



***Summary of the Public Comments Submitted to
the Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force
between September 2005 and March 17, 2006***

***Prepared by Mondo Business Group, Ltd.
Submitted April 11, 2006***

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 3
General Summary of all Comments Submitted Before March 17, 2006	Page 3
Figure 1. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006.	Page 4
Figure 2. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized by the home county and city of the commenter, and support for or against continued roadless area (RA) protection.	Page 5
Figure 3. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized by gender.	Page 6
Figure 4. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized by specificity of comment.	Page 7
Summaries of Forest-Specific Comments	Page 7
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest	Page 8
Pike-San Isabel National Forest	Page 10
San Juan National Forest	Page 13
Arapaho National Forest	Page 16
White River National Forest	Page 18
Routt National Forest	Page 20
Summary of Public Comments in Support of or in Opposition to Continued Roadless Area Protection by Forest and Statewide	Page 22
Summary of Forest-Specific Comments by Topic	Page 23
About the Preparer	Page 32

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 March 17, 2006. To date, there have been public meetings held by the Task Force in Delta, Durango, Pueblo, Denver and Fort Collins 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 comments submitted to the Task Force via the Colorado Department of Natural Resources between September 2005 and March 17, 2006.

Note that although we have provided a summary of the comments submitted about the Grand Mesa, Gunnison, and Uncompahgre National Forest, the Task Force has expressed an interest in repeating the public meeting in Delta and soliciting more public input.

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 March 17, 2006.

From data gathered, **1,265 people** took the time to either attend a public meeting in their region or submitted comments addressing the roadless issue and particular areas of the National Forest they felt warranted comment. There were **974 specific written 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.

Six hundred seventy three (86 percent) commenters specifically called for continued protection of roadless areas, while 108 commenters indicated that they generally were against the continuation of the roadless area protections.¹ 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 (43, or 4% of all the specific comments) indicated that there is a need for more off-road vehicle access. They also commented (34) 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 (175, or 18% of all specific comments) 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

¹ Although 974 specific written comments were received, Mondo Business Group could ascertain a clear position for or against continued roadless area protection only from 781 comments.

have to be more rigorously managed if they couldn't convince other motorized people to behave respectfully (42).

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 (179). In addition, there were many commenters (149) 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 (230). There were a few comments (6) 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 (170) 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, 126 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.

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

One hundred and forty seven 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 March 17, 2006.

Comment Type	Number of Comments	
	Feb. 3, 2006	March 17, 2006
Colorado oral comments ²	172	72
Colorado written comments		
Electronic (e-mail)	269	59
Comment Form (DNR)	174	139
Form letter	13	69
Personalized letters	99	152
Out of state comments	22	25
Total	749	516

² We were unable to break down these comments by city and county in the summary charts in subsequent pages.

Figure 2. Summary of all Colorado public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized 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 Supporting RA Protection	Comments Generally Against RA Protection
Adams County	6			Jefferson County	72		
Commerce City		0	1	Arvada		1	3
Northglenn			1	Blackhawk		1	
Thornton		4		Conifer		0	1
Arapaho County	46			Evergreen		28	1
Centennial		12	2	Golden		4	1
Highlands Ranch		15	1	Indian Hills		0	1
Littleton		15	1	Lakewood		22	4
Archuleta County	9			Morrison		1	0
Pagosa Springs		9	0	Wheatridge		0	2
Boulder County	70			Westminster		1	1
Boulder		59	3	La Plata County	127		
Lafayette			1	Bayfield		17	1
Longmont		1	0	Durango		91	14
Lyons		4	0	Hermosa		1	0
Nederland		1	0	Hesperus		2	0
Niwot		1	0	Ignacio		1	0
Broomfield County	8			Lake County	1		
Broomfield		4	4	Leadville		1	
Chafee County	7			Larimer County	30		
Buena Vista		1		Bellvue		1	
Nathrop		1	0	Fort Collins		22	1
Salida		5	0	Laporte		1	
Crowley County	1			Loveland		3	0
Olney Springs		0	1	Wellington		0	1
Custer County	2			Mesa County	96		
Wetmore		2	0	Clifton		0	3
Dolores County	3			Colbran		1	1
Rico		2	1	Fruita		2	1
Delta County	88			Glade Park		0	1
Austin		0	2	Grand Junction		59	21
Cedaredge		6	4	Loma		2	3
Crawford		0	3	Palisade		1	0
				Whitewater		1	0
				Montezuma County	50		
				Cortez		5	2

