



Draft Agenda
Statewide Public Meeting – Denver
Roadless Areas Review Task Force
February 24, 2006
12:45 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.
Adams Mark Hotel, Grand Ballroom
1550 Court Place, Denver, Colorado

12:45 – 1:00 Welcome and introductions

1:00 – 1:25 Panel 1 – U.S. Forest Service (USFS)
10 minutes - Questions from task force

1:25 – 3:20 Panel 2 (15 minutes each)

- John Hickenlooper, Denver Mayor
- Nancy Warren, USFS Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species Program Leader
- Bob Cain, USFS Regional Entomologist
- Jim Goodyear, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Sara Duncan, Water Providers
- John Rold, Former State Geologist

25 minutes - Questions from task force

3:20 – 3:30 Break

3:30 – 5:00 Panel 3 (8 minutes each)

- Nancy Fishing, Forest Products
- Charles Bedford, The Nature Conservancy
- Myrna Johnson, Outdoor Industry Association
- Will Shaforth, Colorado Conservation Trust
- Sharon Lance, Trout Unlimited
- John Bartman, Colorado Woolgrowers Association
- Dennis Larratt, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Users Association

30 minutes - Questions from task force

5:00 – 5:05 Short Break

5:05 – 6:15 Public Comment

6:15 p.m. Adjourn

Public Meeting Ground Rules

RESPECT

- Refrain from clapping and jeering
- Keep to the time allotted (one minute)
- Use time for new perspective; do not repeat previous points



**Roadless Areas Review Task Force
Statewide – Public Comment Meeting
February 24, 2006
Denver, Colorado
Meeting Summary**

PANEL #1: FOREST SERVICE (FS)

Rick Cables, Regional Forester. Mr. Cables began his discussion with a reference to the 1905 Forest Service Manual, quoting that the purpose of management of the USFS lands was — “not for benefit of government but for the people.” He went on to describe his experience as Regional Forester in Alaska during 1999, when the Tongass National Forest Plan was signed five months prior to enactment of the roadless rule. The Tongass was one of the first forests on which the roadless rule played out. Mr. Cables characterized this as having created a divisive and polarized issue, and expressed his belief that Colorado can do better with how we end up. He asked the task force to bear in mind that this state has one of the strongest collaborative spirits. Mr. Cables went on to express his hopes for the process, including conducting an honest public process where the public is and feels heard, and one that is not driven by election cycles. He requested appropriate respect be given to land management plans, because they represent significant amounts of work. Finally, Mr. Cables expressed hope that the process leads to clarity and certainty on management of Forest Service lands in the near to mid-term, if not long term to effectively resolve conflicts related to roadless areas. He articulated that the Forest Service role in this process is to provide information and understanding on a complex issue and to not prejudice the outcome. Resolving the complex issues related to roadless areas has yet to fully succeed- it has been tried locally with forest plans, nationally in 2001, so now we are trying this at the state level..

Questions & Answers

Question: Is there flexibility/authority in the forest planning process to deal with fire suppression issues without extraordinary measures?

Answer: Yes. The Forest Plan process allocates or zones lands under themes. If we believe access is necessary for some purpose, the planning process can accommodate that. There is also an emergency mechanism which needs to be used judiciously.

Question: Is there flexibility with the overlay of roadless?

Answer: This depends on the language of the rule. There is much flexibility in this rule and Governor’s have great ability to shape that.

Question: How many acres are roadless in western co?

Answer: 2 out 3 acres in western Colorado are roadless.

Question: Is there sufficient policy and funding to reclaim temporary roads so that they disappear?

Answer: Forest Service is not advocating roads in roadless areas for fuels treatment. We can use Caterpillars to do the work. Temporary roads can be reclaimed/grown over. We can do that

on any timber roads with the exception of really steep slopes. In most cases there are ways to effectively reclaim those roads.

Question: Is certainty important?

Answer: I try to take perspective of communities. It is important to provide as much certainty as possible on what future will hold on those lands that are part and parcel of community. As much certainty as we can give them on lands management helps. From an internal standpoint, it is important to know how many biologists, foresters, mineral expertise is necessary in certain areas. If we know an area will be used for timber harvest, we can shape our organization accordingly. I think we owe communities as much certainty as possible in planning process.

