vital for all.
- Stop paving hiking areas.
- This can mean almost anything.
- Active restoration "How exactly"
- Define active forest management. Define natural ecological processes. What does this include?
- Caution should be used when trying to reinstate a natural ecological process back to an area that has been unnatural for many years. Ensure that forestry professionals working on such programs are educated on the latest findings from the NAU forestry center.
- Much of the PNF is either Pinion-Juniper Woodland or a Chaparral ecosystem. Both of these systems or veg-types are currently within their natural range of variability when it comes to natural fire rotations. These types tend to support natural stand replacing fire, with long fire return intervals when compared to the Ponderosa Pine type (which is a minor element on the PNF). As a result, "active management" is not warranted in these type of systems. I would strongly agree if the term "where appropriate" were added to the statement, and allowances made for natural stand replacing fire.
- The phrase "emphasis on restoration of natural ecological processes" may not be understood by all taking this survey. As a result of attending lectures at the HCNH and U of A Extension Service,
- I question the cost benefits to "perfect" restoration of forest to prehuman existence. Protection and reasonable restoration efforts is desired.
- The key is to restore natural ecological processes. Fires are a part of that
- Where fuel load reductions are mechanically managed, the possibility of removal of fuel loads for use in bio-mass energy production should be considered in place of "burning slash", which typically creates poor air quality for extended periods of time, and has at times initiated large, out of control wildfires.
- I'm not sure exactly what (e) means "active forest management with an 'emphasis on restoration of natural ecological processes' "? I marked agree. But, as a rancher I hope this does not mean removal of livestock grazing. I believe that forest health and good management can go hand in hand with livestock grazing.

f) The healthy forest contributes to global sustainability and is a natural, trash-free place with quiet settings.

- Staff raising fines for littering
- Trash free: I wish.
- How does motorized fit into quiet settings?
- FS needs more law enforcement people to stop trash dumping and noisy ATV use.
- It could be but people don't keep it clean.
- I'm not sure I agree with global stability.
- Amen
- While I like the sound of the visioning statements, please don't use to ban vehicle use from the forest. Sound limits are ok - actually I would highly support stock sound levels for OHVs. This doesn't mean zero noise, though.
- Not sure what the exact definition of is; "trash-free quiet settings"
- The forest should be a natural, trash-free place with quiet settings, but that is not necessarily the case at present. Unfortunately, it is a fact that motorized users have torn up parts of the forest and trashed it. There should be options for motorized to enjoy the forest, but they do not seek the same type of experience. Non-motorized prefer peace and quiet while not covering so much territory. Motorized seem interested in covering a larger territory and they do create noise.
- Where are you going with this? If you want it natural and trash-free, keep all people out, which is a poor idea in the present world. I feel you are beginning to direct questions to justify 'taking away' from general users, e.g. home-use wood cutters, hunters and shooters.
- If it is to be public, we need to be wise stewards. Different partitions may satisfy differing needs.
- The forest IS NOT trash free!!!! It is getting disgustingly dirty from people dumping all kinds of refuse, from beer cans and bottles tossed out or off of vehicles, to entire truck loads of trash. I horse-back ride all kinds of places in PNF, from Paulden to Camp Wood/Walnut Creek to the Bradshaws to Mingus. I am seeing an increasing abuse of the land, from off-roaders in whatever kind of vehicle tearing up the terrain, to the people who dump without conscience.
- This is the desired goal.
- Not necessarily quite, and global sustainability is questionable. This is a loaded question.

Vision Statement Nonspecific/General

- There seems to be a premise to some of the questions that "unordained people" are ruining the forest and the "ordained purists" need to step in and save things. I believe this is completely erroneous and there is room for everyone in the balance.

- The PNF is a diverse and beautiful place. It should remain accessible to all, not just hikers and non motorized users, but to those who enjoy jeeping, ATV's, motorcycles, and the trails that have been established many years ago by the original miners should not be closed off for special interest groups. I have been using the trails for over 30 years, and am saddened by the closing of many trails that were previously open to dirt motorcycles, ATV's, etc. and are now closed to motorized transportation, which the environmental groups selfishly feel necessary to protect the forest. We use radios in many cases to report fires, trash dumping, and other detrimental uses. The environmental radicals would have their groups buy the land and close it off to almost all the public. Not Good! Let's not have the PNF follow this trend, please. There is enough land for all uses, and the wilderness areas currently exist for those who want to just walk in and meditate in absolute silence.
- The forest should remain for EVERYONE to enjoy - whether on foot or on motorized vehicles
- I strongly disagree that mandating the indiscriminate removal of fuel from around houses will help Prescott in any way. If you look at the precepts of xeriscape, they rely on increasing amounts of greenery near the house to reduce cooling costs and to increase quality of life. This biomass is not dry - it's full of life and not a fire danger. Mandating zero-scaping (rocks instead of greenery) will destroy a vital part of our quality of life. I will vote against any administration that mandates that new or existing construction cannot incorporate xeriscape into its landscape plan.
- You have not addressed invasive species issues in d, e, or f
- It seems to be shown in more and more research over the recent decades that forest ecosystems "solve" many of their own "problems." We must work with an ecocentric mindset, including human use on equal par with that of natural processes to have successful management for future generations to benefit. On first glance it appears that the wording of these statements is in congruence with that assumption.
- Recognize horse use as both traditional and non-threatening to environmental concerns. The opposite is true of quadrunners, etc.
- I really question our global impact.
- The term "quiet" is subjective. I do not agree that "quiet" must mean an absence of all man made (motorized) noise.
- I don't think that the forest is so "natural" that people have to stay out of it
- What a blessing it is to live in this glorious area. The variety and versatility of the recreation available is what makes living here so great. Let please try to keep it that way.
- I especially appreciate the "agency-community collaborative efforts", as government funding alone often does not meet the needs of ecologically, socially, and sustainable use management. Throughout our nation's history the management of our public lands has become more visible, a more collaborative effort. I fully support this vision.
- I really do not know how much the leaders of Prescott support saving the forests and beauty of the area. But that is what brought me to Prescott and I need to learn more.
- This all sounds good to me.
- Please stop controlled burns. Build a chipboard factory instead.
- I have some concerns about how ecological health is being evaluated. On occasion I feel that certain types of fuel reduction programs are creating a circumstance of dependency on these methods which may be motivated by economic profit rather than ecological health. I feel that the priorities must be balanced between safety to development, health to ecosystems and aesthetic values.
- Collaborative efforts should include those that recreationally use the forests such as off-roaders, hunters and fisherman. Collaborative does not include shutting down the forest for the sake of those that would like to restrict use to little more than standing on pavement and admiring the view.
- It is only logical to preserve the land
- Leave it as it was before we got here to trash the place. NO OHVs belong on pavement, not fragile soils! Let Mother Nature be the guide, it seems when humans get involved, we tend to mess things up by micromanagement, over thinking and excessive tool usage.
- It would be nice if the forest was a trash-free place but with the yahoos that come up here it is not possible
- The Prescott Forest should follow these standards and not the current Healthy Forest Initiative of this administration.
- Help stop global warming kill yourself
- I am very much in favor of prescribed burns to reduce the danger of serious forest fires. I would also like to see as much as possible of the dead, diseased and fallen trees removed from the forest, but I would oppose logging for purely commercial use.
- The risk of wildfire to structures within the urban wildland interface should be VERY clearly explained to all existing, and especially new, home owners, and the inherent risks should be mutual between the owners of said residences and the USFS.
- I'm concerned with the verbiage of some of the above statements, such as LETTER "E". The way that is worded says to me that once again we are going to let the conservation groups dictate the way the forest is maintained. The problem I see with that is the catastrophic fires that have happened recently in AZ forests because of the way they were maintained.
- Wildfires should not be managed to the point that they do not occur. A fire cycle is important to the health of the forest.
- As you can tell, I spend lots of time outside and most during mtn biking in Prescott National Forest areas. I believe it is very important to keep these recreation areas and preserve to the best of our knowledge.
- Formal and "social trails" -- trails used for years by non-motorized users -- have been destroyed these past few years due to reckless tree falling/cutting over such trails. Users still try to use these familiar trails, but skirt around them in a way that creates a new route that often encourages more erosion or damages other native plants.
- I want all good things for the forest health, but not at the cost of closing any of it down for recreation. For instance I'd rather volunteer to help do garbage clean up now and then than close off access.
- I am concerned about the number of dirt bikes and 4-wheelers that do not stay on the roads and tear up the country, also the amount of trash that they generate. In wet weather particularly people create ruts in the road, and off, which in turn creates erosion and washes. Since there are only three officers in the Forest Service to police these actions, maybe it is time for a volunteer posse that has the authority to control these actions. The number of trees per acre now amounts to over 200, when foresters say a maximum of 65 per acre is recommended, so it is time to thin the forest to maintain a healthy forest. In addition we need more juniper control to bring back our forage.
- All the above statements are global. You need to explicitly state that the PNF has been and will remain a resource to be shared by all citizens, private and commercial. All the above goals can be met by wise use by ranchers, miners, loggers, hunters, fishermen, hikers, riders, picnickers, campers etc. Item "e" could be used by environmental extremists to limit use of the forest by humans. You must add to it with wording that provides for multi-use as noted previously.
- Generally speaking, with the shrinking budgets for recreation and the increase in the number of users in the National Forests, I believe we are facing a critical time where we will see greater resource damage.
- My responses are my vision - not all of the statements have been realized - yet.
- I would like No gun shooting, or bow and arrow shooting.
- Yes, these are all desirable with the access to all recreation users protected. Volunteer groups or patrols to be watchful of the forests and report any trashing, vandalism, etc. is a viable way of protecting our valuable resources.
- The above expresses my feelings perfectly. Thank you for stating things so clearly.
- I believe that it is very important to protect all forested and water areas for mtn. biking, hiking etc.
- Also agree with clearing out brush, fallen trees and controlled burns although as far as properties I think that should be up to prop. Owners.

