



***Summary of the Public Comments
Submitted to the Colorado Roadless Areas
Review Task Force between September
2005 and Feb 3, 2006***

***Prepared by Mondo Business Group, Ltd.
February 8, 2006***

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 3
General Summary of all Comments Submitted Before February 3, 2006	Page 3
Figure 1. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and February 3, 2006.	Page 4
Figure 2. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and February 3, 2006 broken out 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 February 3, 2006 broken out by gender.	Page 6
Figure 4. Summary of public comments generated between September 2005 and February 3, 2006 broken out by specificity of comment.	Page 6
Forest-Specific Summaries	Page 7
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forest	Page 7
Pike-San Isabel National Forest	Page 10
San Juan National Forest	Page 13
Summary of public comments in support of or in opposition to continued roadless area protection by forest and statewide	Page 16
Summary of Forest-Specific Comments by Topic	Page 17
About the Preparer	Page 23

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 February 3, 2006. To date, there have been public meetings held by the Task Force in Delta, Durango and Pueblo 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 February 3, 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 February 3, 2006.

From data gathered, 749 people took the time to either attend a public meeting in their region or submitted comments addressing the roadless issues and particular areas of the National Forest they felt warranted comment. There were 555 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.

Four hundred fourteen commenters specifically called for continued protection of roadless areas, while 77 commenters indicated that they generally were against the continuation of the roadless area protections. 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) 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 (135) 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 couldn't convince other motorized people to behave respectfully (34 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 (119). 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 (143). 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 (63) 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, 84 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.

Ninety-five 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 February 3, 2006.

Comment Type	Number of Comments
Colorado oral comments ¹	172
Colorado written comments	
Electronic (e-mail)	269
Comment Form (DNR)	174
Form letter	13
Personalized letters	99
Out of state comments	22
Total	749

¹ 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 February 3, 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 Supporting RA Protection	Comments Generally Against RA Protection
Adams County	1			Jefferson County	25		
Commerce City		0	1	Conifer		0	1
Arapahoe County	8			Evergreen		15	0
Centennial		2	0	Golden		2	1
Highlands Ranch		1	0	Lakewood		2	1
Littleton		5	0	Morrison		1	0
Archuleta County	9			Westminster		1	1
Pagosa Springs		9	0	La Plata County	120		
Boulder County	29			Bayfield		16	0
Boulder		24	0	Durango		86	14
Longmont		2	0	Hermosa		1	0
Lyons		2	0	Hesperus		2	0
Nederland		1	0	Ignacio		1	0
Broomfield County	1			Larimer County	6		
Broomfield		1	0	Fort Collins		3	0
Chafee County	6			Loveland –		2	0
Nathrop		1	0	Wellington		0	1
Salida		5	0	Mesa County	92		
Crowley County	1			Clifton		0	3
Olney Springs		0	1	Colbran		1	1
Custer County	2			Fruita		2	1
Wetmore		2	0	Glade Park		0	1
Dolores County	3			Grand Junction		56	20
Rico		2	1	Loma		2	3
Delta County	60			Palisade		1	0
Austin		0	2	Whitewater		1	0
Cedaredge		6	4	Montezuma County	25		
Crawford		0	3	Cortez		5	0
Delta		5	4	Dolores		5	0
Eckert		1	1	Mancos		12	0
Hotchkiss		1	6	Montrose County	23		
Paonia		3	24	Montrose		11	12
Denver County	13			Olathe		0	2
Denver		13	0	Ouray County	7		
Douglas County	3			Ouray		1	0
Franktown		1	0	Ridgway		6	0
Larkspur		1	0	Pitkin County	2		
Palmer Lake		1	0	Aspen		1	0