Question: How did the pre-2001 rule process work - what worked and didn't in the past to help us in thinking through strategies?

Answer: Pre-2001 rule there was not much public dialogue about roadless. This indicates that public accepted what was determined in forest plans. When it became a national issue, it gave all parties an opportunity to talk about the issues. I cannot think of an issue from my past forest Service work that specifically dealt with roadless (of course we had issues that were peripherally related).

Question: How well will the forest plans be implemented: what is forest service's capacity to implement forest plans?

Answer: Forest Service has historically risen to the challenge and implemented the elements of the forest plans. The OHV issue requires help with enforcement. I am always concerned about how we deliver in the field, but am confident forest service will address the issues. The OHV rule was widely, nationally supported. We will need creative and innovative ways, including cross agency work to implement all the plans.

PANEL 2: STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Nancy Warren, Forest Service Threatened and Endangered Species Program Manager (*submitted hardcopy testimony*) – Nancy Warren spoke about the 21 federally listed threatened and endangered species that Forest service routinely manages for in Colorado, 13 of which are relevant to roadless areas (most are in riparian areas). She provided several tables, one table provided lists of the threats to each of the species and where these threats are applicable to national forests. Nancy reminded the Task Force that Forest Service is authorized to preserve and protect these species.

There are impacts and threats associated with roads for specific species (e.g., cutthroat trout could be threatened by stream sediment) - where roads are built, whether temporary or permanent, impacts are felt (e.g., venues for invasive species). For many of the species, the concerns are about non native invasive species, weeds, and pathogens. Treatment or vegetation management tools can be very beneficial and are of national concern, particularly invasive species controls.

Once the Task Force petition is submitted and if it is accepted, Forest Service will be required to conduct an analysis of the effects of any petition submitted on threatened and endangered species.

Questions & Answers

Question: What are species “not known or suspected to occur on National Forest Service land?

Answer: These are species that are not on Forest Service lands. but they are downstream and will be impacted by Forest Service action. Probably not relevant for your issue here.

Question: What do you mean by pathogens, what kinds of thing are included and how do they move.

Answer: Invasive weeds is a clear example. A particular fungus negatively effects boreal toad. It moves on peoples boots - when someone steps in a stream they can attach themselves to the boot. Then the person steps into a different stream and the fungus drops off to infest a new area.

John Hickenlooper, Mayor of Denver (*did not submit testimony*) – As a former geologist and someone who enjoys the outdoors, Mayor Hickenlooper articulated the benefits affiliated with the prospect of getting out into roadless areas. The frontier days are gone, but by protecting these lands we can create new frontiers, which is a huge element of our quality of life.

Mayor Hickenlooper communicated the importance of these areas to the Denver metro and the whole state for its residents’ enjoyment, for recruiting new businesses, and for the health of the population. Residents of Colorado enjoy opportunities to get out into the forests to help clear their minds to make better decision and gain inspiration. When he is recruiting businesses, Hickenlooper is often asked about schools and traffic followed by questions about the mountains and outdoor opportunities. The health of Colorado residents is fostered by the opportunities to get out and exercise, and this is demonstrated in the fact that Colorado is one of the thinnest states and Denver is the thinnest city in the country.

The mountains are part and parcel of the identify of Colorado and Denver’s character and its economy. Colorado has a \$200 million dollar a year industry in outdoor gear which is a great testimony to open spaces. Close to two-thirds of Colorado’s residents use roadless areas for recreation. Outdoor tourism brings people to visit, and sometimes inspires them to relocate. Hickenlooper warned that the economic benefit of excessive extraction is often only a fraction of what the economic value could be if properly measured.

Water is a significant issue for Denver and Colorado. Mayor Hickenlooper spoke of being interdependent on water and the need to remain mindful of the water situation. He also mentioned it is critical to recognize that a higher percentage of rainfall and snowpack infiltrate into groundwater in roadless areas. He also pointed out the probability of climate change and the need to focus on sustainability and how many of the issues are directly related to how we treat roadless areas and open areas.

