

***Analysis of the Public Comments Submitted to the Colorado Roadless
Areas Review Task Force between September 2005 and June 30, 2006***

***Prepared by Mondo Business Group, Ltd.
July 18, 2006***



Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
General Summary of all Comments Submitted Before June 30, 2006	Page 1
Figure 1. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.	Page 2
Figure 2. Summary of public comments specific to Colorado's National forests generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.	Page 3
Figure 3. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by the home county and city of the commenter, and support for or against continued roadless area (RA) protection.	Page 4
Figure 4. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by gender.	Page 7
Figure 5. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by specificity of comment.	Page 7
Summary of Mass Submissions	Page 7
Summary of Local Government and Organizational Comments	Page 8
Figure 6. A summary of known local government opinion on the roadless issue generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.	Page 9
Figure 7. A summary of known organizational opinions on the roadless issue generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.	Page 10
Forest-Specific Summaries	Page 13
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest	Page 13
Pike-San Isabel National Forest	Page 16
San Juan National Forest	Page 19
Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest	Page 22
White River National Forest	Page 25

Routt National Forest	Page 28
Rio Grande National Forest	Page 31
Manti-La Sal National Forest	Page 34
Summary of Public Comments in Support of or in Opposition to Continued Roadless Area Protection by Forest and Statewide	Page 35
Summary of Forest-Specific Comments by Topic	Page 37
A. Energy	Page 37
B. Wildlife/Habitat	Page 38
C. Water	Page 39
D. Economic Values	Page 39
E. Quality of Life	Page 40
F. Motorized Recreation	Page 41
G. Grazing	Page 43
H. Commercial Timber	Page 43
I. Wildfire	Page 44
J. Environment/Natural Landscape	Page 44
About the Preparer	Page 46

Introduction

Colorado's Forest Legacy hired Mondo Business Group, Ltd., a Denver-based consulting company, to compile a summary of the public comments submitted to the Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force between September 2005 and June 30, 2006. To date, there have been public meetings held by the Task Force in Delta, Durango, Pueblo, Denver, Fort Collins, Steamboat Springs, Monte Vista, Glenwood Springs, and Grand Junction where both oral and written comments were collected. In addition, the public has submitted written comments via email, mail, or a web form to the Task Force. Commenters can provide input generally on the issue, or provide a specific comment about a National Forest or Roadless Area.

This summary was generated from all of the written comments submitted to the Task Force via the Colorado Department of Natural Resources between September 2005 and June 30, 2006. This summary does not reflect the comments submitted either orally or in writing by invited testifiers at the public meetings. In addition, we have provided a separate summary of mass submissions of identical text such as postcards, petitions, or form letters submitted in one package, but have not included these comments in the specific geographic, topical, or forest-specific summaries.

The Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force was created by the Colorado Assembly in Senate Bill 243 in 2005. The legislature directed the Task Force to hold a minimum of 8 public meetings, one in each National Forest and one in Denver, as well as accept and consider written public comments in order to develop recommendations on the management of National Forest roadless areas for the Governor's consideration in the fall of 2006.

General Summary of Comments Submitted Between September 2005 and June 30, 2006

From data gathered, 4,904 people took the time to submit written comments; either at a public meeting or through the web, email, or postal mail, addressing the roadless issue and particular areas of the National Forest they felt warranted comment. There were 4,412 specific comments, which we broke down into a number of categories, including county, city, gender, specific roadless area, specific National Forest, and topic. Not all of the comments made specific recommendations for or against roadless area protection.

Three thousand three hundred and twenty one (91 percent) commenters specifically called for continued protection of roadless areas, while 345 (9 percent) commenters indicated that they generally were against the continuation of the roadless area protections. This average percentage breakdown is generally consistent across the seven Colorado National Forests (see chart on page 5). Many of the written comments under this particular category felt the whole process was misleading and deceiving in designating areas as roadless when many who visit these areas know that some sort of road does exist.

The motorized recreation comments (116) indicated that there is a need for more off-road vehicle access. They also commented (64) specifically for more equal access on public lands, in particular for the elderly and handicapped, and those who could not afford high prices of organized hunting trips and outfitter guides.

Many commenters (248) responded that adequate roads already existed for recreational activity. They stated that while there are many motorized vehicle users that respect the land by maintaining trails, they felt that the whole off-road vehicle group would have to be more

rigorously managed if they could not convince other motorized people to behave respectfully (50 people specifically commented on this).

With respect to the environment and natural landscape, the overwhelming response was that adequate roads already exist and we need to keep roadless areas in their more natural state (353). In addition, there were many commenters (539) that fear damage to roadless areas will be irreversible, are concerned by the effects we have on Colorado’s natural landscapes, and want to preserve roadless areas for future generations.

In terms of wildlife, public response was mostly against the creation of more roads to access wildlife (330). There were a few comments (15) that motorized vehicles were not a threat to elk habitat, and in fact the herds are larger than ever; some were concerned that hunters without motorized access to back roads would no longer be able to hunt, hurting local economies. In contrast, many feared (386) that more roads to access wildlife will create even more impact on the terrain, migration activity, wildlife viability, habitat fragmentation, introduction of noxious weeds, migratory corridors and movement of big game from public to private lands.

While many may disagree with various methods of developing water, no one disagrees with the importance of protecting all sources of Colorado’s water and watersheds. In fact, 340 comments indicated there were adequate roads already in existence and that more roads would harm water resources and quality. A few also feared these resources were being harmed by air pollutants, sediments in stream channels from mining, logging, erosion caused by motorized vehicles, and the competition for water sources from oil and gas (13 people specifically mentioned this concern).

Many believe that the forest could be managed to preserve the integrity of the land, and they encouraged the continuation of public involvement, as well as cooperation with industry, recreational associations, environmental organizations, ranchers and the Forest Service/BLM.

Three hundred and fifty four (354) people asked why we are not upholding the protections granted by the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule under the Clinton Administration. They also questioned why we were all going through this again and indicated “comment fatigue.”

As one person commented, “it is not always about human use and what is best for us. Forest health and maintenance is the true job of the land steward and we owe it to the forest to make the best decisions for the forest itself.” (Polly Huck, Crested Butte)

Figure 1. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.

Comment Type	Number of Comments Submitted by Specific Dates and in Total			
	Feb. 3, 2006	March 17, 2006	June 30, 2006	Total
Colorado oral comments ¹	172	72	175	419
Colorado written comments				
Electronic (e-mail)	269	59	916	1,244
Comment Form (DNR)	174	139	339	652
Form letter	13	69	442	524
Personalized letters	99	152	1,741	1,992
Out of state comments	22	25	201	248
Total	749	516	3,639	5,079

¹ We were unable to break down these comments by city and county in the summary charts in subsequent pages.

Figure 2. Summary of public comments specific to Colorado's national forests generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.

National Forest	Comments supporting future roadless area protection		Comments generally opposing future roadless area protection	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Arapaho-Roosevelt NF	172	98%	4	2%
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison NF	352	98%	98	2%
Manti-La Sal NF	30	73%	11	27%
Pike-San Isabel NF	131	98%	35	2%
Rio Grande NF	10	91%	1	9%
Routt NF	262	91%	25	9%
San Juan NF	220	94%	13	6%
White River NF	104	96%	4	4%

Figure 3. Summary of all Colorado public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by the home county and city of the commenter, and support for or against continued roadless area (RA) protection.