- Existing trails and roads need to be retained and returned to their previous condition after forest thinning/logging. By the harvesters.
- Would like to see some FR/DH Mtn biking trails in PNF. Virtually all the current trails are cross country.
- Fires that are both controlled and natural need to be part of active forest management.
- I think that most of the people who actually get out to spend time in the Prescott National Forest agree with these statements. Over the years people are the most upset when land swaps occur with developers and the new developments obliterate trails that were in the Prescott National Forest.
- I interpret this to mean the use of fire and clearing to replicate the natural occurrence of fire in the forest which routinely reduced the underbrush and smaller trees.
- I would like to see alternatives to prescribed burns used to maintain forest health and reduce the risk of fires that can threaten life and property. Air quality is just as much a part of the forest as are the trees. The air quality of our forest areas should be valued and maintained.
- The "on-the-ground" reality does "not quite meet" the goal.
- Especially in the Urban Prescott Basin area.
- Healthy grasslands help limited precipitation infiltrate into the soil and underlying aquifer. Diverse vegetation is necessary, and herbivory is a key to keeping vegetation diverse.
- Don't rule out the use of new herbicides to reduce costs to control vegetation.
- Cattle grazing does not hurt the forest, it actually improves it>
- All of this can be done with out restricting the use of these lands
- These statements are common sense.
- We must get all who use the area to understand how every thing that happens impacts the forest in some way. Leaving trash behind, not cleaning up campfire areas, chopping down firewood randomly all impacts in some way
- I notice a lack of diversity in this planning operation and that the groups represented see a forest as their opportunity. I propose we stop looking at the forest as something to be "used." Keep the little that's now left of it as it was meant to be - a forest. HUMBLY BOW OUT! Let something in this world be unadulterated by human self interest. A forest is home to native plants and animals, not a haven for ruin by people - through mines, off-road vehicles, shooting, and cows.
- I believe the National Forest Service should be allowed to manage our forest.
- I also agree with harvesting timber to thin overgrown areas, clearing a zone for wildfire control between the community and the forest, and closing the forest during times of high fire danger.
- I'm just not sure how focused we actually are on having healthy forests when we have designated 190 miles of trails for ORV use and only 155 (or so) miles of trails designated for hiking. ORV damage to our forests and the wildlife that lives there is undeniable.
- ORV users are responsible for 2 out of 4 of what is currently considered by Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth to be the major threats to our National Forests.
- I'm sure you know the states that these threats are 1) wildfire, 2) encroachment (housing in National Forests), 3) ORV use, and 4) spread of invasive species. Of these, ORV use is responsible for the last two, or HALF of the threats to our forests. Why are we allowing them to run rampant over our forest floors, creating degradation and ruining our forests for not only the wildlife, but future human generations as well?
- I disagree only in the unqualified use of the word "quiet". This word is too often used in attempts by elitist hikers and mountain bikers to close more and more forest roads & trails to motorized off-road vehicles. In fact, the vast majority of these vehicles now have four-stroke engines, which are quieter and have a much less obnoxious sound to begin with than the old stereotypical two-stroke engines, and the sounds of these vehicles do not carry far at all in tall timber forests.
- The unrestricted use of ATV's must be curtailed in order to preserve any sort of vegetation and/or sense of serenity. It totally destroys the ground, pollutes the air with fuel and sound. There needs to be an allowance made for this use but well controlled and regulated.
- Use by horses/mules has been traditional both for personal recreation and for forest maintenance needs. It needs nor deserves no restrictions.
- I saw nothing in any of these about protecting the oldest of the ponderosa pines that remain in the forests rather than allowing the last of them to be logged. That should be a part of the vision.
- I value a quiet, wildlife present forest hiking experience. Off-road vehicles should not be allowed to go off trail. Urban/Wild interface should be protected but not at a cost to the forest.
- Maintaining road free and as much wild land as we can will best support biodiversity and sustainable good environments.
- Management of land for holding water and releasing it later also is VERY important. The science on that is kind of confusing.
- Active forest management should not include the creation of new roads and should include closing a significant number of roads and trails to provide undisturbed habitat.
- To turn our shared resources into a source of profit for some timber company is unforgivable. If we make it another 100 years, history will not look kindly on this behavior. The right thing to do and the hard thing to do are usually the same thing. Please do the right thing, resist corporate pressures, and reserve these lands for the quiet, pristine enjoyment of the public. Thank you.
- Periodic natural forest fires clear out the deadfall and undergrowth which unnatural forest fire prevention allows to build up - creating the fuel load that encourages massive wildfires. Commercial enterprises harvest old growth and larger trees which are economically useful, but not the source of fuel that needs to be addressed. I favor a forest management plan that deals with the unnatural build up of undergrowth and deadfall as opposed to continual harvest of older "economically" valuable trees.
- Keep ORV's out, reduce roads, and ban hunting
- Quiet natural places that support diverse ecological services are important.
- I am glad you used the term "quiet settings." Freedom from noise is important especially as cities get noisier.
- Urban wildlife interface is not defined. Many of these messages seem mixed to me, in terms of values, and/or too vague to agree with strongly. For example, I agree strongly that the natural beauty and rural character of the surrounding public lands are a vital part of this community, and not that the value is in the economic services it provides. Since actively work to reduce fuel loads can be interpreted so many ways, I can't support that, although I can support landowners near forests engaging in firewise practices and creation of defensible space on their lands. Likewise, active forest management could mean drastic logging, according to Wally Covington's approach to restoring natural processes, or it could mean the natural processes advocated by the SW Forest Alliance. I support the latter strongly and oppose the former.
- Natural and wild places are vital to Arizona's future. They are an important resource that need to be protected.
- In terms of the "urban-wildland interface," I think that while we need to pay attention to "hazardous fuel loads," it is even more important to curb urban/residential encroachment into wildland areas. Sprawl is even more of a problem than fuel.
- The forest should be managed to provide accessible areas for recreational shooting in order to minimize trash, fire danger and prevent dispersed shooting through out the forest.
- The concern of many of us who support protection of our natural resources, is the presence of organizations that use deceptive titles to mask their interest in opening the forests to massive invasion by OHV's and other vehicles and uses, who show little or no respect for the forests and natural growth. Arizona is an arid-land state; the mountains not only provide a beauty that reflects our Creator, but also offer us water and climactic variation

that make this state a natural wonder. I have seen enough "roadways" developed by OTV's to know that only - ONLY - vigorous protection for compatible uses of the forests will help them survive.

- I think that ecosystem resiliency should be prioritized above any social and economic use of forest products. "Active forest management" should be done with the goal of ecosystem resiliency in mind.
- Please define global sustainability and local sustainability. And what do you mean by 'healthy'?
- Maintaining our National Forests for their natural beauty and the protections the forests offer both wildlife and humanity in regard to watersheds, reductions of carbon-loading, soil erosion, and riparian areas (crucial in an arid place like AZ) is an absolute must! Collaboration between the NFS and local communities will enhance a "win-win" situation for all stakeholders.
- I am strongly in favor of some logging/commercial harvest of forest products as one of the mechanisms of sound forest management. Shooting facilities near town, such as the one at Granite Mountain Park, are very beneficial in providing safe recreation without excessive driving/use of fuel while making sure the forest is not spoiled by shooters. The use of such facilities should be more strongly encouraged.

Recreation

a) In our vision, a comprehensive recreational travel plan region-wide protects forest health and promotes robust economies in our cities and towns.