In summary, Mayor Hickenlooper stated that how we treat our open spaces has much to do with how we look at ourselves, how we think about our role and what we are leaving for generations to come. He requested that the Task Force look closely at maintaining vital protections for roadless areas, including environmental and economic benefits.

Questions & Answers

Question: What is your perspective on Denver's watershed in relation to roadless areas?

Answer: A large percentage of Denver's water comes from watersheds on Forest Service land, or is influenced by this. Roadless and wilderness areas are powerful in so many ways and go a long way to limiting risk.

Question: What is your perspective on fuels treatment and management for disease?

Answer: Certainly there are times where remediation is necessary. You will have to struggle with how many roads are imposed on roadless areas. We should always try to err on the side of caution rather than trying to solve everything and perhaps deal with the consequences of someone else's solution.

Bob Cain, USFS Regional Entomologist (*submitted hardcopy testimony*) – Bob Cain reported that Colorado is currently experiencing bark beetle epidemics in much of Colorado's conifer forests – currently impacting 430,527 acres of lodgepole pine forests and 66,000 acres of ponderosa pine forest. There are also impacts from spruce beetle, Douglas fir beetle, and western balsam beetle. The number of acres impacted and the number of dead trees recorded has surpassed the record number since aerial surveys began in 1932.

Mr. Cain outlined some of the influences to susceptibility to bark beetles: stand conditions, weather conditions and bark beetle populations in the area. He also outlined the best, long term strategy for managing bark beetle is to increase diversity across large homogeneous areas by creating a mosaic of age classes across the landscape, using management tools that mimic the way a stand reacts to natural fires can increase the vigor and diversity (e.g., thinning or partial cutting, clear cutting lodgepole).

He identified other bark beetle strategies which included: sanitation – removing or treating infested trees, this does not require roads; trap logs – use green trees to attract and concentrate spruce or Douglas Fir beetles which are then destroyed by milling or peeling (this does not work for pine beetle); pheromones – anti-aggregations pheromones have been effective for Douglas fir, yet inconsistent for pine beetle; preventative insecticides – around homes; and salvage – removal of dead trees.

Because of the sensitivity of roadless issues and the time it takes to complete the necessary environmental documents, the Forest Service has been conservative about entering roadless areas for insect related concerns. Yet, Mr. Cain warned that entering roadless areas is likely to be an increasing issue in wild land/urban interface areas where beetles are creating a fuel threat to people and property. Communities such as Steamboat Lake, Grand Lake and Vail, adjacent to roadless areas, are dealing with dead and beetle infested trees.

Mr. Cain concluded by saying that being able to evaluate insect populations and stand conditions on a case by case basis would be helpful in managing bark beetle impacts

Questions & Answers

Question: Almost all of our major conifer species are experiencing bark beetle infestations. Will this cycle pass?

Answer: We are definitely having forest management done by beetles. A tremendous percentage of the forest are old age stands. Greater age diversity in stands helps temper future outbreaks. If you look at the Williams Fork outbreak in Grand county, and the only green stands you will see are those that were clear cut years ago and are now young stands not attractive yet to the mountain pine beetles.

Question: Would the infestation map look different if there wasn't hesitation to get into roadless areas?

Answer: This addresses the capacity of management and ability to do things on large scale. One would probably see some local difference, but it would be unlikely to see differences on a wide scale outbreak. There may be examples of management in roadless areas where roads need not be built. In Grand county, behind the Shadow Mountain community, adjacent private lands are providing access to remove trees in a roadless area.

Jim Goodyear, Colorado Division of Wildlife (DOW) (*did not submit specific testimony*) – Jim Goodyear communicated that the DOW has significant interest in the outcome of this public review process. DOW's mission is to protect, preserve, enhance and manage wildlife and wild life habitat for the benefit of the people of Colorado and its visitors.