County	Total Comments	Comments Generally Supporting RA Protection	Comments Generally Against RA Protection	County	Total Comments	Comments Generally Support RA Protection	Comments Generally Against RA Protection
Adams County	45	42	3	Lake County	6	6	0
Aurora		16	0	Leadville		6	0
Commerce City		0	1	Larimer County	222	217	5
Henderson		1	0	Bellvue		1	0
Northglenn		3	1	Berthoud		3	0
Thornton		22	1	Erie		1	0
Alamosa County	7	7	0	Estes Park		8	0
Alamosa		6	0	Fort Collins		147	3
Mosca		1	0	Jamestown		1	0
Archuleta County	14			Laporte		4	0
Arboles		2	1	Livermore		1	0
Pagosa Springs		11	0	Loveland		48	0
Arapahoe County	145	140	5	Red Feather Lake		1	0
Centennial		40	2	Wellington		1	1
Englewood		8	0	Windsor		1	1
Greenwood Village		6	0	Las Animas County	1	1	0
Highlands Ranch		22	1	Trinidad		1	0
Littleton		61	2	Lincoln County	1	1	0
Lone Tree		3	0	Limon		1	0
Archuleta County	11	11	0	Logan County	1	1	0
Pagosa Springs		11	0	Merino		1	0
Boulder County	518	513	5	Mesa County	215	141	74
Allens Park		3	0	Clifton		1	5
Boulder		375	3	Colbran		1	1
Eldorado Springs		5	0	Fruita		4	1
Lafayette		12	1	Glade Park		0	1
Longmont		70	1	Grand Junction		127	55
Louisville		13	0	Loma		2	4
Lyons		15	0	Mesa		1	0
Nederland		11	0	Palisade		4	6
Niwot		6	0	Whitewater		1	1
Superior		3	0	Mineral County	4	4	0
Broomfield County	20	16	4	Creede		4	0
Broomfield		16	4	Moffat County	12	10	2
Chafee County	13	13	0	Craig		8	2
Buena Vista		2	0	Meeker		2	0

Nathrop	2	0	Montezuma County	74	53	21
Poncha Springs	1	0	Cortez		5	2
Salida	8	0	Dolores		6	0
Clear Creek County	2	2	0	Mancos	14	0
Idaho Springs	1	0	Montrose	26	17	
Rollinsville	1	0	Olathe	2	2	
Conejos County	1	1	0	Morgan County	2	2
La Jara	1	0	Fort Morgan	2	0	
Costilla County	3	3	0	Ouray County	14	14
Fort Garland	3	0	Ouray	1	0	
Crowley County	1	0	1	Ridgway	13	0
Olney Springs	0	1	Park County	1	1	
Custer County	5	5	0	Shawnee	1	0
Westcliffe	3	0	Pitkin County	166	166	
Wetmore	2	0	Aspen	61	0	
Dolores County	3	2	1	Basalt	15	0
Rico	2	1	Carbondale	59	0	
Delta County	145	98	47	El Jebel	3	0
Austin	1	2	Redstone	3	0	
Cedaredge	8	5	Snowmass	25	0	
Crawford	7	3	Prowers County	2	1	
Delta	45	10	Lamar	1	1	
Eckert	3	1	Pueblo County	41	32	
Hodgekiss	5	0	Beulah	3	1	
Paonia	29	26	Pueblo	26	7	
Denver County	240	233	7	Rye	3	1
Denver	233	7	3	Rio Blanco County	1	1
Douglas County	28	25	3	Rangely	1	0
Castle Rock	6	1	Rio Grande County	11	8	
Franktown	5	1	Del Norte	5	0	
Larkspur	2	0	Monte Vista	2	0	
Palmer Lake	1	0	South Fork	1	3	
Parker	11	1	Routt County	242	223	
Eagle County	79	79	0	Clark	1	0
Avon	19	0	Hayden	2	0	
Eagle	2	0	Oak Creek	6	3	
Edwards	1	0	Phippsburg	0	1	
Vail	57	0	Steamboat Springs	212	13	
El Paso County	434	414	20	Yampa	2	2
Colorado Springs	408	15	Saguache County	4	4	
Falcon	1	0	Crestone	1	0	
Manitou Springs	3	3	Moffat	1	0	
Monument	1	0	Saguache	2	0	
Peyton	1	0	San Miguel County	55	55	
Rock Creek Mesa		2	Mountain Village	1	0	
Elbert County	2	2	0			
Agate	2	0				

Fremont County	7	5	2	Norwood	9	0
Canon City		3	1	Rico	3	0
Howard		1	1	Placerville	3	0
Penrose		1	0	Telluride	39	0
Garfield County	77	74	3	San Juan County	2	0
Glenwood Springs		53	2	Silverton	2	0
New Castle		17	0			
Parachute		2	0			
Rifle		2	1			
Gilpin County	1	1	0			
				Summit County	54	0
Central City		1	0	Breckenridge	26	0
Grand County	6	5	1	Copper Mtn.	6	0
Fraser		2	1	Dillon	8	0
Granby		1	0	Frisco	6	0
Hot Sulphur Springs		1	0	Silverthorne	8	0
Kremmling		1	0	Teller County	9	3
Gunnison County	16	16	0	Divide	1	0
Crested Butte		10	0	Florissant	1	0
Gunnison		6	0	Woodland Park	4	3
Hinsdale County	1	1	0	Weld County	32	3
Lake City		1	0	Brighton	1	1
Huerfano County	2	2	0	Greeley	23	2
Walsenburg		2	0	Johnstown	2	0
Jackson County	12	6	6	Milliken	1	0
Rand		1	0	Platteville	2	0
Walden		5	6			
Jefferson County	254	196	58			
Arvada		8	4			
Bailey		3	0			
Blackhawk		1	0			
Conifer		4	1			
Edgewater		5	0			
Evergreen		33	3			
Golden		33	1			
Indian Hills		0	1			
Lakewood		72	45			
Morrison		1	0			
Wheatridge		3	2			
Westminster		33	1			
La Plata County	223	207	16			
Bayfield		18	1			
Durango		180	15			
Hermosa		1	0			
Hesperus		3	0			
Ignacio		5	0			

Figure 4. Summary of written public comments generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by gender. For some comments, gender was unknown.

	February 7 Response	March 17 Response	June 30 Response	Total
Male	405	232	1,383	2,020
Female	141	95	1,290	1,526

Figure 5. Summary of written public comments submitted between September 2005 and June 30, 2006 broken out by specificity of comment.

<u>Public Comments Focus</u>	<u>Responses 2/7</u>	<u>Responses 3/17</u>	<u>Responses 6/30</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Statewide Comments	293	227	1,921	2,441
Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest	33	55	114	202
Grand Mesa Uncompagne-Gunnison NF	250	67	136	453
Manti-La Sal National Forests	24	7	10	41
Pike-San Isabel National Forest	70	18	86	174
Rio Grande National Forest	36	9	11	56
Routt National Forest	29	12	284	325
San Juan National Forest	151	29	111	291
White River National Forest	32	24	102	158

The public on their e-mails, comment cards or letters in many cases checked numerous National Forests. A total of 1,700 responses were directed toward particular National Forests.

Summary of Mass Submittals

At various points throughout the process, a packet of identical comment forms were submitted to the Task Force for consideration. These identical comment forms were in the following formats: postcards, petitions, or identical letters submitted together. Letters that were practically identical that were submitted by individuals were not counted in this category, but instead were included in the specific comment summaries in this document.

The only analysis performed on the mass submittals was to identify whether the comment was in support of or against future protection of roadless areas. They were not broken out by location, National Forests, or gender. We have noted when it was clear which organization organized the mass submission.

Support 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Roadless areas should remain protected for future generations. Organized by Colorado Forest Legacy (www.roadless.net).

Post Cards Total 15,433

Oppose arbitrary roadless designation that disregards this nation's energy supplies. The west slope is an important energy resource needed to meet our nation's demand for domestic economical supplies of energy.

Post Cards Total 228

Keep public lands open. Areas with pre-existing old roads should not be considered roadless. Areas that are not capable and available for wilderness designation should not be included in the inventory of roadless areas. The Forest Service needs flexibility to implement management projects and timber harvest without new road construction.

Post Cards Total 122

Each roadless area should be managed under the provisions contained in each Forest Plan. OHV contribute to the maintenance of many recreation sites and infrastructure in roadless areas. Organized by the Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition.

Form Letter Total 1,926

Protect Roadless Areas in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest. Citizens to Preserve Roadless on Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest submitted 657 signatures on a petition asking for roadless land protection.

Petition signatures 657

Protect Roadless Areas because they are vital to our business. A letter signed by 131 outfitters and sent to the Task Force asking for roadless area protection.

Signatures 131

Summary of Local Government and Organizational Comments

A number of governmental entities have expressed opinions on the roadless issue since September 2005. They have done so via resolution or correspondence to the Task Force. We have, to the best of our ability, tracked these local government actions. We compiled all local government correspondences to the Task Force that were delivered to the Keystone Center. If local governments bypassed the Keystone Center and handed materials directly to the Department of Natural Resources, we did not record the information. We also have contacted local governments that we suspected were engaged in the process and asked for copies of their resolutions. We recognize that our list may be incomplete.