- This travel plan should provide for ATV playgrounds on PRIVATE LAND! Not on NF land!!
- With an emphasis on watershed protection.
- Not sure; need more info.
- Don't really know what this means.
- Huh?
- Four wheelers are destroying it.
- What does this mean?
- Don't know.
- Bring them here! Advertise them.
- Define recreational travel plan!!
- What does "a comprehensive recreational travel plan" mean?
- Helps to control off-trail use
- I don't understand what "a" means.
- A nice campaign slogan that is never actually promoted.
- I don't necessarily think determining how many roads the forests have should be based on economic benefit - rather what road density is needed to maintain overall forest ecological health.
- I am unclear what is meant re. Promoting economies of our cities and towns. I don't believe that PNF has a responsibility of "promoting local economies". The protection of the land is their responsibility, which may or may not promote the economy.
- I'm not sure I understand what you are talking about.

b) The Prescott National Forest maintains a comprehensive system of meaningful and sustainable trails, trailheads and dispersed campsites.

- Our trails are causing erosion especially where motorized vehicles are allowed! Dispersed campgrounds are expanding and destroying the vegetation; soon all we will have is large bare dirt parking lots!
- Clearer maps, more loops.
- Forward thinking on trail systems and loops is key.
- It is important for our emotional, mental and social health.
- But I would vote for much more roadless areas in the PNF.
- Not enough.
- Always room for more trails.
- Not enough for public use and awareness.
- Important to help the campers, hunters and recreationalists.
- Keep up the good work!
- Love them!
- Needs to be looked at and refined. Case in point, the current Forest Service maps have roads or trails marked on them that no longer exist or are incorrect to begin with and that has put a large burden on the ranches and residents that own private property that the forest service maps show roads on! We've been shot at by "recreationalists" who were upset that they can't travel through our private property like the Forest Service maps show!
- I would like to see these facilities improved.
- I sure don't know where they are!

c) Through ongoing dialogue with the community, a thoughtful balance is achieved between the need for access and the protection of forest resources and aesthetics.

- Would like to see mtn biking trails at top of glassford hill for PV residents.
- Don't want to lose horse access.
- How about closing more roads and trails and making some service roads only.
- When in question, protection should always be favored over access.
- Ongoing dialogue limited, access more interesting.
- Communication - so important.
- This balance is crucial; ORV's are very detrimental to the ecosystem.
- Would like more dialogue.
- The balance and access is decided by whom???
- This is often a small vocal user groups, not the general, non-organization person

- dialog is good, but the government hires experts to manage our lands and we (the public- should trust in their judgment and the scientific data they use for their decisions.

- There is no balance whatsoever. It is all in favor of developers.

d) Low maintenance facilities built collaboratively among citizens and agencies are valued by all.

- Need access and trailer parking.

- I hope so but without law enforcement these areas will be trashed!

- Meaning??

- Any building is insensitive to forest.

- Not valued by all.

- So important to all.

- Maybe we should all help.

- What do you mean by "low maintenance facilities"? Do you mean restrooms or picnic areas with structures for shade? Question not clear. I would agree to some type of trash bins and restroom facilities along trails and/or OHV trails, but placing picnic tables and shades up is going too far. Pull out areas provided for picnic areas and turn around areas along trails is a good idea as OHV riders don't usually have a place to stop, view sites, turn around etc. without getting off trail.

- not sure how many people actually notice or care

- What are you talking about?

e) The trails are enjoyed by hikers, equestrians, bicyclists, motorized vehicle operators and hunters, with a reasonable amount of access to all user groups.

- No motorized vehicles.

- Please include equestrian use in this mix.

- Need separation.

- Limit motorized vehicles; they tear up trails and promote erosion.

- Not motorized vehicles on trails. Remove motorized vehicles.

- Motorized vehicles in the forest drive away game and leave beer cans and trash.

- Keep motorized to restricted areas.

- Prefer no motorized vehicles on trails; roads only.

- Would prefer not to have motorized vehicles.

- Yes, however most places motorized use is not compatible with non-motorized use.

- I am personally an advocate of human powered activities.

- Specific trails should be identified for specific uses b/c some uses disrupt the experience of other uses and even introduce dangers (hunters/ohv).

- Motorized vehicles are damaging, polluting and drivers often unaware of their footprint.

- A few trails are impossible to be multi-use.

- Not enough dedicated to ATV trails.

- Keep the quads off of the PNF

- ATV access is overdone.

- I only support the use of motorized vehicles on a limited number of trails and with strict regulations.

- You have not addressed invasive species issues in e (these users need to be aware that they can spread weeds and other organisms).

- The devil is in the definition of "reasonable"

- Define reasonable amount of access.

- Needs to have certain roads or trails designated for use by non-vehicular and vehicular usage, the way the quads use the trails is not safe for non-motorized use to be included in it.

- Strongly believe that motorized vehicle use should be kept at a minimum in the PNF

- Some trail can be designated for prioritized use, with warnings to pedestrians that motorized travel is appropriate, allowed and should be expected.

- What is your definition of "reasonable access to all"?

- More places should have limited off-road-vehicle access allowed because when these users embrace and use an area it often degrades the area and prevents non-motorized users or quiet users from enjoying the land. That said, ORV users are one of the users of the forests and should have some places they can travel on and use public lands.

- There are too many competing users listed. It is not possible to have a "reasonable amount of access to all user groups." Acknowledging that some groups will not be served as well as others, in advance, is a better starting point in my mind than trying to make everyone happy.

- It is important to keep in mind OHV use is the only use that affects all other uses, which should make it a use that is subject to more controls than the other uses. It is also the use that carries the most potential for resource damage compared to other uses.

- As to "e" and motorized vehicles, motorized vehicles are a form of transportation, not a form of recreation as far as the forest is concerned. If people want to thrill-ride on their ATVs, it is not compatible with a healthy forest. It is not the responsibility of PNF to provide tracks for ATVs any more than it is to provide tracks for car racing or the like. Motors and the "natural world" are not compatible in my opinion (and personal observations.) I know that there are responsible ATVers who use their vehicles for transportation on existing roads, but I also see, every day, the results of those who use the forest as a venue to drive around wherever they want with no regard as to where they are or what they are doing to the environmental health of the forest. I think that when PNF concerns itself with supplying a venue for ATVers they are introducing the concept of the forest being the place to drive as opposed to the forest being a natural environment.

f) The PNF, with user participation, minimizes user conflict through enhanced separation between non-motorized and multi-use trails.

- No motorized vehicles.

- As an ASI instructor, we need one-way motorized trails to limit accidents.

- Stop all motorized trails.

- Need to have more separation from motorized to protect non-motorized.

- Groom??CRK?? Is on my horse camp in Prescott - there should be no motorized in that area.

- Keep motorized to restricted areas.

- Do not understand how you will do this.

- This is good but without law enforcement ATV's will not stay on the trails. We have unauthorized vehicles presently destroying land!

- Before more comprehensive rules - enforceable and education for motorized vehicle users.

- Could be much better.

- If you open more motorized, there will be less people making their own.
- It works!
- Separation of uses makes the most sense along the urban interface where the number of contacts would be highest. I think an acceptable solution is to have motorized trails that enter/leave the community, but take motorized users further out. Allowing the neighborhood kid to ride around at the end of the street may not work in most areas, but perhaps there are opportunities in some areas for a play area at the end of the street. Please be mindful that OHV riders like an afternoon fix, too.
- Shared access for all uses
- Again, a desirable goal.
- I see no control of ORV use anywhere, but people on foot are harassed for any reason.

g) Trails systems have areas of interconnecting loops accessible via corridors of motorized and non-motorized trails to other loop areas.

- No motorized vehicles.
 - Love to see more of this.
 - No motorized trails.
 - Loop trails for motorized users only serve to stress wildlife populations and the constant buzz of ATV's is bad now! i) Yes, we are losing vegetation every weekend from ATV and other vehicles; lets protect our basic resource--SOIL!
 - As long as areas of natural quiet are preserved.
 - Reduce motorized vehicle use.
 - Smart.
 - True, but greater motor restrictions needed.
 - ?
 - However it is more important to keep the ecosystem intact than to make more easily accessible trails; only when completely necessary.
 - I've used them.
 - Good!
 - Unless appropriately signed and blocked, I have seen single track trails (non-motorized) explored by motorized vehicles. When this happens, the foot/horse/bike trail is torn up/widened and loses it's character. So interconnecting may not be the way to go. It would be helpful to see a break down of how many existing trails are available for motorized vehicles. If the existing forest service roads and OHV area is not sufficient for the population, then this may need to be explored.
 - Good goal. Hard to accomplish. Especially without funds.
 - I can't quite understand the statement.
 - I am not sure where you are talking about. All I see is ATV & motor bike ruts.
 - Not all interconnecting loops should be or need to be accessible by motorized trails.
- It is often difficult to escape non-motorized recreation. Often, while hiking or camping in the PNF, OHVs can be heard or seen. When OHVs are not immediately present, the effects of irresponsible users can always be seen.

h) Cross-country (i.e., off trail) vehicle travel is not allowed.