Delta	35	4	Dolores	5	0
Eckert	3	1	Mancos	12	0
Paonia	6	24	Montrose	11	13
Denver County	69		Olathe	1	2
Denver	63	6	Ouray County	7	
Douglas County	13		Ouray	1	0
Castle Rock	1	1	Ridgway	6	0
Franktown	4	1	Pitkin County	4	
Larkspur	1	0	Aspen	2	0
Palmer Lake	1	0	Carbondale	2	0
Parker	3	1	Pueblo County	37	
Eagle County	3		Beulah	3	1
Eagle	2	0	Pueblo	23	6
Edwards	1	0	Rye	3	1
El Paso County	51		Roout County	1	
Colorado Springs	40	6	Oak Creek	1	0
Manitou Springs	3	2	San Miguel County	11	
Elbert County	2		Mountain Village	1	0
Agate	2	0	Norwood	2	0
Fremont County	6		Telluride	8	0
Canon City	3	0	San Juan County	2	
Howard	1	1	Silverton	2	0
Penrose	1	0	Summit County	1	
Garfield County	3		Breckenridge	1	
Parachute	1	0	Teller County	5	
Rifle	2	0	Divide	1	0
Gunnison County	16		Florissant	1	0
Crested Butte	10	0	Woodland Park	1	2
Gunnison	6	0	Weld County	4	
			Brighton	1	1
			Greeley	0	1
			Johnstown	1	

Figure 3. Summary of written public comments generated between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized by gender. For some comments, gender was unknown.

	Submitted by 2/7/06	Submitted by 3/17/06
Male	405	232
Female	141	95

Figure 4. Summary of written public comments submitted between September 2005 and March 17, 2006 categorized by specificity of comment.

Comments Focus³	Submitted by 2/7/06	Submitted by 3/17/06
General Statewide Comments	293	227
Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests	33	55
Grand Mesa Uncompagne-Gunnison NF	250	67
Manti-La Sal National Forests	24	7
Pikes San Isabel National Forests	70	18
Rio Grande National Forest	36	9
Routt National Forest	29	12
San Juan National Forest	151	29
White River National Forest	32	24

Summaries of Forest-Specific Public Comments Submitted Between September 2005 and March 17, 2006.

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

General Comments. 222 people commented on this particular forest, with 77% 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 5 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:

171 (77%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

51 (23%) comments against continued roadless area protection.

³ The public in e-mails, comment cards or letters in many cases checked numerous National Forests. A total of 846 responses were directed toward particular National Forests.

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

- 2 people commented on enjoying this area
- more roads would decrease elk need protection of special ecology

Cochetopa Hills/Sargent's Mesa roadless area

- should 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

- 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

- 6 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

- 6 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

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

- 4 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 nations 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)

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

Kelso Mesa to Dominguez Canyon.

- 2 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

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. 83 people commented on this particular forest, with 81 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 2 specific areas mentioned in support of more access for motorized vehicle activity.

There were 4 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 (22).

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

67 (81%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

16 (19%) 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
- 2 people requested no more motorized roads; preserve for future generations

St. Charles Peak to Lock Mt. from Willow Creek to Lewis Creek
- 2 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
- 2 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
- 1 person encouraged careful planning of area

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

Blodgett and Pikes Peak West, Bear and Catamount Creek
- Places of peace and beauty; 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

- 1 person mentioned this is not inventoried as roadless area

Loud's Cabin in Jones Park, Bear Creek Canyon, Frosty's Park

- 2 people see loss of wildlife due to motorized activity

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

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

116 people commented on this particular forest, with 91 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:

106 (91%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

10 (9%) 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

- 3 people would like to see preserved

HD Mountains SE of Bayfield, La Plata, Florida River

- 10 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

- 30 people commented that they appreciate these resources untouched. Many hunt and fish in these areas to avoid crowds, noise and ORVs

Ryman Roadless area, Rico

- 2 people commented on preserving

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

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

Ouray district

East Leon

- 2 people said preserve

Opposed to Roadless Management...

For Continued Roadless Management...

East Animas

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

- 1 person 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

31 people commented on this particular forest, with 90 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 Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest, there was one comment requesting more roads or access.

There were 3 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).

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

28 (90%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

3 (10%) 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 commented on these areas

Grey Rock, White Pine Mountain, North Lone Pine, North Fork Powder

- 3 people commented on this areas

Region east of continental divide between Nederland and Estes, this 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

- 2 people commented on this area

Square Top Lake Roadless area surrounding Mt. Evans

- 1 person 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.

- 3 people commented on this area

Lion Gulch – access limited Forest Service proposal for timber project will include roads

- 1 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,

-1 person commented on this area

Hell Canyon, no road should be constructed in this area

-1 person commented on this area

Opposed to Roadless Management...

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

V. White River National Forest

32 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 White River National Forest, there was one comment 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.

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 (5).

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

29 (91%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

3 (9%) 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...

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

- 2 people commented on this area

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

- 3 people were concerned about these areas

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

VI. Routt National Forest

3 people commented on this particular forest, with 100 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 were no comments requesting more roads or access.

One person 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.

One person 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.

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

3 (100%) comments for continued roadless area protection.