Colorado-based organizations submitted comments on behalf of their members or interest group. We have attempted to capture the essence of these comments that were submitted to the Task Force in written form. Similar to the situation with local government correspondence, the Keystone Center retained copies of all organizational correspondence that was sent to them. If comments were submitted directly to the Task Force, the Keystone Center did not have a copy, and hence the comment is not reflected in this summary.²

² Note that testimony provided to the Task Force members during a public meeting is not included in these summaries.

Figure 6. A summary of known local government opinion on the roadless issue expressed between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.

Government Entity	Generally in support or against roadless	Summarized comment
Aspen	For	Protect roadless designations
Basalt	For	Protect roadless designations
Bayfield, La Plata County, Durango, Ignacio, Archuleta County	For	Protect the HD Roadless Area
Boulder Board of County Commissioners (BOCC)	For	Protect roadless areas
Carbondale	For	Protect roadless designations
City of Boulder	For	Protect all roadless areas in the ARNF
City of Durango	For	Uphold 2001 roadless area conservation rule
Clear Creek County	For	Protect roadless designations
Colorado Division of Wildlife	For	Manage areas for wildlife conservation
Delta County BOCC	For	Recommend protection of GMUG 2005 roadless inventory areas minus Pilot Knob #11, Flatirons #24, and Sunset #23
Dolores	For	Protect roadless designations
Douglas County	Con	Roadless management should be decided locally; get rid of roadless rule
Eagle County	For	Protect roadless designations
Gilpin County BOCC	For	Supports roadless protection
Glenwood Springs	For	Protect roadless designations
Jackson County	Con	
La Plata County BOCC	For	Protect all roadless areas
Larimer County BOCC	For	Supportive of roadless area protection, but raised the concern of the situation where private property might require a road through a roadless areas.
Montezuma BOCC	N/A	We are working with the FS on the plan revision process
New Castle	For	Protect 2001 roadless areas
Pitkin County	For	Protect roadless designations
Rifle	For	Protect roadless designations
Rio Grande County BOCC	Con	Rescind roadless designation and make eligible fro logging, commercial purposes, motorized vehicles 6 areas (Tewksberry, Beaver Mtn, Middle Alder, Whitman For, Upper Burro, Lion Pat/Green Mtn, Alamosa River, Fox Mountain)
San Juan BOCC	N/A	Roadless areas should be managed locally. Would not support road closures. Would support temporary roads in roadless areas for legitimate mining operations
San Miguel County	For	Supports Mountains to Mesa Citizen Plan for the GMUGNF which includes full roadless area protection
Silt	For	Protect roadless designations
Snowmass Village	For	Protect roadless designations
Steamboat Springs	For	Protect roadless areas while accommodating fire needs
Summit County	For	Protect almost all IRAs minus Ryan Gulch plus additional acreage including land bridge over I-70
Telluride	For	Protect roadless designations
Town of Eagle	For	Protect all roadless areas

Figure 7. A summary of known organizational opinions on the roadless issue generated between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.

Submitter	Related to which forest	General message	Month Submitted
American Association of Professional Geologists, Colorado Section	All	Look at mineral potential/resource maps; consider that USFS can require restoration so that lands have value post mineral extraction	
Arkansas River Outfitters Association	All and PSI	Protect all roadless areas	February-06
Aspen Skiing Company's Environmental Foundation	WRNF	Protect roadless areas	May-06
Aspen Valley Land Trust	WRNF	Protect roadless areas	June-06
Audubon Society of Greater Denver	PSI	Protect roadless areas; important for habitat	January-06
Audubon Society of Greater Denver	All on Front Range	Protect all roadless areas	February-06
Blue Ribbon Coalition	All	Generally opposed	June-06
Blue River Group of the Sierra Club	WRNF	Protect Summit County roadless areas	
Boulder County Audubon Society	All	Protect roadless areas	March-06
Boulder County Nature Association	All, ARNF, WRNF	Protect roadless areas	March-06
Boulder Mountain Bike Alliance	ARNF	Protect roadless areas	March-06
Center for Energy and Economic Development	GMUG	Keep roadless lands open for coal production	March-06
Colorado Bowhunters Association		They are polling their membership but want TF decisions to heavily weight protection of big game habitat	June-06
Colorado Farm Bureau	All	Roadless management decisions should be made at the local level and should be based on sound science. Let forest planning make these decisions.	June-06
Colorado Forest Legacy	All	Provided in depth policy language for consideration and urged protection	April-06
Colorado Motorcycle Trail Riders Association	PSI and Southern Colorado	Return roadless areas to forest planning process	March-06
Colorado Mule Deer Association	All	Supports DOW recommendation to protect roadless areas	June-06
Colorado Outfitters United for Roadless Area Protection	All	131 outfitters wrote asking the Task Force to protect roadless areas	June-06
Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail Association	GMUG	Protect roadless areas	February-06
Colorado Sportsmen United for Public Lands Protection	All	Protect roadless areas	November-05
Colorado Sportsmen's Advisory Group	All	Protect roadless areas	June-06
Colorado Timber Industry Association	All	Opposed to roadless protection	June-06
Colorado Timber Industry Association	All	Delete all non-wilderness qualified areas from inventory; allow actions in Wildland Urban Interface (WUI); modify FS mapping protocol to protect management options in WUI; FS planning should decide roadless area management	June-06
Crested Butte Mountain Bike Association	All	Supports roadless rule	March-06

Crystal River Caucus	WRNF/all	Protect roadless areas per citizens' boundaries	June-06
Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration	All	We want to work with Task Force to make sure WAPA roads are available for energy corridor uses.	April-06
Elk Mountains Hikers Club	GMUG	Protect roadless areas; enough roads	January-06
Evergreen Naturalists Audubon Society	All and PSI	Protect roadless areas	January-06
Ferdinand Hayden Chapter of Trout Unlimited	WRNF/all	Protect roadless areas	
Forest Park Home owners Association	WRNF	Support continued roadless status for Ryan Gulch	June-06
Friends of Routt Backcountry	Routt	Protect roadless areas	
Friends of the Lower Blue River	WRNF	Protect Summit County roadless areas	
Grand Valley Audubon Society	GMUG	Keep all roadless lands roadless, support 2001 rule, birds need large roadless areas	
High Country Citizens' Alliance	GMUG	Protect roadless areas; GMUG roadless inventory is lacking	February-06
Independence Pass Foundation	WRNF/all	Protect roadless areas	June-06
Mountain States Legal Foundation	All	Task Force should not suggest a management scheme that would contravene Congressional authority under the Wilderness Act	March-06
Outdoor Education Department, Colorado Mountain College	All	Protect roadless areas for students	
Outdoor Industry Association	All	Protect roadless areas	September-05
Outdoor Recreation Business Community	All	Protect roadless areas	
Pikes Peak Sierra Club Group	PSI	Protect roadless areas	January-06
Public Lands Partnership	GMUG	Draw heavily from GMUG draft plan; have interactive process	March-06
Roaring Fork Conservancy	WRNF	Protect roadless areas	June-06
Roaring Fork Valley Horse Council	WRNF	Protect roadless places	June-06
Rocky Mountain Long Ears Association	All	Protect all roadless areas	February-06
Routt County Riders Bicycle Club	Routt	Protect roadless areas	
San Juan Corridors Coalition	GMUG	Support Mountains to Mesa citizens vision for the GMUGNF, which includes protecting all roadless areas identified by citizens	
Silver Queen West Condominium Association	WRNF	Do not put a road in our roadless area	June-06
Solar Energy International	WRNF/all	Protect roadless areas	June-06
Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project	All	Roadless areas and wildlife linkages are key for wildlife, water, etc.	December-06
The Colorado Trail Foundation	All	Protect roadless areas; keep level of road development in roadless areas the same or reduce it along CO Trail Corridor	February-06