- Maybe that's the rules, but I see it going on.
- But this is not enforced.
- Don't know.
- Its done anyway.
- Very important for grass.
- Very important for grass growth.
- Many trails seem destroyed by motorized vehicles.
- Strict regulations and steep punishments for violators should be enforced.
- OHV on trails ONLY!
- Excellent!
- There needs to be agreement between all parties before access to the areas in question are shut off.
- I would like to see all motorized regulated out of existence so I am in favor of more wilderness areas and strongly agree that no cross country vehicle travel be allowed. Until that comes about I agree with (f), (g) and (-.
- Should exclude recovery of game animals but as a general rule is acceptable
- The devil again; What about cross-country travel for lawfully taken big game and cutting fire wood for personal use????????????????? Do we have to ask permission for common sense?
- Excepting ranchers with leases - maintain waters, help animals, etc.
- While cross-country may not be allowed, it IS happening. As a horse rider, I am coming across all kinds of off-road off road activity. People doing donuts in their vehicles (truck, quads or dirt bikes) ripping up the terrain. I've gone back to ride areas I haven't been in for several months, and find new, illegal trails. Specific case in point is the area on the west side of Walker Rd, between Ranch Trail 62 and Smith Ravine. As of last summer and fall, dirt bikes had put in many new trails, and made existing ones so deeply rutted the horses couldn't even walk in them, nor could I when on foot.
- OHV trails should be put in the forest plan as public and private lands get torn up because riders have no place to ride. It is unclear to many what is a legal trail and what is an illegal route. It is often hard to tell. It should still be against the law to go off road, but roads should be provided. Utah has done a good job of providing OHV access. They could be a model.
- Is not allowed, but there is not enough staff to enforce
- It is being used as such
- Enforcement needs to be funded more adequately.
- Horses should be classified as bicycles, both separate from pedestrian and motorized travel.
- I agree! Now enforce it!
- In some locations cross country travel should be allowed .i.e. Alto pit area

Vision Statement Nonspecific/General

- Always use existing trails and roads, for any wheeled transportation, very important
- Off-trail vehicle travel should not be allowed at all. More enforcement is necessary.
- The trails should be available to ALL!! persons whether on Jeeps, Bikes or walking!!

- OHV use impacts the forest and the ability of other users to enjoy the forest by destroying trails, surrounding land and by creating an unacceptable level of noise pollution. OHV use should be limited to designated areas.
- Also the city of Prescott needs to have connectivity to the forest's recreation areas via trails leading from the heart of the town. Creek corridors perhaps?
- I believe there is a place for all however mixing hikers and horses with vehicle is a dangerous mix.
- While in the sake of fairness and the multiple use philosophy of the USFS, all methods of recreation should be respected and accounted for. However, there is substantial evidence, especially in recent years, that shows us some methods of transport are destructive to a degree that damage cannot be undone without large amounts of funding, man-power, and the passage of time. All of which unfortunately are not easily acquired resources. We need to start dealing with motorized use now, not later. In no way do I suggest its banishment from the forest, but tight regulations are in need of being developed now.
- I believe there is a designated off road area in Prescott for Motorized Vehicles, and although I do not use it, I feel it is only fair to those who do enjoy 4X4. I enjoy horseback riding and feel that some separation between us and other users is helpful.
- Sharing a hiking trail with ATVs is quite unpleasant. They stink and make a great deal of noise. Cyclists are quiet, on the one hand, but on the other I have occasionally been nearly hit by a silent fast-moving cyclist. Riders are another matter. We can stop and chat and wish one another well and go on our ways. I realize that horse hoofs can damage trail ways, as can bicycles and especially ATVs.
- Many official trails are boring. Please stop closing the others.
- Promoting economies in towns??? This is the Nat'l Forest, NOT the chamber of commerce! Recreational motorized use should be discouraged and severely limited as inconsistent with the values and spirit of forest lands.
- Motorized vehicles have no place in the forest, and on the trails. They create more damage, pollute the area and are hazardous. Operators are often thoughtless and arrogant.
- I am NOT a fan of motorized use of trails, have had confrontations with motorized users, fortunately without injury, and suggest motorized users stay within the jurisdiction of paved roadways and law enforcement. If they don't want horse poop on the trails, they should stay on the roads!!!
- The Prescott has not completed its Travel Management Plan. There is too much conflict between motorized and non-motorized recreational users. The information the Forest presents to the public is confusing and, in some instances, completely wrong. There needs to be less motorized trail use and more dedicated non-motorized trails. Better trail maintenance is needed.
- Motorized vehicles should follow a tread lightly program. All users should be responsible for carry out any trash used.
- Help stop global warming kill yourself
- We have noted that trail restrictions, ie "no motorized vehicles" are not always observed by users.
- Opening more USFS lands to motorized vehicles limits management options henceforth and thus should be strongly scrutinized by the USFS and affected parties before any management actions are taken.
- Facilities do not affect my travel in the forest. Motorized vehicles must have tighter restraints than non-motorized travel since they have a larger negative impact on ecosystems and aesthetics.
- Against motorized use of trails of any kind. Bad for the environment and does not mix with non-motorized users. Also frequently see minors using on motorized vehicles with no supervision or consideration of others.
- Our biggest problems have been off road vehicles, and shooters. I think that all people should have access to these lands; however there is no enforcement when rules are broken.
- The Circle Trail System is a great addition and I have personally worked on some of trails with MBAA. I think that the off road vehicles do need their own trails like Alto Pit as they do tend to make noise and tear up regular trails.
- Hunters to NOT belong in an area where people are likely to be using trails.
- Motorized vehicles to NOT belong on forested trails -- they are noisy, polluting, and most often the biggest offenders of littering and not respectful of the forest. Motorized vehicles do NOT mix with users wanting a quiet, nature experience, and do NOT mix with horses. Tires dig into trails when trail surfaces are soft. Motorized users often go off trail looking for up-hill thrills.
- Careful thought should be given where motorized travel increases erosion and other damage. Currently motorized vehicles vandalized the area even where they are banned...this needs to stop. One violation leads to another, then another and another.
- The Prescott Circle Trail will be greatly benefiting the community by enhancing recreation, tourism, and personal health.
- OHV activities on the PNF are growing exponentially. Their use/abuse negatively affects most other user groups. Trail designations and other regulations are only effective if enforced. Where is the PNF L.E.? In other parts of our state (i.e., the rim) OHV activities are carefully watched by forest LE personnel. While off-road travel is prohibited on the forest, it seems only game and fish routinely seeks out these violations and takes action.
- In the planning stages we need to address the lack of designated camp sites in the Prescott area. The forest will be used, and it would be great to have many of those users in a designated site to limit fire danger, trash, and human waste in the forests. As the surrounding communities grow so will the need to add these camp sites. There is already a shortage in the area of designated camp sites.
- "Community" is not defined. Will extremist groups be in the community, you know, those that said in the 70's and 80's "cattle free by '93"? Ranching must be protected. All these recreation statements don't provide for protecting rancher developed water resources, fences, etc.
- WHILE RIDING MY HORSE, I HAVE HAD PROBLEMS WITH MOTORIZED VEHICLE USERS FAILING TO APPRECIATE THE DANGER THEY POSE BY DRIVING TOO FAST, TOO CLOSE AND CREATING A LOT OF NOISE.
- Mnt bikes seem to be the last group considered in the decision making process.
- There are many cases where trails that are off limits to motorized travel are damaged, sometimes extensively by atv's and motorcycles.
- It is very difficult if not impossible for motorized vehicles and horseman to share the same trails; therefore, there should be separate trails for horses which motorized vehicles may not use.
- I request that people who are "motorized" or bicycle riders be informed that it is very dangerous to everyone for them to be around horseback riders. I ride the trails and I've almost been bucked off by careless and rude bicyclists who don't know that approaching a horse and rider at speed, and not giving way the trail to the rider, is an invitation to a serious accident. Horses are unpredictable and a fast moving bicycle can make a horse explode. I've been overtaken by fast bicyclists who give me disdainful looks and have endangered my safety. Many riders tell me this has happened to them as well. Proper trail etiquette is the nicest way to share the outdoors. It goes without saying further that motorized vehicles or dirt bikes are even more dangerous to horse riders. The forests and our beautiful outdoors are to be shared, but I, as a rider, try to stay away from trails shared with bicyclists because of the many scary and dangerous experiences I've had with them. I think that most bicyclists don't know that they are supposed to yield the trail to a horse and rider and be careful around them to ensure everyone's safety. Thank you.
- I do not believe that our forests should be open to any motorized vehicles. They are destructive and noisy and disturb wildlife and those who wish to either hike or ride by horseback to enjoy nature.
- There should be designated areas for off road vehicles. They can real tear up an area in a hurry and shouldn't be throughout the forest
- Same as before - these are the vision statements - we're not there yet.
- Please reduce, limit and preferably eliminate and police ORV's in this area.
- I ride horses; some are young and just learning. For safety sake motorized vehicles do not mix well with horses. Hunters near a horse trail doesn't sound like a good idea either. Not sure about how to go about that. But if you notice there are an awful lot of horse trailers traveling to and fro, a glad

sight to me from California where trail systems are quickly disappearing, hence an exodus of horse loving souls moving to a better environment. Creation of community trails as well, hooking up with forest trails, would be ideal. Some of the survey wording seems to hide other agendas, such as logging, which for forest health is a good thing I think but on the surface of course one would almost half to say yes to just about everything as it is worded. Just my sense of things. I would also like to say that horses do not disturb wildlife and the track made by them is often narrow. Horses and hikers seem to do well together.