Eagle County	1			Carbondale	1	0
Edwards		1	0	Pueblo County	33	
El Paso County	44			Beulah	2	1
Colorado Springs		36	3	Pueblo	21	6
Manitou Springs		3	2	Rye	2	1
Fremont County	5			San Miguel County	9	
Canon City		3	0	Mountain Village	1	0
Howard		1	0	Norwood	2	0
Penrose		1	0	Telluride	6	0
Garfield County	3			San Juan County	2	
Parachute		1	0	Silverton	2	0
Rifle		2	0	Teller County	5	
Gunnison County	15			Divide	1	0
Crested Butte		9	0	Florissant	1	0
Gunnison		6	0	Woodland Park	1	2
				Weld County	2	
				Brighton	0	1
				Greeley	0	1

Figure 3. Summary of written public comments generated between September 2005 and February 3, 2006, broken out by gender. For some comments, gender was unknown.

Male	405
Female	141

Figure 4. Summary of written public comments submitted between September 2005 and February 3, 2006; broken out by specificity of comment.

<u>Comments Focus</u>	<u>Public Responses</u>
General Statewide Comments	293
Arapahoe Roosevelt National Forests	33
Grand Mesa Uncompagne-Gunnison National Forests	250
Manti-La Sal National Forests	24
Pikes San Isabel National Forests	70
Rio Grande National Forest	36
Routt National Forest	29
San Juan National Forest	151
White River National Forest	32

The public on their e-mails, comment cards or letters in many cases checked numerous National Forests. A total of 625 responses were directed toward particular National Forests.

Forest-Specific Summaries of Public Comments Submitted Between September 2005 and February 3, 2006.

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

General Comments. 176 people commented on this particular forest, with the majority for 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 3 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:

130 comments for continued roadless area protection.

46 comments against continued roadless area 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

- 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
-

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

- 2 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...

- 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. 73 people commented on this particular forest, with the majority for 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:

57 comments for continued roadless area protection.

16 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 will 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 Mnt., Starvation Creek, Chipeta,
Mount Antero, Romley Roadless, Badger Creek
- 5 people indicated this has core habitat
linkages, preserve and keep watershed clean

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

100 people commented on this particular forest, with the majority for 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:

95 comments for continued roadless area protection.

5 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
- 2 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, 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 Juans 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...

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

Public comment to continue roadless area protection far outweighed public comment against continuing protection.

414 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

77 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

Under the general statewide response 43 people specifically indicated that they would like to keep Colorado beautiful, this is why people visit communities and support local economies.

Under the general statewide response, 25 people supported upholding protections granted under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, and 4 opposed upholding protections.

Under the general statewide response, 37 people specifically commented to allow current access to continue for off-road vehicles. In contrast, a few commented that opening pristine areas to a relatively small group of users (off-road vehicles users) would be a disastrously shortsighted approach.

Many also expressed concern about the closure of roadless areas and the perception that these areas were being sold off 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 February 3, 2006 by topic and by forest.

A. Energy

12 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

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.

63 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

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.

B. Wildlife/Habitat

6 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

143 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

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).

63 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

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

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 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>
0	0	0

84 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

- 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.

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

86 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

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.

32 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.

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

103 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

39 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
-		

26 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

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

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). 34 people commented specifically on this particular access issue.

83 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

Many people indicated that as avid motorized vehicle enthusiasts they help maintain trails in cooperation with the Forest Service, and asked that more roads are not 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 a few comments about keeping roadless areas open for ATV hunters (especially in Western Colorado).

135 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

31 comments: *Do not allow motorized recreation in roadless areas.*

-		
- GMUGNF	Pike San Isabel NF	San Juan NF
- 22	0	9
-		

- 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 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.

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

10 comments: Adequate roads exist; roads harm grazing.

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
5	2	3

Livestock cause erosion.

H. Commercial Timber

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
1	1	1

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
11	15	16

I. Wildfire

5 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

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	5	5

- 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.

J. Environment/Natural Landscape

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

<u>GMUGNF</u>	<u>Pike San Isabel NF</u>	<u>San Juan NF</u>
10	2	1

119 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

- 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.

-

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

- | | | |
|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| - GMUGNF | Pike San Isabel NF | San Juan NF |
| - 75 | 25 | 49 |

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