Trail Ouray Group	GMUG, SJNF	Protect all roadless areas identified by GMUG staff	November-05
Trails and Open Space Coalition of the Pikes Peak Region	PSI	Keep Roadless areas roadless	January-06
Trout Unlimited	All	Transmitted report outlining the benefits of roadless areas	
Trout Unlimited Collegiate Peaks Chapter	PSI	Protect all roadless areas. Lists streams that flow through roadless areas in Lake, Chafee and Fremont Counties	February-06
United Four Wheel Drive Associations	All	Roadless area management should be decided in forest plans	March-06
Upper Arkansas and South Platte Project	PSI	Protect all roadless areas, uphold 2001 roadless area conservation rule	January-06
Upper Arkansas Motorized Recreation Coalition	PSI	Cannot comment because they are having difficulty getting information on roadless areas and roads	March-06
Utah Shared Access Alliance	All	Return roadless areas to forest planning process	June-06
Watch Hill Homeowners Association	WRNF	Do not remove Ryan gulch from inventory	May-06
Western Colorado Congress, High Country Citizens' Alliance, Sheep Mountain Alliance, Western Slope Environmental Resource Council	GMUG	Protect roadless areas; GMUG plan does not adequately protect roadless areas.	
Western Colorado Congress, High Country Citizens' Alliance, Sheep Mountain Alliance	GMUG	Protect roadless areas to make a landscape work	October-05
Western Slope Environmental Resource Council	GMUG	Protect all roadless areas	March-06
Western Slope Environmental Resource Council	GMUG/all	Blueprint of agreement between Western Slope Environmental Resource Council and Mountain Coal Company which sets forth a framework for upholding conservation values	June-06

Forest-Specific Summaries of Public Comments Submitted Between September 2005 and June 30, 2006.

I. Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest (GMUGNF)

General Comments. Four hundred and fifty (450) people commented on this particular forest, with 98 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as they are. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. Of the written comments gathered for the GMUGNF, there were only five specific areas mentioned in support of more access or roads for motorized vehicle activities.

There were 8 people who specifically said how misleading and deceiving this whole process seemed when designating areas roadless, since many who visit areas know some sort of road does exist.

Many wondered why we were going through this all again, and expressed frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (41).

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the GMUGNF:

352 (98 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

98 (2 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Citizens to Preserve Roadless on Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest (GMUGNF) submitted 657 signatures on a petition asking for roadless land protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Cochtopa Pass area South and East of Gunnison
-3 people commented on enjoying this area
-More roads would decrease elk need protection of special ecology

Cochetopa Hills/Sargent's Mesa roadless area
-4 people asked that these areas be preserved because it is the lowest altitude stretch of the CO Continental Divide
-Critical passage for wildlife between Rio Grande watershed and Gunnison Basin/Colorado River

GMUGNF between Grand Junction and Silt
-3 people indicated that drilling limits access for hunters and recreationists

Meeker to Craig (CO 13).

Milk Creek, Big Ridge to South Fork

Muddy Creek, North Fork and Kannah Creek
-8 people commented on abundance of vegetation and wildlife breeding in area
-Noxious weed spread is concern

Vega, Priest Mountain, Hightower, Clear Fork, Electric Mountain areas of Grand Mesa
-10 people mentioned enjoying these areas
-2 people said these areas deserve to be preserved

Lone Cone Region, Naturita Canyon
-Residential development is shrinking open space
-Preserve Naturita Canyon, elk calving area

Salt Creek, Sunset Trail
-8 people commented on this area

Springhouse Park near Pilot Knob, NE of Paonia
-3 people commented that this area is a nice alternative to the majority of densely roaded forest
-Springhouse Park has nesting purple martins

Clear Creek, Gunnison-Delta County border
-5 people commented: feeder stream has pure strains of native Colorado River Cutthroat trout; also area known for goshawks, elk winter range, fawning habitat for mule deer

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Huntsman Ridge & McClure Pass
- Support energy development to help supply nation's energy needs

North Fork area – Somerset, primarily coal producing regions should not be classified roadless
- 1 comment

- 1 comment: don't close any roads, need more roads

For Continued Roadless Management...

Priest Mountain (flat tops)

- 4 people commented, existing ORV routes not diminished by roadless protection

Cimarron Ridge, Whitehouse Mountain
Windy Point, Dominguez

- 2 people said that this area deserves additional protection from developers

West Elk Mountains between Grand Mesa and
Muddy County

- 2 people commented on this area

Kelso Mesa to Dominguez Canyon.

- 5 people said this area is currently being evaluated for wilderness protection and support protecting this area.

Bangs Canyon

- 3 people said keep as is; would be a terrible mistake connecting to Hwy 141

East Divide Creek, link between Gunnison NF &
BLM South of New Castle & Silt

- 1 person said this area is high potential for oil and gas development

Huntsman Ridge, McClure Pass

- 4 people commented on this area as an important wildlife migration route

Baldy Mountain Roadless

Opposed to Roadless Management...

There are roads in Cimarron County
High Mesa, Gunnison does not have ATV trails
1 person indicated need for multiuse

Elk Ridge trail from Overland Reservoir to
Fairmont Reservoir needs to be motorized

II. Pike-San Isabel National Forest

General Comments. One hundred and sixty six (166) people commented on this particular forest, with 98 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as they are. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. Of the collected written comments from Pike-San Isabel National Forest, there were only two specific areas mentioned in support of more access for motorized vehicle activity.

There were four people who commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Twenty-two wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (22).

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the Pike-San Isabel National Forest:

131 (98 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

35 (2 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Pike-San Isabel National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Cameron Cove, Artists Glen and Dark Canyon
-1 person asked to keep them roadless, feared
ATVs would take over.

Custer County between Greenleaf Creek and
Goat Creek
2 people have noticed motorized erosion
damage and wildlife disruption

Grape Creek roadless area, Curly Peak, Beaver
Creek
-4 people requested no more motorized roads;
preserve for future generations

St. Charles Peak to Lock Mt. from Willow Creek
to Lewis Creek
-5 people indicated that these areas are critical
to the survival of wildlife

Pike NF between Palmer Lake and Perry Park
-2 people commented that Dakan mountain
road was an example of what erosion can do;
roadless area is a watershed for Palmer Lake

Green Mountain, south of Buffalo Creek Road
East from Stoney Pass
-3 people said it is badly eroded; meadow is
scarred by ORV users

Farnum Peak, Park County, Schoolmarm Peak
-2 people commented on preserving this area
for future generations

Spanish Peaks wilderness
-3 people encouraged careful planning of area

Monarch Pass and Poncha Pass, Dorsey Creek,
Methodist Mnt., Starvation Creek, Chipeta,
Mount Antero, Romley Roadless, Badger Creek
-7 people indicated this has core habitat
linkages, preserve and keep watershed clean
-5 people said it is great to get away from city
noise and motorized vehicles

Blodgett and Pikes Peak West, Bear and
Catamount Creek
-3 people wrote how peaceful and beautiful;
wildlife in abundance: deer, rabbits, bighorn
sheep & various bird species

Opposed to Roadless Management...

For Continued Roadless Management...

Trout Peak Pass and south, Kaufman ridge
-2 people mentioned this is not inventoried as roadless area and should be

Loud's Cabin in Jones Park, Bear Creek Canyon, Frosty's Park
-2 people see loss of wildlife due to motorized activity

Elk Mountain – Collegiate, Mt. Antero, Mt. Blanca

Thirty-nine Mile Mountain
-1 person requests preserving this area

Aspen Ridge

Greenleaf Creek roadless area

Stanley Canyon, outside Air Force Academy
-1 person requested preserving this area

Greenhorn Creek, Chalk Creek, Cisneros Creek, Scraggy Peaks roadless area

Browns Canyon wilderness area

Barr Trail, Cheyenne Canyon, Craggs and Horse Thief trails
-3 people appreciate solitude and wildlife in this area

Thunder Butte Roadless Area
-2 people said there is great climbing and habitat for raptors, hawks, falcons

Opposed to Roadless Management...

-Need more trails to ride because of population increase

Rampart Range, Webster Pass, Four-Mile Area
-1 comment: need more ORV trails here

III. San Juan National Forest

Two hundred and thirty three (233) people commented on this particular forest, with 94 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the San Juan National Forest, there were no comments requesting more roads or access.

There were 6 people who commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Many wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (32).