- These are all ideal, but the reality is that the trails system for all users can be improved upon and expanded.
- Protects forest health
- There needs to be significantly greater emphasis on non-motorized, rather than motorized use. All it takes is one loud polluting, trail-degrading vehicle to ruin the pleasure of many non-invasive users! Also, access by motorized vehicles should NOT interconnect easily with non-motorized user access: it is too easy for vehicles to invade connected non-motorized areas.
- As a mtn biker, I use the trail often and love the Circle Trail and have helped work on part of that system. Alto is great for ATV riders and I think they do need their own trails.
- I believe we have the best trails in the area as they are kept up and marked well.
- Motorized vehicles need to be more diligent about staying on existing allowed trails and roads. Also need to be more cognizant about the impact they have on the roads/trails and not abuse areas prone to erosion etc and avoid going straight up or down fall-lines. Same applies to Mt Bikers.
- The forest needs to obliterate closed roads that are being used by ohv and causing big impacts to vegetation, soils, and streams. There are way too many miles of roads in our forest.
- It appears that access to the forest has been reduced over time regardless of what the comments from the community are. Portions of the forest could be temporary closed to restore itself however; none of the forest should be permanently closed.
- Too many people use motorized vehicles on trails designated as non-motorized areas only. This is dangerous to hikers, mtn. bikers and horseback riders. Non-motorized trail systems need to be complete systems without motorized vehicles. Four wheel drive vehicles drive cross country and make hill climbs in areas where it causes erosion and water shed issues. Supervision of those who do not contribute to safe multi-use areas because they are breaking the rules is minimal or non-existent.
- I doubt most non-motorized users feel this is being done.
- Or, that it is even desirable.
- What about handicapped people who would like to explore the surrounding areas?
- Cross country should be allowed but close no existing roads or trails.
- Strongly oppose ORV use off of public roads.
- ATV's and any other motorized vehicle use must be restricted on certain designated trails as it is not at all feasible for hikers & equestrians and mountain bikers to share trails with ATV's.
- I'd like to know that what's left of this forest is still a forest, after all, rather than something engineered and manipulated to appease those who would "use" it. Is there anything we can appreciate in its natural state? Yes, groups must cooperate for their own self interest. But the earth cannot advocate for itself. Please, let's be as gentle and respectful as possible to this home of native plants and animals that keeps us alive as well, just by being there. Let's protect it from motors, guns, fuel and noise. In short, let's protect it from us.
- Limited cross-country vehicle travel should be allowed by special permit only.
- Though it is illegal, ORV off-trail vehicle travel still occurs and is rarely enforceable. The damage this causes to an ecosystem we are already trying so hard to keep in balance is inexcusable. More effort should be put toward educating the public about the long-term damage of ORV use.
- Unfortunately, the expansion of ORV trails that occurred on Mt. Union recently completely changed a pristine area. Though I realize the Yankee Doodle trail (and others) were designated years earlier as ORV user trails, this should now be changed. There was public input before this trail was opened up. ORV users are pushing their way to get whatever they want, no matter the damage they are causing!
- In areas where I indicated only "Agree" rather than "Strongly Agree", I am still concerned that non-motorized users seem to be having their way a bit too much in restricting motorized use. I'm also concerned about what constitutes off-trail use. I certainly don't want to damage virgin forest with my vehicle. However, all obvious well-worn trails should be designated officially as trails, so that I do not break the law by using them.
- See previous comments.
- There needs to be an opportunity for quiet recreation, which means that some areas should be closed to vehicles and no cross country vehicle use should be allowed.
- I have concerns about being able to maintain "Balance" between motorized vehicles and other users. This would require a high degree of monitoring to make sure motorized vehicles do not take advantage of their access to trails and contribute to damage to the ecosystem.
- I don't hunt and would like to see this land preserved for non-hunters.
- I have not seen the trails system. My friends have a cabin near Goldwater Lake and they are very concerned that their peace and quiet will be impacted by motorized vehicles and people on non-motorized vehicles and just plain too many PEOPLE, dogs, etc. We are concerned that there will be soil compaction, soil erosion, and fires. We have hiked some in the area and love it. It could very easily burn and create a real disaster! A permit system would be helpful.
- The Forest should not prioritize allocation of resources to promote a robust local economy. Putting such a priority on equal footing with Forest health and quality habitat would cause the Forest to make trade-offs and as our population and recreational demands continue to increase the ecological integrity of the Forest would be continuously diminished. Your first priority should be to sustain forest health a quality habitat. Uses that are compatible with that goal should be accommodated, and uses that diminish habitat should be curtailed. Just because there is demand for and activity does not make it healthy or appropriate.
- I advocate a plan that includes separation of motorized vehicles and hunters from other uses within the trail system.
- ORV's destroy the environment; it's dangerous to mix hunters with hikers or other users.
- Roads and trails can fragment habitat, contribute to erosion, and encourage invasive species. The travel plan should do as little harm as possible. It should defer to effective ecological functioning as a primary goal
- Dialogue is good but it does not always lead to consensus. While there should be some areas where motorized travel are allowed, the forest should be primarily for non-engine use.
- It is important to develop non-motorized trails with links between developed and undeveloped areas.
- Vehicle travel on trails undermines the benefits of the wilderness area.
- Care must be taken that motorized vehicle (and non-motorized vehicle) traffic doesn't ruin the forests for the quiet solitude that can be experienced only in these places and for future generations. Our Southwest forests are very fragile.
- Off-road vehicle use is a real problem and a threat not only to the ecosystem but to non-vehicular users. It's noisy, polluting and large numbers of the operators seem unable to adhere to the rules. Unless their use can be adequately policed (and it obviously cannot), OHVs should be prohibited.
- There is and will be strong pressure to open the forests more and more to OTV's and their like. The forests are NOT created for that kind of purpose. Enough of Arizona's treasures have been spoiled! Let's have nor more. I'm neutral on low-maintenance facilities because I don't know just what these will entail. The trails shouldn't be used by OTV's.

- I think that motorized vehicles should have a very limited place in the forest. They have a much greater effect on ecosystem resiliency than horses, hikers, and bicycles. Giving them equal access to the same amount of forest as those lower-impact groups is unfair. I would not like to see motorized vehicle use expanded. I think throughout most of the forest, hikers, bicyclists and equestrians should have privacy and should not have to be near motorized vehicles.
- Motorized vehicle operators should have limited access. Trails should be non-motorized.
- I did not respond to "e" and "g" above because the ramifications of these vision statements are not clear to me. As a hiker, I really do not want to share hiking trails with motorized vehicles. I am not a hunter, but I don't object to hunting. I would like, however, to know that hunting seasons are well publicized and posted, so that, as a hiker, I will know to avoid trails during hunting seasons. I also find hiking on trails shared with equestrians objectionable as horse manure both detracts from the aesthetics of the forest and creates trail hazards.

Traditional/Other Economic Activities

a) The PNF continues to support a range of activities beyond recreation that directly contribute to local economies.

- Need to focus on trails and forest balance.
- Ranching and logging and outfitting.
- That do no harm.
- Don't Know.
- Activities like what?
- Such as?
- So important to ranchers.
- ? Like what?
- Don't know.
- In order to agree, I need to know more about the range of activities.
- Yes, PNF manages our National Forest for the Public good
- I don't know whether these statements are true or not. Not publicized in a way that makes me aware.
- Not so sure: WHAT other activities, is there potential for harm to our forests therefrom?
- I sure hope this means continued cattle grazing. Remember before early Europeans killed all the Bison, these lands were over grazed from time to time from the enormous herds that roamed these lands. We now have to substitute this herbivory with an alternative, I say cattle fit the bill. Eat Beef!
- Just what are you actually saying?
- Always to maintain the quality of life.
- I have no idea what "a" means. It is written too vaguely for me to agree or disagree.
- There is no requirement existing that directs a national forest to "pay for itself" through commercial activities. Conservation of wildlife and habitat should be the top priority on the forest at all times.

b) Grazing allotments are managed in a progressive and adaptive manner that promotes healthy and productive grasslands and watersheds and supports ranch families who are stewards of the land, representing an important part of our local history and culture.