Lands that are traditional building blocks of our economy as recreation and tourism are the fastest growing industries in the state today. These lands need also to provide essential wildlife habitat. Inventoried Roadless Areas provide significant habitat and have helped Colorado become a world class destination for fishing and hunting.

Mr. Goodyear reminded the Task Force that DOW management emphasizes protecting threaten and endangered species, big game, upland game, and hunting/angling opportunities.

Aquatic, terrestrial, and species conservation specialists have recommended that roadless areas be protected and managed to benefit wildlife. Management of these areas tie into economic advantages. Currently, Inventoried Roadless Areas lands are managed for multiple uses that benefit from fewer roads. This management approach has provided public benefits through prohibiting grazing and mineral extractions.

Relative to DOW's understanding of 2001 rule, DOW asks that the Task Force consider whether the concepts in 2001 rule may be sufficient to satisfy the task before them. Conservation of wildlife habitat is essential. Forest Service lands are essential to our way of life. Issues continue to be challenging as needs and demands grow and diversify. Roadless areas are valued by the public and their characteristics need to be maintained.

Questions & Answer

Question: How does DOW recommend roadless areas, critical to wildlife and threaten and endangered species, be managed for catastrophic fire?

Answer: Sometimes roads do make a difference. In the Hayman fire, it jumped a three lane road.

Question: What was the methodology used in compiling the DOW report distributed to the Task Force on 10 February 2006?

Answer: Each forest is at different points in their plan revision processes, so DOW staff and field comments will not be consistent across forests. The assumption about the methodology is that the field staff considered GIS data and their personal and professional knowledge and observations.

Sarah Duncan, Denver Water Department (*submitted testimony electronically -see appendix B, and hardcopy maps and photos, see appendix for testimony only*) – The Denver Water Board is a municipal corporation that supplies water to one out of every four people who live in Colorado. Denver Water’s supply is dependent on water generated within the boundaries of watersheds located on Forest Service and other public lands.

Ms. Duncan noted as interesting the fact that no one mentioned the RARE II process. She mentioned that one of the reasons some inventoried areas were not included in RARE II was because of water issues. Forest Service’s organic act include two goals – to reserve to the public forests land and resources and the other was to protect watersheds.

Denver Water is neither pro nor anti roadless. Ms. Duncan identified three road issues that affect Denver Water: 1) the need for access to water facilities on forest land; 2) protection of the municipal watershed from degradation caused by fire and attendant erosion; and 3) assure forest, and therefore watershed, health by limiting the adverse consequences of roads.

Generally, Denver Water has had great cooperation with Forest Service on access and response to catastrophic fires. The effect of fire on Denver’s water system varies, but overall the result is one of degraded water quality. For example, approximately twenty miles of the South Platte River is now subject to soil erosion that has severely reduced water quality, increased stream turbidity, and diminished reservoir capacity. This has proven to be true from the six fires that have occurred in the South Platte River basin since 1996 that caused detriment to burned forest soil and foreign debris in the water system. The cost of mitigating these fire impacts to date is in excess of \$9 million with all costs to be paid by our customers.

Ms. Duncan reflected that existing roads were built for different purposes – to construct and maintain conduits, dams, reservoirs, ditches, diversion structures and siphons. These roads continue to be use to repair and replace critical elements of Denver Water’s system.

Denver Water’s concern is that those areas that while they are not officially designated as roadless, they are treated by public land managers and federal rules as such, and this will make future water development impossible in locations where Denver Water has held right for generations.

Denver Water has a right of way in the Frasier Basin in an inventoried roadless area and hasn't been able to move forward. Denver Water is not blameless, but this is an area we could use some help.

Denver Water is concerned because watersheds on forest land have been decimated which creates a terrible situation for Denver water - degraded water quality, sedimentation and surface debris..

Ms. Duncan concluded by saying that roadless areas are important to watersheds. This is proved by the fact that areas where a watershed is adjacent to a designated Wilderness area, the health of the watershed is seldom in question. Where you have conflicting uses, there needs to be some acceptable way to address what needs to occur. Every citizen of Colorado drinks water everyday. Water development needs to continue; protection of watersheds is critical.