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the San Juan National Forest:

220 (94 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

13 (6 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the San Juan National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Waterfall Canyon, Hope Lake above Ophir, Lizard Head Wilderness, Sneffels Wilderness, Fish Creek watershed

- 5 people would like to see preserved

HD Mountains SE of Bayfield, La Plata, Florida River

- 12 people had concerns with motorized vehicles tearing up land; don't destroy pristine areas for short-term supply of gas

Storm Peak, Hermosa Creek, Hermosa (west part), Stoner Mesa, Fisher, Blackhawk Mtn., Ryman, Goble, and Cherry Creek in the San Juans

- 35 people commented that they appreciate these resources untouched. Many hunt and fish in these areas to avoid crowds, noise and ORVs
- These areas are nationally known as a premier wilderness & recreational experience for cyclists

Ryman Roadless area, Rico

- 2 people commented on preserving

San Juan's from Middle Mtn. Rd and Beaver Meadows, San Juan roadless area

- 3 people commented on these areas

San Miguel, West Needles and Treasure Mountain Area between Moles & Lizard Head Passes

- 6 people enjoy hiking and camping there
- Tourism makes up 65% of San Miguel economy

Fox Mountain, Kitty Creek, Wrightman Fork, Lookout Mountain, Summit Peak-Elwood Pass

- 2 people asked to protect core habitat, links

Andrews Lake on Molas Pass

- 1 person said that this area has 200 non-motorized acres but has attracted renegade snowmobile activity

Weminuche Wilderness, Andrews Lake

- Great hiking due to peace and solitude

Opposed to Roadless Management...

For Continued Roadless Management...

Ouray district

East Leon

-2 people said preserve

East Animas

Rico Mountains, Calico, Sockrider, Storm Peak
and Stoner Mesa

-4 people commented on how gorgeous and
unspoiled this area is, though motorcycles and
dirt bikes are a problem

Opposed to Roadless Management...

IV. Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest

One hundred and seventy six (176) people commented on this particular forest, with 98 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement, damage to watersheds, air pollution and the uncontrolled/unsupervised recreation activities resulting in a growing amount of illegal roads being carved out in once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest, there were two comments requesting more roads or access.

There were three people who commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Many wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (10).

With Colorado’s Front Range growing rapidly, ten people commented specifically that recreational use on National Forest lands is increasing. It is imperative that we preserve roadless areas, which are becoming the last places of refuge for many species.

Several people (3) asked that roadless areas not be open for commercial corporate extractive industries in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest.

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest:

172 (98 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

4 (2 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Elk Creek & Burning Bear, Crozier Mountain, Comanche Peak
-3 people commented on these areas

Grey Rock, White Pine Mountain, North Lone Pine, North Fork Poudre
-6 people commented on this areas

Region east of continental divide between Nederland and Estes Park is a buffer zone for Indian Peaks Wilderness; also, Boulder Ranger District east of Indian Peaks, elk migrating in large herds, boreal toads & several native grasses are endangered. Big horn sheep, black bear
-7 people commented on this area

Square Top Lake Roadless area surrounding Mt. Evans
-4 people commented on this area

North St. Vrain area, 200-400 year old trees and big horn sheep herds (150); North St. Vrain Roadless area part of City of Longmont's drinking water supply; Roads should only be allowed for fire-based thinning.
-13 people commented on this area

Lion Gulch – access limited Forest Service proposal for timber project will include roads
-3 person commented on this area

Green Ridge-East, Williams Fork, Gray Rock, Bard Creek, Never Summer adjacent area, Comanche Peak, Green Ridge- West, Indian Peak adjacent area
-10 people commented on these areas
Hell Canyon, no road should be constructed in this area
-3 people commented on this area

Bright Trail 1 person commented on this area

Copper Mountain & Byers Park, please preserve these large tracts of National Forest
- 2 people commented on this area

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Methany Park roads are closed and limit most access to elderly citizens

Rawah Wilderness
- Closing access would reduce business, which offers guests view of natural setting

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Coulsen Gulch & Rattlesnake Gulch near Big Elk Meadows

- 3 people wrote that they noticed that flammulated owls are becoming less frequent and that it is becoming difficult to hear owls over the roar of the ATV engines & booms of rifles.
-Large areas of Lefthand Canyon have become virtually off-limits to bird watchers & other hikers due to ravaging of the landscape by off-road vehicles & target shooters.

Rock Creek area and Rocky Mtn. North Park

-3 people commented on hiking in this area and have seen 4-wheel drive vehicles on tundra, cutting new roads, trails, and short cuts causing massive erosion & destruction of wildlife habitat

Sourdough, Wapiti, Buchanan Pass, Little Raven trails, please preserve

17 people commented on Camp Dick, Johnny Park and Brainard Lake, please keep open for mountain biking

Do not slate for possible roads, already receives heavy recreational use

3 people asked to add Deer Ridge to the roadless inventory. This area is one of the largest recognized natural landmarks

3 people mentioned Button Rock area, corridor for contiguous wildlife habitat leading to the east

4 people were concerned about the Ironclads above Raymond, which are slated for possible road construction

3 people mentioned a small area around the USFS Rainbow Lakes campground, a natural connector between existing wilderness & the county's largest mountain open space – Caribou Ranch (2000 acres)

Canyon Lakes – Poudre Wilderness, great recreational Fishing and hiking

Opposed to Roadless Management...

V. White River National Forest

One hundred and eight (108) people commented on this particular forest, with 96 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement, damage to watersheds and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in a once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the White River National Forest, there were three comments requesting more roads or access.

There were 2 people who commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Five wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (5).

Twelve people commented specifically that the introduction of roads in roadless areas will effect drinking water quality, pollutants will increase, harm fish, vegetation, riparian, increase invasive species and affect local economies. Recreational activities contribute significantly to the local economy by generating substantial dollars.

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the White River National Forest:

104 (96 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

4 (4 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the White River National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Golden Horseshoe of Breckenridge, new roads created by motorized vehicles
-1 person commented on this area

West side of Shrine Pass Roadless as well as other to the south, West of Vail Pass down to Dotsero, please preserve
-5 people commented on this area
-Continue having Sound of Music views

Gore Creek – gold medal trout stream, receives tons of sediment from several different sources within watershed: caused by Vail Ski area, Red Sandstone Road, as well as I-70
-7 people were concerned about these areas

East Vail & Coral Creek Roadless
-2 people wrote that this area has excellent ski touring and thriving mountain goat herds

Red Mountain Roadless
- 1 person talked about the wildflowers and a natural habitat for wildlife (deer, chipmunks, birds)

Piney River, North of Vail
-1 person wrote that motorized vehicles are notorious for leaving empty beer cans—more roads equals more trash

Flat Tops in Four Mile Park
-3 people commented that this area is extremely washboarded and deeply rutted

Upper Four Mile Park, the Grizzly Creek RARE II area
-3 people said this area incorporates Grizzly Creek watershed, which is for city of Glenwood Springs

Eagles Nest area above Blair Ranch Conservation easement area
-3 people said this area is rich in wildlife & botanical diversity, elk wintering habitat, big horn sheep and two species of fern

Maroon Bells & Snowmass Wilderness
- 7 people asked to keep serene without roar of motors

Opposed to Roadless Management...

National Forest across Eagle River from Red Cliff that borders Holy Cross Wilderness area
-1 person would like jeep trail open that borders the Gore Peterson Creek drainage for hunting

Tenderfoot Mountain near Dillon
-1 person asked to keep open for dirt bikes

Flat Top Wilderness, Windy Point – Budes Trail head
- 1 person asked not to close roads in this area

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the White River National Forest.