- Don't know.
- Again, wildlife and habitat should be given top priority within any given Allotment Management Plan.
- Don't think this is possible to achieve.

- For the most part ranchers are grazing properly; this is not to say that some improvement is needed in some areas.
- Only those families who are good land stewards will receive public support.
- But how do you educate for "progressive and adaptive"?
- Thank you so much; so important to America.
- Very important- managed grazing prevents blazing.
- Not always.
- Not nearly enough.
- Grazing management still allows for much ecosystem disruption.
- Unfortunately the grazing of cattle is not now done responsibly. In most back country areas that I visit there is considerable over grazing and vast destruction of riparian areas. I believe that most allotments should be cancelled or more strictly controlled.
- Ranchers who limit or stop Public access to Public lands should not have low-cost grazing leases
- The meaning for this changes depending on the context/folks in power.
- Define progressive and adaptive.
- Unfortunately, many of the general public don't respect the ranchers' part. As a result, there are accesses such as deeded land that are being locked up, because the ranchers are tired of the abuse.
- To item b add economic benefit statement. Arizona has always been founded on the five C's: Copper, Cotton, Cattle, Citrus, and Climate. Cattle, copper and climate (recreation) dominate in the PNF.
- They are certainly progressive in scope. I am not against ranchers, but they make most of their living off of so called private lands which they close to everyone else.
- Good ranchers are good stewards!
- Regarding "b" as is evidenced by the poor conditions of many allotments on the Prescott, they are not being good stewards. The vision should be that grazing is only allowed where it has been determined to be suitable and where it is sustainable relative to the needs of wildlife.
- I think some grazing is overdone, and actually damages the natural land. Cows are messy and not good for the environment. It should be looked at carefully, and not just allowed as it has for years without much management.
- Has anyone checked how much a rancher pays when leasing from a private source? It is much more than governmental agencies charge.
- I believe the ranchers are slowly getting pushed out for a number of reasons. Grazing rites and herd count is part of it.
- The PNF does not take adequate measures to ensure that grazing allotment boundaries are adhered to by permittees, nor to maintain physical boundaries such as damaged fences (or to require their maintenance by permittees). This is a problem that can easily be observed on the Verde River in places where the PNF has jurisdiction. The ranchers are not being stewards of our public land and will create problems for their own future generations of ranchers, as well as for everyone else that would like to enjoy public lands as a part of our local history and culture.
- We must turn our heads towards the negative impact grazing is having on our land. I in no way wish to express disrespect for the deep history of ranching in our area, but new methods must be sought out. My main worry is with the exceptional amount of invasive species that the cattle deposit wherever they go, especially with the correlation of cattle and invasives colonizing after fire. With more fire we're looking at more invasives brought on by cattle as shown in some studies on the Kaibab. The list goes on, we need cooperation between the forest, the community and the ranchers. I do believe it is possible to have a healthy forest with grazing though.
- Ranchers are stewards to and for the land--they create water availability via tanks, and more
- Perhaps range land management is changing, but I see lot of evidence of abuses from the past. I am in favor of retaining our western legacy of ranching, but I am hopeful that this can be done in a sustainable way.
- I personally do not have a forest allotment for our ranch but continue to hear horror stories from neighboring ranchers that do have forest allotments. They continue to have their AUM's cut unnecessarily because of the environmentalists persuasion of the forest service. This action of decreasing AUM's for the ranching families is helping to put them out of business and shortly AZ will lose the majority of it's ranching heritage because of it.
- Grazing and other economic activities must not be done at the expense of the integrity of the land.
- Recreation takes precedence to Grazing allotments. This should not be.
- Livestock grazing in the semi-arid central Arizona ecosystems of the PNF is rarely sustainable as practiced. Furthermore, many livestock permittees are wealthy businessmen, and do not support their families on livestock ranching. The question is really one of support of a lifestyle, rather than an economic boom. I'm not personally interested in perpetuating the myth of the American cowboy when it has a negative consequence on the ecological condition of public lands. I think resource conditions should dictate where and if livestock grazing should be permitted on the PNF. Grazing needs to be managed from the standpoint of charging the actual costs of providing grazing and not subsidizing the use on federal lands.
- Keeping grazing is important. With proper planning and implementation, many activities can take place on the land without user conflict or damage to the land.
- I do not think the ranchers should be allowed to keep people off the land because they have grazing allotments.
- I believe that grazing privileges are regarded as sacrosanct and subsidized by the general public through abysmally low grazing fees. The livestock industry destroys native vegetation and pollutes local watersheds.
- Ranchers have an essential role to play in managing the forest; I'm not opposed to ranching. However, ranchers need assistance and guidance to use the land sustainably. Grasslands are in very bad shape now after decades of overuse.
- Are you nuts? Do you read the studies about the effect of cows on vegetation, air, ground water? I can't even believe that cattle would be an option in the soon destroyed forest. You lost me on that one! What's left of this forest after sand and gravel extraction and all the other abuses it's endured should be protected from interests who see it as a money maker for any reason.
- I am very concerned about grazing on public lands.
- Grazing should not be allowed, there's no benefit to anyone besides the rancher. It's ridiculous to hike in a supposed "wild area" to find dozens of cattle pushing out the native wildlife and disgusting cow pies everywhere, fouling the water and completely negating the entire outdoor experience. It's such a backwards and wasteful way to use the public lands.
- I advocate a limitation on grazing allotments to promote wildlife and natural forestation. I support a "heartland" of natural ungrazed, unharvested, unmotorized wilderness that allows for the natural development of wildlife populations.
- grazing is destroying the environment
- I DO support ranching, but have seen instances where I believe ranchers have deliberately made access to public domain (NOT PRIVATE) grazing lands very difficult. This bears watching, and there should be an easy way for other users to check on the legitimacy of such obstructions.
- While these sound good, the devil will be in the details. To date PNF staff have not promoted/insisted on managing grazing allotments in a progressive adaptive manner that promotes healthy and productive grasslands and watersheds. While some ranch families have been responsible stewards of the land that, unfortunately, cannot be said of all ranchers. "minimize' forest damage" is open to a wide range of interpretation. Protecting the health and sustainability of our forests (nationwide) is vital to our very survival!

c) All other economic activities are managed to minimize forest damage while promoting healthy ecosystems and public safety.

- Don't know
- With care all economic uses can be allowed but not on all landscapes; some areas are not suitable for some types of use.
- Need to monitor cutting wood more closely.
- Managed to prevent forest damage...activities resulting in damage will be mitigated.
- Forest health over economic gain.
- ?
- Stop building homes here!
- Not enough.
- I think this is a good vision considering there are always emerging technologies. The scenario I think could have the most impact on wildlife and the human environment is the day when personal flying vehicles become available. There are already ultralight planes that can go as slow as 25mph. Sorry if this sounds kooky, but failure to consider future events could limit the ability to deal with them.
- Define forest damage. Is selective logging damaging or is it promoting healthy ecosystems?
- Who decides what is un-recoverable damage and what is not.
- "Managed to minimize"--? Activities allowable only so long as there is frequent oversight and control, such that any incipient damage receives immediate review, and cessation of incompatible/damaging ones.
- see my previous comments.
- I don't know whether these statements are true or not. Not publicized in a way that makes me aware.
- Lets be smart about our resources. If the budget bean counters and taxpayers are not willing to fund the management necessary to facilitate a healthy National Forest system then some resources must be sold to supplement the cost of management, smartly.
- I don't see how you can call this management! Large commercial mines & ranchers can pollute with impunity and you want to charge a rockhound \$40 for stopping to look at or pick up a rock!
- Extractive industries must not damage the ecosystem.
- I would agree with "c" if you left out the word "other".
- It is hard to disagree with a statement that "economic activities are managed to minimize forest damage while promoting healthy ecosystems". Yet it is difficult to manage conventional economic activities to minimize forest damage. Logging, for example, has created the dense thickets of trees and wildfire problems that we see today. I think that "all other economic activities" should be regularly disclosed to and reviewed by scientists and the community to make sure they are "promoting healthy ecosystems". I think that small-scale ranching is appropriate, but often what is described as "sustainable ranching" has little scientific basis. The ranching question requires more information, for example, are private interests being subsidized to use public land?