Questions & Answers

Question: The 2001 rule allows for water rights development, what example do you have where this was not allowed?

Answer: Williams Fork could not be developed because of roadless area designation. The 2001 rule allows for but does not mandate access. We need pipes to get water and we haven't been able to use roads because of wetlands issues in roadless areas, just off of right of way.

Question: Please describe the string of fires on South Platte, these cooperative efforts you undertook after buffalo creek and the scope of crisis and immediate aftermath of the Hayman fire.

Answer: The Hayman was the most difficult because it moved so fast and blackened Cheesman reservoir. Denver owns 8000 acres that did not burn because the State and the Forest Service had thinned and removed fuel.

Question: Describe more about the importance of limiting roads and their adverse consequences to watershed and forest health protection.

Answer: Roads bring people into the forest, which can cause damage. The Hayman fire was caused by people. If there are no roads then there is no risk of man made fires. Roads adjacent to streams can create sediment and other problems; consider that maybe not all those roads are necessary. Think about whether remediation can be done, the use of the road and if it can be located elsewhere.

John W. Rold, former State Geologist (*submitted testimony electronically, see appendix C*) – John Rold presented his remarks as private and informed citizen. As a prior state geologist and Director of the Colorado Geological Survey, Mr. Rold was involved in the designation and boundary changes of numerous Wilderness areas. He focused the Task Force on the importance of adequately evaluating the mineral and other resource potential. Mr. Rold remarked that the roadless areas decision is the largest and most important decision to be made in his lifetime. He warned that there is not enough time for the Task Force to review the enormous amount of available data before the deadline.

Mr. Rold advanced the concept of “multiple sequential land use,” which supports the Forest Service 1900s mission for “multiple uses of the land’s resources.” This concept means phased land use – for example, original phase I was wildlife habitat and grazing, phase II may be/may have been mining, phase III might be reclamation for wildlife habitat and grazing.

His observation and experience showed that exercising legal rights of access is frustrating, lengthy and frequently leads to lawsuits, even though the Roadless Rule makes exceptions to prohibition of road construction when a road is needed in relation to current mining leases.

Factors Mr. Rold outlined to be considered in roadless designation include: location and density of inholding parcels; mineral claims, patents or leases; location of active and abandoned mining activities; oil and gas leases and production; mineral resource potential information; critical wildlife habitat; current and projected commercial timber and forest health; current and future water development facilities; current and future power lines; current or future needs for oil, gas, or water pipelines and aqueducts; current or future communication facilities; and potential unmitigable environmental impacts.

He commented that few realize the major economic impact of designating lease-able mineral resource areas as Roadless. In 2005, The Colorado Geological Survey indicated that Colorado produced \$10.3 billion of mineral values. In the last year Colorado produced an estimated \$800 million worth of coal. Much of the \$253 million paid by producers in the form of taxes and fees will be distributed to local governments and school districts. Therefore, without discovery and development of new resources within the 4.4 million acres of Roadless areas, we will lose much of that income stream. Economics should not be the overriding factor in the Roadless decision making, but the monetary values are so large that they should be seriously considered.

Mr. Rold observed that coal resource areas are pretty small overall and reclamation of these areas in northwest Colorado has been successful. Undiscovered natural gas deposits/potential occupies less than 5% of statewide inventoried acres, so the actual footprint of disturbed areas would be less than 1%.

John recommended that judicious designation of a relatively few of the several hundred inventoried tracts and 4.4 million acres designated as multiple use, would allow recovery of a significant amount of our mineral resources which would incrementally benefit local communities, local businesses, local governments and ultimately the consumers in our society with only a small impact on wildlife and other environmental resources.

Questions & Answers

Question: What are the four large coal reserves you mentioned and are they leased now or are they future projects?

Answer: They are in Somerset, North Fork. Part of land is leased and part has been difficult to access.