For Continued Roadless Management

Old Mill, Crystal City & Crystal Rivers
-2 people asked to preserve these areas

Johnny Park, Buchanan Pass near Camp Dick
-1 person asked to continue access for
mountain bikes

Basalt Mountain, Ashcroft, Thompson Creek
& Red Table Mountain
-8 people asked to preserve access to outdoor
activities. ATVs create too many bandit
trails, increase ecological damage

Red Table, north of Ruedi Reservoir near
Basalt
-3 people asked to keep this area roadless, have
spotted coyote, elk, squirrels, rabbits

Roadless area between Eagle's Nest
Wilderness & Holy Cross Wilderness
-4 people have spotted elk, deer, mountain
goats, beaver, ptarmigan, song birds, old
growth aspen, pine forests & riparian plants

North Independent A & B roadless
-3 people indicated great wildlife habitat,
scenery, unspoiled ecosystems, summer
skiing slopes of Blue Peak. This roadless
area is essential to maintain a buffer zone
between Hwy 82 corridor & the Hunter
Frying Pan wilderness to the north

Little Grand Mesa, adjacent to Colorado River
in Glenwood Canyon
-3 people commented on this area

Ryan Gulch roadless area, Buffalo Mountain
beneath Crater Lake
-3 people said this area was the most wild,
beautiful & lush wetlands area, winter home
for elk and moose

Opposed to Roadless Management...

VI. Routt National Forest

Two hundred and eighty seven (287) people commented on this particular forest, with 91 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement, damage to watersheds and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the Routt River National Forest, there was one comment requesting more roads or access.

Three people commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Three people wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule.

Eighty people stated that it is critical that roadless areas on the Routt National Forest be protected from destructive activities in order to preserve wildlife habitat and natural ecosystems.

Three people thought that Routt National Forest could do a better job of restoration management without roadless designation.

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the Routt National Forest:

262 (91 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

25 (9 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Routt National Forest

For Continued Roadless Management...

Troublesome South; erosion is a problem; area is abundant with elk and deer herds; four wheelers have harmed lake edges marked by tire tracked mud

- 7 people commented on this area that over the years motorcycles and ATV's are destroying the backcountry

Zirkels and Flat Tops, please keep roadless there are enough motorized access roads

- 4 people commented on this area

-Keep motorized off, they are impacting the solitude of area

Mad Creek, Long Park, access is good now, no new roads, exceptional location for wildflowers, hikes & mountain biking

-10 people commented on this specific area

Rabbit Ears

-5 people commented on the excellent back country skiing

Medicine Bow, continue good management plan between permittees & overseeing agency

-1 person commented on this area

Pagoda, part of Routt NF & White River NF

-6 people said elk herd is largest in US, hunting is unparalleled

Harrison Creek, Green Creek, adjacent to Sarvis Creek Wilderness, South of US 40 include in roadless inventory

-3 people commented on these areas

Dunkley Flat Tops, keep roadless

-5 people commented on this area

Chatfield Dome Park South, scenic corridor along Elk River

-3 people mentioned this area

Ripple Creek Pass

-2 people asked to preserve this area

Bunker Basin, Kettle Lakes, Grizzly Heleva, Never Summers N & S, Walden Creek, Chedsey Creek, Black Mountain, Sugarloaf S & N, Nipple Park N & S, Buffalo Pass

-11 people mentioned these areas to preserve

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Routt National Forest

For Continued Roadless Management

South Fork, Gold Creek, Mad Creek, Long Park, Waldon Peak, Little Green Creek, Big Park, French Creek, Dusty Creek, Shield Mountain, Elk Horn and Dome Park—Swamp Park & hot springs trails
-11 people mentioned these areas

Morrison Creek B & C
- 12 people said it was great watching wildlife, view wildflowers and solitude
Bear Ears area and the Parks area
-1 person asked to preserve these areas

Hahn's Peak area, especially Farwell Mountain trail
-1 person mentioned that there is much damage done in this area by motorcycles and ATV's

Bunker Basin, Chatfield Res contain national scenic trails, city's main water supply (Fish Creek Reservoir)
-1 person mentioned this is a large wildlife migration corridor

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Release all inventoried roadless areas within the boundaries of Jackson County
- 1 person wanted this area returned to multiple use management status, allow road construction or reconstruction, timber harvest, motorized summer and winter recreation.

VII. Rio Grande National Forest

Eleven (11) people commented on this particular forest, with 91 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were many concerns about soil erosion, animal displacement, damage to watersheds and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the Rio Grande River National Forest, there was one comment requesting more roads or access.

Three people commented on how misleading and deceiving this whole process seems when designating areas roadless, when those who visit know some sort of road does exist.

Two people wondered why we were going through this all again, frustration with “comment fatigue” and not upholding protections granted roadless under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule.

Roadless areas in the Rio Grande National Forest protect biodiversity, which is important to the headwater regions. Roadless areas protect water quantity and quality for people, wildlife, aquatic habitat as well as watershed protection for river systems and streams (3 people specifically mentioned this).

If the Forest Service keeps chipping away at public lands, opening areas to more people and motorized access, not only will citizens be hurt but all wildlife (6 people specifically mentioned this).

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the Rio Grande National Forest:

10 (91 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

1 (9 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Rio Grande National Forest

For Continued Roadless Management...

Chama Basin, Cumres, La Garita (upper Rio Grande watershed) provide backcountry hiking, hunting, lynx denning and foraging habitat
-3 people mentioned these areas

Colorado and New Mexico hunts and hikes in Chama River, important watershed, premier Aspen Groves, Rocky Mountain Big Horn Sheep lambing habitat, grizzly habitat, quiet and solitude
-4 people wrote about this particular area

Snowshoe mountain, Pole mountain/Finger Mesa, Bear Creek, Elkhorn Peak, Trout Mountain, Elk mountain, Deep Creek
-3 people mentioned that the cutthroat trout was excellent fishing, and the area supports upper elevation elk, mule deer and lynx

Spruce Hole/Sheep Creek
-1 person spotted Rocky Mountain Big Horn Sheep lambing habitat, Peregrine Falcons
-the Conejos River & watershed protection, premier elk hunting please preserve

Big Buck/Kitty/Ruby Creek
-1 person mentioned this area

Saw Log, Carnero Creek watershed, Rio Grande cutthroat trout, lower elevation of elk, mule deer and winter landscape connectivity
-1 person mentioned this area

Wason Park, Palmer Mesa, Wrightman Fork/Lookout, Antora Meadows, Lost Park, Taylor Canyon, Willow Mountain, Tewksberry, Fox Mountain, Four mile Creek, Lak Fork, Briston Head, Ruby Lake, Fox Creek, Silver Lakes/Stunner, Beaver Creek Reservoir
-14 people mentioned these areas

Alamosa River, backcountry hunting and fishing
- 1 person mentioned this area

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Specific Places Mentioned for Roadless or non-Roadless Management on the Rio Grande National Forest

For Continued Roadless Management...

Beaver Mountain roadless area

-1 person mentioned this area burnt in 2002 in the Million Fire. Priority upland fire recovery for S. Fork municipal supply watershed

Ruby Lake roadless area

-2 people mentioned the upper Rio Grande stewardship, back country alpine lake fishing, hiking and hunting. Elk and mule deer habitat

Conejos River roadless area

-1 person mentioned the world-class fishing, riverside quiet and solitude

Fox Creek roadless area

-1 person talked about the heritage, culture of the area, great backcountry hunting, unparalleled Conejos Canyon rim quiet and solitude. Vital Rocky Mountain Big Horn habitat

Middle Alder roadless area

-1 person mentioned Middle Alder Creek watershed stewardship, backcountry, hunting, recreation, exploration, riparian habitat, upland wildlife corridor, lynx landscape connectivity.

Finger Mesa, Pole Mountain, and Kitty Creek roadless area

-1 person mentioned this area

Lost Park Taylor Canyon roadless area, Lake Fork roadless

-2 people mentioned this area, Saguache Creek watershed, great hunting, ponderosa pine, grasslands and riparian habitat

Pole Creek mountain area

-1 person mentioned motorized dirt bikes/ATV's disruption of elk habitat

Opposed to Roadless Management...

VIII. Manti-La Sal National Forest

Forty-One (41) people commented on this particular forest, with 73 percent indicating keeping roadless areas as is. There were two concerns expressed about soil erosion, animal displacement, damage to watersheds and the amount of illegal roads that have been carved out in once pristine landscapes. From the written comments gathered for the Manti- La Sal National Forest, there was one comment requesting more roads or access.

Roadless areas protect water quantity and quality for people, wildlife, aquatic habitat as well as watershed protection for river systems and streams (1 person specifically mentioned this).

One person mentioned they felt there were adequate number of roads and feared more roads would harm wildlife and disrupt habitat.

Public comment on whether to continue roadless area protection in the Manti-La Sal National Forest:

30 (73 percent) comments for continued roadless area protection.