Vision Statement Nonspecific/General

- My friends and family have concerns regarding the mining of flagstone in the Drake area. It is making huge scars on the sides of hills and mountains.
- Too much emphasis is placed on commercial extraction on our public lands. This isn't the Wild West anymore. We should preserve these places for the ecosystem and soul-satisfying restorative values they offer to everyone.
- New mining activities should either be prohibited or very restricted.
- Miners and gold panners destroy National Forest areas and walk away with old growth tree roots exposed at their hands etc. Cattle grazing has been continued on grasslands until there is nothing but dirt and the pronghorn populations have starved to death during the past 5 years and other drought years before that. This is not my vision of good use of National Forest land.
- The logging I have seen has devastated some areas. One the other hand, carefully managed cattle grazing and saving the "cowboy way of life" seems important to me.
- I believe that we should be logging parts of our forest to maintain a balance of trees of all ages and sizes. They are overgrown and unhealthy in many areas.
- This all sounds very progressive, but the NFS staff needs training and re-education to intelligently implement these visions. I have encountered several managers and many staff with their heads firmly stuck in cowboy mode.
- Loosing pronghorn habitat rapidly, possible expansion of forest into grasslands to maintain some habitat for pronghorn without fencing
- There is too much gun shooting in the forest and too close to homes.
- Shooting of firearms near housing should be prohibited.
- Forest harvesting has too much of a damaging impact on the forest floor caused by the heavy equipment operating without enough concern for erosion in many areas.
- Mountain bike races have been banned from certain areas of the forest because other user groups have complained about the one day per year event. Mountain bikers spend hours upon hours doing trail maintenance. When the trails are muddy, the mountain bikers, for the most part, stay off the trails however; horse rides are out there damaging the trails.
- What is this PNF - you will get my disagreement if you don't explain!
- Please include invasive species somewhere in the vision - it is critically important.
- Again, a), b), c) are goals.
- I think the PNF does a pretty reasonable job in most areas.
- ALWAYS room for improvement.
- Always a need for more people and funds.
- I have witnessed quite a few acts of "terrorism" by thoughtless and even menacing ORV users on our forest lands. It is not possible to enforce the law with all of these users. Access needs to be cut back for these folks if we hope to keep our forests intact.
- Grazing should not be permitted in these forests. They are too sensitive, especially now in the drought. What does "managed" mean in regard the economic activities? If it means "controlled" or not allowed to over-impact the forest, fine. If it means little oversight, not fine! For instance, a birding group can go look for birds. But 150 birding groups in the same area could really impact the area! ORV use, especially, would be harmful anywhere in the forest.
- Any and all uses should do no harm and not degrade the ability of the system to remain healthy into future generations. Climate change must be factored when considering carrying capacity.
- Again, almost every question in this survey is either too vague, or too contradictory to agree or disagree with strongly. Almost every question represents a compromise. While I can agree that grazing allotments should be managed to promote ecosystem health, I can't agree that ranch families represent an important part of our local history and culture. For the most part, grazing on southwestern forests is incompatible with forest health.
- Unfortunately, much of the PNF is not managed in a manner that protects the resources.
- Other activities such as ranching, logging, and mining should not be subsidized with low fees, road building, etc. unless they are the very best way of sustaining the forest. Subsidizing to sustain an uneconomical way of life or to remove un-replaceable resources should be minimized.
- I have very limited knowledge of these things.

Community Involvement and Partnerships

a) We envision a forest where adequate law enforcement is complemented by scores of community volunteers involved in stewardship of its resources and users.

- I'm a backcountry horseman volunteer and member.
- Need more volunteers who are empowered.
- More enforcement needed.
- This is fine but FS must provide law enforcement training to keep the volunteers and public safe.
- With adequate law enforcement - unsure about volunteers.
- Need more enforcement!
- nice dream; the PNF only has a couple of LE where response is often non-existent due to work load
- will not work unless the community volunteers are allowed to carry firearms, the second you approach a "rebel" who is on the wrong trail or is trespassing with his quad in an unmotorized area and have no way to defend yourself you are putting your life in danger. I live this every day on our ranch!
- More effort needs to be made to protect vandalism of our forest through illegal poaching of Monarch Alligator Juniper and other varieties of trees that are protected by the Forest Service laws that apply to the cutting of wood.
- I believe it would be dangerous to have private individuals enforcing the rules. I have seen a number of instances where ATV's and 4-wd vehicles were out of bounds and they were aware of it and did not care nor were they going to let anyone tell them what they could or could not do.
- What you are saying is that you want to turn enforcement over to special interest groups so they may promote their own interests!
- It seems the more that economic responsibility for processes that ultimately are dependent on land management agency decisions is taken over by citizen groups, the less money the agency receives in its ongoing budgetary processes. It is important that the land management agencies receive adequate funding to fully staff local offices on each forest.
- Law Enforcement should be done only by "the Pro's".

b) Vibrant partnerships with emerging or established community groups enhance the Forest Service's ability to provide services, enabling a large group of citizen volunteers to respond to the needs of the forest, including trail maintenance, user education and fire prevention.

- Trail construction with the FS help and blessing/oversight.
- ESSENTIAL!
- Yes back in the 1940's and 50's the FS paid part-time helpers to do this! We even put out forest fires and still do.
- Wow! Long-term volunteer involvement!
- Educational use by accredited schools, colleges, and universities that focus on ecology and conservation education that align with the mission of the U. S. Forest Service should be given fee waivers for educational activities and when service projects are included, be given Day Use Fee waivers for families of participants. Appropriate volunteer service should be recognized by the Forest Service and the encouragement of stewardship in maintaining the quality of our Forests.
- This is another nice campaign slogan that has absolutely no basis in reality!

c) Citizens widely hold a land ethic supported by all and taught to all newcomers to the area.

- I wish.
- Need to always continue.
- Not sure.
- Education very important. If you do not know your forest, you are not cannot love it, care for it.
- Ethics by all. Good effort.
- So important.
- could be better.
- We need more.
- Yes and no - there are individual groups, but not enough full community support.
- Land ethics vary widely.
- There is a lot of people who don't care.
- We wish!
- Yes, get the word to ATV dealers!
- Define land ethic.
- Reflect my view that there are too many people who have no clue how about land ethic.
- The amount of trash and bullit ridden objects you see in different areas would not support this ideal.
- This would be great, but I do not see it as currently true.
- Too many people are trashing the land, and have no respect for it. I run into ranchers while I'm out riding - they have started locking off portions of their land because of the abuse to it.
- You will always have a "redneck" element, poorly educated and ignorant, who will never rise to the level of appreciation in the vision statement. How is the redneck element to be dealt with in the plan?
- Unfortunately there are some citizens who have very little respect for land ethic and are thoughtless, uncivil and at time dangerous.
- Great ideals, but unfortunately not observed by enough of the local citizenry.

- Yeah! Who and where are they? The only thing being taught is that miners and ranchers control all the land.
- The land ethic frequently gets trampled by economic interests - greed! The land is a basic part of our community, probably the basis.
- It would be ideal if all citizens had the same land ethic, but that is not the case. Some see the land as something to be used to its fullest extent thinking only of the here and now, others believe they have an obligation to future generations. Those two land ethics cannot coexist.
- Not sure this is a given.

d) This educated, engaged citizenry – through a multi-interest non-profit and/or stewardship group - actively participates in ongoing collaborative processes of forest planning that ensures that the Prescott National Forest will be enjoyed by more generations to come.

- Good to hope for.
 - Need more education and participation.
 - I'm willing to do more.
 - Important.
 - More outreach to schools and public education.
 - I would like this to happen in the future.
 - I wish it was like that.
 - Yes!! we all need to help!
 - As long as all groups are equally represented and no one or two can over ride another's interests.
 - Sounds like narrow-viewed special interest groups will have a significant impact on our Public lands. Sorry for my pessimistic view of your Vision.
- Overall, the intent is good but I do not trust special interest groups who often take away from general everyday users to develop their dream.
- Keeping in mind some of the groups has their own agenda
 - We get too many newcomers here who never go to the forest. Their greatest participation is looking outside through windows. I don't think they care much or are engaged much in the forest.
 - Great ideals, but unfortunately not observed by enough of the local citizenry.
 - Depends on how "educated" is defined.
 - Under this group (which appears to be non-existent) there will be no public forest for the next generation!
 - This is a good effort, but good dialog must be ongoing!