0 (0%) comments against continued roadless area protection.

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

- 2 people commented on this area that through the years of motorcycles and ATV's are destroying the backcountry

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

- 1 person commented on this area

Opposed to Roadless Management...

Summary of public comments in support of or in opposition to continued roadless area protection by forest and statewide.⁴

Public comment to continue roadless area protection (86%) far outweighed public comment against continuing protection (14%).

673 comments were received expressing support for continuing roadless area protection.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Statewide</u>
130	57	95	132
37	6	12	134
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>	
0	0	0	
61	6	3	

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>	<u>Statewide</u>
46	16	5	10
1	1	0	28
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>			
0			
1			

Under the general statewide response 247 people specifically indicated that they would like to keep Colorado beautiful. Colorado’s beautiful landscapes are why people visit communities and the backcountry, and support local economies.

Under the general statewide response, 54 people supported upholding protections granted under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, and 7 opposed upholding protections.

Under the general statewide response, 59 people specifically commented to allow current access to continue for off-road vehicles. In contrast, 110 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.

⁴ Note that each of the topics discussed in this section categorize the comments by National Forest and by date. The number in the top line under each forest represents the number of comments submitted by February 7th, 2006, and the number in the second line represents the number of comments submitted by March 17, 2006.

10 people also expressed opposition to the proposal to sell off forest parcels, including roadless areas, to private developers.

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

21 comments: We need more roads for energy development.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
9	1	2
2	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
1	0	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 nation’s energy independence (5 people). Any areas containing coal reserves/oil/gas should not be included in roadless designation.

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
40	10	13
2	1	1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
3	1	0
4	0	0

Many 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. Fourteen commenters from the GMUGNF 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 (10 people).

B. Wildlife/Habitat

8 comments: We need more roads to access wildlife.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
6	0	0
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
2	0	0

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
40	60	43
35	5	6
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
17	6	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).

Motorized vehicles disrupt hunting, has negative impact on biodiversity and need to preserve ecosystem and species (15).

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
23	12	25
33	7	6
<u>Arapaho NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
21	5	2

More roads, more trash. Wildlife need more space as lands continue to be developed. Watershed, animal biodiversity will be affected (5).

13 comments: We do not have adequate numbers of roads.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
10	2	1
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	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 private game reserves 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>
0	0	0
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

126 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>
32	30	22
12	2	6
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
6	3	0

Many specifically expressed a fear of water supplies being harmed by air pollutants, sediments in stream channels from mining, logging, 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 gist was a request to protect watersheds (13).

D. Economic values

16 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>
10	3	3
0	0	0

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

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
33	23	30
7	4	4

<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
4	0	2

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.

49 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 (9).

E. Quality of Life

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
7	2	2
0	0	0

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

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
35	28	40
47	6	7
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
31	4	3

62 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>
15	9	15
1	0	7
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
8	7	0

49 comments: Roadless areas keep the air quality high.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
9	9	8
7	6	1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
4	5	0

F. Motorized Recreation

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
35	5	3
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

Many 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). Forty-four people commented specifically on this particular access issue. There were 26 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 the Forest Service.

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
43	15	25
1	1	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	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 be not closed. They would like to keep access to the forest for multiple recreational uses including: ATV, motorcycle, 4x4, snowmobile, and other off-road vehicles. There were also a few comments about keeping roadless areas open for ATV hunters (especially in Western Colorado).

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
60	26	49
10	4	7
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
12	5	2

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
22	0	9
2	4	2
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
6	6	2

People expressed that there has been a large increase in motorized vehicle use including, motorcycles, dirt bikes, ATV's, 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 similarly, the whole ORV group will have to be managed more intensively. There were also concerns about the amount of trash left on lands, abuse of trails and irresponsible behavior. There needs to be more enforcement of ATV/ORV users (8).

G. Grazing

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

12 comments: Adequate roads exist; roads harm grazing.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
6	2	3
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

Livestock cause erosion. Support grazing on public lands and the indirect economic benefit it brings to the county.

H. Commercial Timber

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
1	1	1
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

One person mentioned several areas that are at risk for fires: the Comanche Peaks Wilderness has mature lodge pole pine; East & West White Pine are surrounded by homes and ranches; and Green Ridge east and west – partially roaded.

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
11	17	16
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

I. Wildfire

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

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

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
5	7	5
0	0	0
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

Some people commented that there are 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.

J. Environment/Natural Landscape

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
10	2	1
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
0	0	0

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
49	37	33
34	3	6
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
4	4	4

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.

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
75	25	49
35	3	4
<u>Arapaho-Roosevelt NF</u>	<u>White River NF</u>	<u>Routt NF</u>
0	0	0
14	7	2

Benzene, which is used by oil and gas industry and is harmful to wildlife and watersheds, has been found in ground water downslope

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, 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.