PANEL 3: INVITED STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Nancy Fishing, Forest Products Industry (*submitted presentation slide, hardcopy*) – Nancy spoke broadly about the timber industry and its use as a forest management tool. Today’s timber sales are used as a vegetative management tool to manager for fire and insect salvage, fire risk and fuels reduction, protect wild land/urban interface and habitat improvement. Timber industry assesses topography, cover type, big diameter, aspen, lodge pole, and spruce. The forest products industry position is that the National Forest management process needs flexibility. They believe the 2001 rule reduced flexibility originally found in forest plans. Because no one can predict emerging forest health issues, flexibility is the solution and forest plans provide that context-sensitive flexibility.

The forest products industry has declined over the last decade. Remaining companies use modern, low impact, highly efficient equipment and timber projects can be designed for access with or without roads. Logging provides a cost effective tool for management on public lands. Forest Service is challenged to maintain a sustainable level for the industry to continue to work on forest management issues. The question is: Should the Forest Service or timber industry be paid to carry out timber management activities?

The Forest Product industry embraces identifying and protecting appropriate wilderness areas in Colorado. We support policies that enable viable and sustainable timber management in appropriate areas. Finally, we support using Forest Plan Revisions to identify roadless areas needing protection and those needing flexibility for management.

Charles Bedford, The Nature Conservancy (*submitted hardcopy testimony*) - TNC is dedicated to preserving the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. TNC has more than 1.1 million individual members and 30,000 in Colorado. TNC has purchased or established conservation easements on more than 14 million acres in the U.S. and Canada and owns one of the largest private systems of nature sanctuaries in the world. We urge the Task Force to ensure that recreation, commercial and commodity opportunities are compatible with the conservation of natural values. We cannot control where species and ecosystem occur on the land, but we can control the placement of the human footprint.

The Nature Conservancy has conducted detailed ecological assessment across the U.S. These assessments reveal a high correlation between areas without roads and areas important for the protection of biodiversity. Large expanses of unfragmented forests and other ecosystems are important to biodiversity values because: large patches are generally healthier-more resilient, and can better support a broad diversity of species; many important species in Colorado require large and relatively undisturbed habitat; they provide necessary sanctuaries and seclusion for wildlife during sensitive portions of their life cycle (lack of disturbance during sensitive parts of a life cycle can be critical for a species’ existence); and these areas are critical for species at risk of extinction.

Question: if public lands are a focus for threatened and endangered species management, does it lessen load on private landowners? Burden of compliance with ESA.

The introduction of new roads can lead to a domino effect of negative consequences. Impact of roads on biodiversity includes habitat fragmentation (leading to decrease in species diversity, increased mortality, reduced genetic exchange and lower densities of species), introduction of invasive species (roads are one of the first points of entry) and increased water pollution (roads, cutbacks and ditches represent a significant source of sediment which leads to decreases in fish density, loss of winter carrying capacity, and increased predation).

The Task Force needs to consider prescriptions that are tailored to the plants, animals and systems that occur in each area; one size does not fit all. It is crucial to maintain areas without roads to keep our forests healthy.

Myrna Johnson, Outdoor Industry Association (*submitted hard copy testimony and reports*) – OIA is a national trade association whose mission is to ensure the growth and success of the outdoor industry, including leading manufacturers, distributors, supplies and retailers of outdoor recreation equipment and services, as well as other related businesses. In 2002 Colorado residents spent \$2 million on outdoor merchandise. Residents and visitors will continue to contribute to the Colorado economy only if Colorado continues to offer high quality recreation destinations.

OIA was an active participant in the Forest Roads Working Group – an advisory committee formed to seek common ground about the uses of roadless lands and provide guidance to the Administration on forest health. OIA also researched and published a report that gave an overview of roadless areas in the U.S. The report found that 58.5 million roadless acres in the U.S. generate \$600 million in recreation benefits each year and provides 24,000 jobs (Report distributed to Task Force members, “Protect Today, Play Tomorrow”).

OIA’s Outdoor Recreation Participation Study found that 76% of Coloradoans participate in human-powered outdoor recreation. And a recent survey conducted by Colorado State Parks concluded that a Colorado residents’ first choice for an outdoor destination are wilderness and undeveloped areas for hiking, camping, fishing, climbing, backcountry skiing, paddling and wildlife viewing.