Vision Statement Nonspecific/General

- I would want to see a strong volunteer program for OHV, such as trail maintenance, sign replacement and education.
- Citizens should be more involved, BUT the agencies have the responsibility to do their job and protect and manage these lands. The agencies are part of the public's trust in this equation, and thanks to the ridiculous federal funding situation, they can't do their jobs as well as they should. I don't think the answer is giving up on that, though. The answer is to increase the funding through citizen and agency pressure on the higher-ups (executive branch and Congress) who hold the purse strings.
- Who decided which organizations would comprise the visioning group? It would appear that a large portion of non-motorized users were excluded (Yavapai Trails Association who have been in existence for 20 years and been very active with the FS). Also horse organizations such as Prescott Saddle Club and Granite Mountain Riders who were organized trail users long before the existence of most other groups. PSC members used the trails when there were no mountain bikes or ATVs and they have always been forest advocates.
- I don't believe you can get to all newcomers. I have seen so much disregard for grazing land with off road vehicles it is sad. I believe many folks have no idea how long it takes for veg. to grow back.
- Strongly agree
- Currently I feel that we are severely lacking in a land ethic, and it will only come through rigorous education projects brought out by groups in the community aligned with the PNF. I wish to see the possibility of a community based land ethic with deep roots in our National Forest grow over the years, but we must work at it.
- The most dangerous activity practiced by newcomers is the day hike. Many are killed by their ignorance of forest conditions. They need to be educated before they step into the forest.
- I do not believe that our citizenry currently has a good land ethic. Campfires are abandoned, litter is evident everywhere, illegals use remote parts as their garden and some users still travel cross country. If the public can be educated that would be great but many people come from the valley and trash our northern forests.
- There are limits to what the citizens can contribute. Their intentions are good and education can add sophistication to their interest and ability to productively help out. However, I disagree with the economically attractive option of promoting citizen volunteer in substitution for true professional who have a deeper understanding of problems and therefore a more creative vision of solutions.
- Law enforcement by volunteers is acceptable if individuals are properly trained. Quite a few people are not aware of what "Ethic" let alone "Land Ethic" again qualified people to enforce the law.
- I do not support Forest Service use of volunteers to patrol or maintain a "presence" in the forest. Most citizens (new) do not hold a land vision, nor are they willing to become educated. Want to "do it the way we did in _____" Most are neither educated or engaged.
- The Prescott NF does a poor job of communicating and involving the community. The information they have available is misleading and in some cases is wrong. Law enforcement and management of the Forest needs to be done by Federal employees and not volunteers. There is not adequate LE. There is a role and place for volunteers, but it should not in place of permanent employees. There are a number of user groups that do not support good land ethics and adversely affect uses in the Forest.
- Request 4 wheel drive groups help with trail maintenance and clean up, often they are very willing and have equipment which is helpful.
- From first hand knowledge the citizenry is becoming more obnoxious. They know they are to stay on existing roads and they don't. They know they should be aware of their surroundings when shooting and they don't. They should have respect for a rancher's livestock and water tanks and windmills and they don't. and these are some educated people. I have personally had the misfortune to speak with a great number of them..
- It is very important to get our community involved.
- In a fantasy world, community volunteers would be scampering through the woods ensuring it remain a beautiful place. The reality is that habitat damage from illegal OHV activity, illegal littering/dumping, vandalism and numerous other destructive activities are increasing in our area. I truly believe that only frequent Law Enforcement presence will deter this behavior.
- I moved hear 14 yrs ago. And one of the biggest reasons I did was because of access of the forest and areas to mtn bike , dirt bike , 4x4ing, hunting, camping, etc. Since then I have seen quite a few roads get blocked by boulders especially in the thumb butt area. I cant tell you how many complaints I have gotten about this in my bicycle shop here in PV. We thought it was a temp thing for logging the dead trees but there still closed. This very thing started in CA where I used to live thats a big reason I left there. The way things are going here with the blocking of access I bet ill probably move somewhere else in the next 5 years. If we don't use a trail enough they grow over and we spend \$ cutting them wider? I feel if some trails are growing over why not open them up to OHV's Quads, motorized bikes for a period of time till the trail is widened and then change it back to hiking biking etc. Just

an idea. Also its getting much more difficult to find places to do some serious 4x4ing, more along the rock crawling style. These vehicles go very slow there is nothing fast about this sport LOL. I feel places like alto pit should be open to this sport. It has grown in leaps and bounds in the last 5 years and since the local Prescott road closers we have to go to cordes junction for the nearest place to do this. We gas there, eat there, etc. This is \$ that could be going to Prescott instead. Also these groups are excellent in organizing clean up's of areas that suffer from dumping.

- This is extremely dangerous to economic use. Mob rule? What is a land ethic? Who is a newcomer? Why don't they have a land ethic, but vibrant groups who want to indoctrinate newcomers do? This section is poppycock new age socialistic community-speak. You should have said "it takes a village" to manage the sweet forest. What do the 400+ employees of PNF do? When I was growing up, if I remember correctly, there was a ranger in the Verde Valley and two on the Prescott side and a secretary. What's going on?

- We can do it!

- I am originally from the Tijuana Estuary state park area of San Diego. A place I grew up riding my horses. Because of lack of funds there are MAU - mounted assistance groups throughout California, which patrol the park system. There are a lot of places you can go on horseback and see what is going on and make almost no noise. One time I was trail riding alone and come upon a guy about to rape a woman, luckily many people have a fear of horses as he was armed and I was not. I put the woman on my horse to calm her down and get her mind to something else, (this was before cell phones) and took her back to my ranch. He was confident about his surroundings as it was remote and didn't expect company. This is the difference riders can make. Plus in the estuary there is a bird (lease belvario - not sure of spelling?) which was starting to come back to the area. Only place on the US side of border, one nest of which the birds decided to take residence next to an established horse trail. There are a number of rare birds there that some of which it is there only nesting area in the world. Most riders are animal lovers so our concern for our environment is to our benefit and runs deep.

- Community involvement is very important such as volunteers (which we have many).

- The Highlands Ctr. does a wonderful job at teaching all about our nature areas.

- People do not understand State Land use

- Most citizens not that well educated.

- All user groups are not actively listened too for comments.

- It's difficult to hear of PNF planning events, and I believe that if the word got out more, in mainstream media sources, more people would become involved.

- For the most part, I think this is true, but there are still a large number of people who think that a 4-wheel drive truck and a couple of 12 packs is the best use of National Forest land. We need to do a lot to educate the public starting with school age children. There are a lot of local organizations like Yavapai Trails Association and Prescott Cycling Club who address these educational issues with their membership.

- Volunteers should NOT be involved in "policing" of users. Their "stewardship" is valuable, but should be limited to helping maintain and improve "resources". And, reporting of any misuse to the "authorities" is fine.

- Let's not forget that the Forest needs to provide motivated, educated rangers in numbers high enough that the public using the forest are in contact no matter where they decide to use the forest.

- I think there needs to be more funding for increased numbers of Rangers. Maybe a ration of rangers to users.

- I am willing to help on volunteer to help keep the trails clean of trash if i can do in on my ATV being that I am handicapped

- There are examples of community efforts elsewhere. Let's do our best to promote generosity, cooperation, respect and biodiversity. For once let's look at nature and the topsoil that sustains us all in a new way - not as something for us to harness and manipulate for our own pleasure or money.

- Rather than this increased reliance on community volunteers, I'd prefer better funding of the Forest Service so the Service can pay for requisite law enforcement, trail maintenance, etc. (The tax dollars are there -- how 'bout shifting Defense dollars to life-giving agencies?)

- Nice vision, but the word "scores" does not adequately describe the low number of volunteers that are actually out there helping.

- Newcomers really don't have a clue about how to care for our forests. Many people come up from Phoenix, either to live in the National Forest (because it's cooler) or to visit. These people bring with them only the knowledge they have of living in the city. They are quite clueless about fire danger, forest health, and ORV damage. We do not have the means set in place--or signage, even--to educate them.

- This is an idealistic vision, and one that I share. I caution, however, that this kind of collaborative effort will require LOTS of monitoring to make sure all parties keep their promises!

- Great vision and goals!

- Please consider a stronger role for wilderness in this plan. To me, there is a difference between a "forest" and a "recreational area". I hope that through this plan the Prescott National Forest will remain a "forest".

- I don't know what any of this means.

- The key is a sustainable forest for generations to come.

- Doubtful that the general "citizenry" possess this ethic. Maybe with a lot of education this may happen far into the future.

- Do citizens "Hold a land ethic supported by all?" It's a great vision, but I think that they need to be educated to really understand their impacts on the land.

- In reference to a) above, I would not support community volunteers in the form of vigilante groups like the Minutemen along the border who might be involved in "stewardship of users".

- There are far too many groups who love to control everything and enforce their particular vision of the national forest. These groups want to control everything. Good examples are the elitist "fly fishing only" waters of several states, closing traditional trails to motor vehicles, closing campgrounds, closing shooting ranges and other such maneuvers by those who would deny use of the forest to those who do not share their particular "vision."

Sponsors: Arizona Off Highway Vehicle Coalition; Arizona Wilderness Coalition; Back Country Horsemen; City of Prescott Parks and Recreation Trails Program; Hyde Mountain Vista Group; Open Space Alliance of Central Yavapai County; Prescott Open Trails Association; Prescott Area Wildland-Urban Interface Commission; Yavapai Cattle Growers Association, Arizona Trail Riders