11 (27 percent) comments against continued roadless area protection.

For Continued Roadless Management...

Roc Creek

- 1 person asked that inventoried roadless receive additional protection

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Summary of public comments in support of or in opposition to continued roadless area protection broken out by forest and statewide

Public comment to continue roadless area protection (91 percent) far outweighed public comment against continuing protection (9 percent)

3,346 comments were received expressing support for continuing roadless area protection.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 352	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 131	<u>San Juan NF</u> 210	<u>Statewide</u> 2,075	
<u>Arapahoe Roos.</u> 172	<u>White River NF</u> 104	<u>Routt NF</u> 262	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 10	<u>Manti La Sal</u> 30

351 comments were received expressing opposition to continuing roadless area protection.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 98	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 35	<u>San Juan NF</u> 13	<u>Statewide</u> 160	
<u>Arapahoe Roos. NF</u> 4	<u>White River NF</u> 4	<u>Routt NF</u> 25	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 1	<u>Manti La Sal</u> 11

Under the general statewide response, 874 people specifically indicated that they would like to keep Colorado beautiful, this is why people visit communities, backcountry and support local economies.

Under the general statewide response, 354 people supported upholding protections granted under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule (it's not just good policy, it's what the people want), and 17 opposed upholding protections.

Under the general statewide response, 116 people specifically commented to allow current access to continue for off-road vehicles. In contrast, 707 people commented that opening pristine areas to a relatively small group of users (off-road vehicles users) would be a disastrously shortsighted approach and felt there was already enough designated motorized roads, please preserve for future generations.

OHV groups that educate and conduct restoration work, unfortunately, do not represent the majority of OHV owners. Roads are the single most effective way to deter wildlife, destroy watershed function and structure, and damage scenic quality for years to come (5 people).

Thirty-one people also expressed concern about the closure of roadless areas and they do not support these areas being sold off to private developers. There are countless number of subdivisions popping up everywhere, our wildlife are suffering with tremendous loss of habitat Keep “National” lands national...don’t sell off to development (23 people commented on this).

Roadless areas are essential in protecting clean air and watersheds, the extraction industries will continue to contaminate by toxins and heavy metals that seep into soil and water supplies (408 people specifically mentioned these concerns).

Hunters and anglers cherish the solitude from roadless areas, and large tracks of unbroken habitat where big game animals live are important to Colorado’s sporting and recreation (426 people mentioned these issues specifically in their general comments).

The U.S. Forest Service cannot maintain roads they already have a \$163 million backlog of road maintenance and restoration projects. Present forest management needs to change dramatically (19 people mentioned this in general comments).

Under general comments, thirty people indicated they would like to keep roads open for multi-use.

Summary of Forest-Specific Comments by Topic

Public comment was categorized by the following topics of concern: energy, wildlife habitat, water, economic values, quality of life, motorized recreation, grazing, commercial timber, wildfire, environment, and natural landscape. Below, is a summary of the public comments submitted between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 by topic and by forest.

A. Energy

24 comments: We need more roads for energy development.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 16	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 1	<u>San Juan NF</u> 2	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 1	<u>Routt NF</u> 4	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0

Oil and gas has been a part of Western Colorado for many years. There is no indication of abuse, and reclamation has been successful on past sites. We should allow this use to continue to heat our homes. Colorado has a 100-year history of coal mining. With current regulations, mining has a minimal impact on the Colorado environment. Coal mining is an important clean energy source and provides many jobs, contributing to local economies. Developing energy resources in these areas vital to our nation's energy independence (5 people). Any areas containing coal reserves/oil/gas should not be included in roadless designation.

108 comments: There are enough roads already for resource extraction.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 62	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 11	<u>San Juan NF</u> 14	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 11	<u>Routt NF</u> 5	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 5

One hundred and eight people shared written comments saying that energy exploration in roadless areas should stop. They would like to apply protective designations that secure roadless areas from the extractive industries. Twenty-four people commented about the GMUGNF and were specifically concerned that the more oil and gas developed, the more harm to the natural environment. It was also suggested that we remove some of the older existing roads left over from past resource extraction. Old logging roads are being taken over by motorized vehicles and causing erosion.

Property owners adjacent to Grand Mesa National Forest stated that the area east of Colbran is no longer quiet because of drill rigs, heavy equipment and truck traffic. Brush Creek,

which typically has hunter camps on BLM land, now has 5 new oil and gas roads along with attendant development.

Opening Colorado roadless areas to oil and gas exploration rigs, mining and timber cutting pollute the crystal clear streams, which are vital to wildlife and watersheds. Roadless areas are a precious commodity and should not be squandered in the last “days” of our quest for oil (10 people commented on this).

B. Wildlife/Habitat

8 comments: We need more roads to access wildlife.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 6	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 0	<u>San Juan NF</u> 0	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 2	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 0	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

315 comments: We do not need more roads to access wildlife.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 103	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 69	<u>San Juan NF</u> 51	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 37	<u>White River NF</u> 24	<u>Routt NF</u> 28	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 3

A few written comments indicated that they did not think motorized vehicles were a threat to elk habitat. Colorado elk herds are larger than ever and the Department of Wildlife would like to see it reduced. Hunters without access to back roads would no longer be able to hunt and this would hurt many local economies (15 comments from GMUGNF area).

More road construction and motorized vehicles disrupt hunting and have negative impacts on biodiversity and to the preservation of ecosystem and species (18 people commented on this).

350 comments: We already have adequate numbers of roads and we fear more roads will harm wildlife and disrupt habitat.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 94	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 22	<u>San Juan NF</u> 33	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 1
<u>Arapahoe NF</u> 47	<u>White River NF</u> 34	<u>Routt NF</u> 116	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 3

More roads equal more trash. Wildlife need more space as lands continue to be developed. Watershed condition and animal biodiversity will be affected (10 people commented on this).

16 comments: *We do not have adequate numbers of roads.*

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
10	2	1	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
0	0	3	0

There were also comments about the increase of traffic on roads which have spilled over onto roadless areas creating more serious impacts to terrain, a decrease in elk migration activity, threats of extinction to wildlife, habitat fragmentation, introduction of noxious weeds, harm to migratory corridors, and movement of big game from public to private lands such that landowners end up with a private game reserve only they can access.

C. Water

0 Comments: *We need more roads to develop water resources.*

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
0	0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
0	0	0	0

327 comments: *We have adequate numbers of roads; roads harm water resources and quality.*

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
60	43	31	1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
29	50	110	3

Thirteen people specifically expressed a fear of water supplies being harmed by air pollutants, sediments in stream channels from mining, logging, and erosion from motorized vehicles, and reduction of water quantity from oil and gas operations. Protection of headwaters should be included in best management practices. The overall concern was a request to protect watersheds (13 people).

D. Economic values

17 comments: *We need more roads to create economic opportunity and jobs.*

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
10	3	3	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
1	0	0	0

188 comments: Adequate roads exist; roadless areas create economic opportunity.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 45	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 29	<u>San Juan NF</u> 44	<u>Manti La Sal</u> 1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 17	<u>White River NF</u> 21	<u>Routt NF</u> 20	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 11

Some expressed that the economic benefit from mining in Colorado has had a positive impact on the state and on local communities. Many more said that there is economic impact from people not visiting the GMUG because it is not the quiet haven they had expected. People come to see the beautiful landscapes, and not the oil, gas and mining operations. The effect on wildlife habitat hurts hunting and fishing tourism. Protect the Western Slope from development (15 people specifically noted this). Businesses depend on the natural assets that define areas in Yampa, Steamboat Springs, Oak Creek and Hayden; more roads will directly affect the unique outdoor experience (20 people mentioned this as a concern).

69 comments: The Forest Service can't manage roads they have already.

Road creation, maintenance and closure costs are too high to justify. Many feel the Forest Service is doing an excellent job managing the forests for everyone who depends on the forest to make a living or for people who simply want to enjoy what it offers. However, many indicated that the Forest Service already has a roads maintenance backlog exceeding \$8 billion. This is a huge fiscal and legal liability as well as a burden to the taxpayers. The Forest Service does not have an adequate budget to manage the lands for multi-use and has to make decisions that will not result in legal action. If we can't maintain existing roads, it doesn't make sense to create new roads (15 people commented specifically on this).

E. Quality of Life

11 comments: We need more roads to enhance local quality of life.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 7	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 2	<u>San Juan NF</u> 2	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 0	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

262 comments: Adequate roads exist; roadless areas enhance quality of life.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 93	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 36	<u>San Juan NF</u> 48	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 45	<u>White River NF</u> 15	<u>Routt NF</u> 23	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 2

197 comments: People visit Colorado to enjoy the solitude and pristine lands, and to get away from noise and traffic of the cities.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
46	19	22	1

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
26	43	33	2

113 comments: Roadless areas keep the air quality high.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
31	17	16	0

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
9	20	20	0

F. Motorized Recreation

49 comments: We need more roads to create recreation opportunity.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u>
35	5	4	1

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	<u>Rio Grande NF</u>
0	0	3	1

Some indicated that the creation of more off-road vehicle access would provide more opportunity to enjoy public lands. There were many letters, e-mails and comment cards asking for continued motorized access especially for the elderly, handicapped, and poor (can't afford outfitter guides, organized hunting). 64 people commented specifically on this particular access issue. There were 36 people who did not specifically address an individual forest but indicated that as OHV enthusiasts (which are on the increase) they would like to see areas managed by Forest Service.

94 comments: Motorized vehicle enthusiasts help maintain trails in cooperation with the Forest Service; do not close more roads.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 44	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 17	<u>San Juan NF</u> 25	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 6	<u>White River NF</u> 1	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

Many people indicated that as avid motorized vehicle enthusiasts they help maintain trails in cooperation with the Forest Service, and asked that more roads not be closed. They would like to keep access to the forest for multiple uses including: ATV, motorcycle, 4x4, snowmobile, and other off-road vehicles. There were also three comments about keeping roadless areas open for ATV hunters (especially in Western Colorado).

On another note, there were 8 comments that said, while it is admirable that 4-wheeler clubs participate in clean-ups, it is also obvious that it's not hikers, bikers, or skiers that haul in a 12 pack of beer miles into the forest and scatter the empties when they are done.

248 comments: Adequate roads exist; roadless areas create recreation opportunity.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 70	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 33	<u>San Juan NF</u> 57	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 28	<u>White River NF</u> 31	<u>Routt NF</u> 27	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 2

The elimination of the Roadless Rule could jeopardize a trail infrastructure that has taken years to develop and maintain (three backcountry mountain bikers mentioned this).

169 comments: Do not allow motorized recreation in roadless areas.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 60	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 20	<u>San Juan NF</u> 26	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 24	<u>White River NF</u> 24	<u>Routt NF</u> 14	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 1

People expressed that there has been a large increase in motorized vehicle use, including motorcycles, dirt bikes, ATV's, and ORV's, which degrade and harm backcountry experiences. Some hunters mentioned hiking into remote areas to hunt and ATV's pulling up disrupting their hunting experience. Comments indicate that while there are many motorized vehicles that respect the land, if they can't convince other motorized people to behave likewise, the whole ORV group will have to be managed. There were also concerns about the amount of trash left on lands, abuse of trails and irresponsibility. There needs to be more enforcement of ATV/ORV crowd (15 people commented specifically on this issue).

G. Grazing

0 comments: We need more roads for cattle ranchers to operate.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 0	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 0	<u>San Juan NF</u> 0	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 0	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

15 comments: Adequate roads exist; roads harm grazing.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 6	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 2	<u>San Juan NF</u> 3	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 1	<u>Routt NF</u> 3	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

Livestock cause erosion.

Support grazing on public lands and the indirect economic benefit it brings to the county. The largest segment of Colorado's agriculture is the beef industry and over half of these cattle graze on public lands. Please consider any decisions on the roadless issue not impact these businesses (4 people commented on this issue).

H. Commercial Timber

7 comments: We need more roads to promote commercial timber industry.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 1	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 3	<u>San Juan NF</u> 1	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 2	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0

One person mentioned several areas that are at risk for fires: the Comanche Peaks Wilderness has mature lodge pole pine – a fire risk; East & West White Pine are surrounded by homes and ranches – represent a large wild fire risk; Green Ridge east and west – partially roaded – high fire risk. There were three comments that we should consider more logging to create a healthier forest.

47 comments: Adequate roads exist; commercial harvesting harms the landscape.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 12	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 17	<u>San Juan NF</u> 16	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 1	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 1

I. Wildfire

10 comments: We need more roads to reduce risk of wildfire.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 3	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 1	<u>San Juan NF</u> 1	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 3	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 2	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0
----------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

26 comments: Adequate roads exist; more roads increase risk of fire.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 5	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 8	<u>San Juan NF</u> 5	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

<u>White River NF</u> 1	<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 2	<u>Routt NF</u> 4	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 1
----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

Some people commented that there were already plenty of roads for fuels reduction. They acknowledged the actual existence of historic roads and trails which could provide access if needed to treat forest and ecosystem health problems with minimal new disturbance. It was suggested that the Forest Service keep logging roads open a little longer to allow people to cut firewood and clean up beetle kill areas more.

Road construction on the Front Range should be for fire roads only. Twelve people were not opposed to temporary roads to facilitate essential restoration treatments for clearing fire hazards and/or search and rescue operations.

Restoration and wildfire reduction treatments are expensive, federal appropriations are shrinking, we need to find some economic value in the by-products through small, adaptive locally based enterprises. Develop small-scale biomass facilities that can use low value material removed to reduce fire dangers (3 people supported these ideas).

J. Environment/Natural Landscape

13 comments: We need more roads - perhaps roadless areas create de facto wilderness?

<u>GMUGNF</u> 10	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 2	<u>San Juan NF</u> 1	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
---------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 0	<u>White River NF</u> 0	<u>Routt NF</u> 0	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 0
----------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

348 comments: Adequate roads exist. Keep roadless areas in natural state.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 88	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 44	<u>San Juan NF</u> 41	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 28	<u>White River NF</u> 31	<u>Routt NF</u> 113	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 3

Damage to roadless areas will be irreversible. We need to preserve these areas for future generations. We must learn from the African Sahara and parts of Europe...our creatures will disappear.

535 comments: Preserve the environment; concerned about human impact on Colorado's natural landscapes.

<u>GMUGNF</u> 132	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u> 35	<u>San Juan NF</u> 56	<u>Manti La Sal NF</u> 1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u> 57	<u>White River NF</u> 40	<u>Routt NF</u> 211	<u>Rio Grande NF</u> 3

Benzene, which is used by oil and gas industry, has been found in groundwater down slope from industry, which is harmful to wildlife and watersheds.

Mondo Business Group, Inc.

Dawn Gardner, President

gardner.dawn@comcast.net

303-319-2726

Mondo Business Group, Inc. specializes in research, community and economic development analysis, and the evaluation and monitoring of programs with particular expertise in marketing, policy and program implementation throughout the west. Contracts have included work with the U.S. Forest Service implementing and monitoring the Four Corners Sustainable Partnership Revolving Loan Fund project, the Four Corners Forest Products Entrepreneurial Support Program, Bureau of Land Management, Colorado Utilization and Marketing Program, small business needs assessment for the Governor's Office of Economic Development in Colorado, a Small Business Prosperity Strategy for the City of Portland and a home-based business evaluation strategy for Colorado.

Ms. Gardner's past experience includes managing programs such as: Colorado Rural Development Council's Center for Rural Entrepreneurship, the U.S. Forest Service, Four Corners Sustainable Partnership Revolving Loan Fund, the RuralTeleCon 1999 & 2000 in Aspen, developing economic development plans through the High Performance Communities program for cities throughout the west, Colorado Rural Technology Program grants through the Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado Leading Edge program. Through these programs Dawn has offered expertise in fundraising, marketing, website development, evaluating programs successes, developing strategic plans and curriculum development.

During Ms. Gardner's career she has developed reports on community capital lending throughout the west and coordinated a forum on *Angels in the West* at El Pomar in Colorado Springs, coordinated five leadership summits on rural affordable telecommunications to encourage dialogue on rule-making decisions by the FCC, and served on an International team for the Countryside Exchange in Hiraethog, Wales to help the community design their economic/community strategy