During the past 50 years, recreation has clearly emerged as the greatest use of Forest Service lands and the primary driver of the National Forest economy. OIA’s State of the Industry Report (provided to Task Force members) found that recreation opportunities are more important than ever as Americans battle the inactivity crisis and resulting health care costs. The report also found that the best way to get people active is to make recreation accessible, for example the Arapaho-Roosevelt national Forest’s Cherokee Park Roadless Area, just north of Fort Collins. Another area in the Arapaho-Roosevelt is Herman Gulch in the Clear Creek Ranger District.

OIA strongly supports the continued protection of all Colorado’s Roadless areas.

Will Shaforth, Colorado Conservation Trust (*submitted hardcopy brochure/report*) – The Trust is focused on the increasing pace and effectiveness of conservation projects. We also do capacity building with existing organizations. There are a few trends the Task Force should consider:

- Population growth – Colorado is expected to grow 100,000 people per year for next 25 years in state.
- Landscape effects – there is a greater emphasis on rural subdivisions.
- Increased conflicts on urban/wildlife interface.
- Level of public support for conservation in Colorado. The Trust did an analysis of attitudes from 1991 - support for conservation remains above 75% across the board; across the board a statewide value.
- Colorado has one of the strongest commitments to open space values in the country. Great Outdoor Colorado (GOCO) accepted private land donations that exceeded \$100 million dollars/year.
- Strong infrastructure in the state maybe the best conservation tax credit programs in the country.
- 46 private land trusts at work in virtually every community in the state, as well as local governments has left us with a strong set of outcomes.
- Colorado is ranked third in country for the amount of protected lands.

Mr. Shaforth suggested that the Task Force also pay attention to where those protections that occur at the urban interface and to where conservation easements abut roadless areas - understand the goals, so you can factor for this in recommendations.

Sharon Lance, Trout Unlimited (*submitted hardcopy testimony*) – As President of Trout Unlimited, an organization of 10,000 members, Sharon asked the Task Force to advise Governor Owens to submit to the current administration to keep roadless areas “roadless”. Roadless areas account for only 6% of the state. These areas are home to almost all of Colorado’s renowned trout fisheries and critical habitat for three native cutthroat trout – the Greenback, the Rio Grand and the Colorado River cutthroat. For example 76% of Colorado’s greenback cutthroat streams flow through roadless areas. Only back country streams have been able to sustain these native fish since they require clean, cold water. We want to safeguard these native fish populations which are fragile and necessary to reestablishing native trout across the state.

Roads and trails are known to be a source of erosion that deposits sediment into streams. The sediment: covers gravels necessary for successful spawning; smothers aquatic insects which trout eat; reduces the depth of streams which fish need to survive the summer – when streams become shallow, temperatures rise and fish die. Culverts are also a problem, creating barriers.

Forest Service currently faces a \$68 million dollar road maintenance backlog. Poorly maintained roads increase acceleration of erosion and sedimentation. Maintenance of current roads needs to be addressed before considering any new roads.

There is strong public support for roadless areas. More than 90% of nearly 100,000 comments were in favor of preservation 5 years ago. We must preserve and protect these lands for the people of Colorado. Roadless areas provide peace and solitude in a state that is growing by leaps and bounds.

John Bartmann, Colorado Woolgrowers Association (*submitted email testimony, see appendix D*) – Mr. Barmann began by noting that historic range populations have used grazing

allotments as an important component of maintaining the health and vitality of our National Forest, including reducing fuel load, stopping the spread of invasive species, and helping regenerate pine seedlings and recycle vital nutrients back into the soil after a fire. Sheep are a unique and important land management tool for large landscapes.

The Colorado Woolgrowers Association recommends the Task Force support responsible, multiple-use of our federal lands and the activities identified in the Forest Service Allotment Management Plans. In order to maintain a proper grazing program that benefits the environment, livestock, and wildlife, ranchers need all types of access (trucks, ATVs and/or horseback) to maintain fences and watering facilities. Curtailing access to allotments greatly increases operational overhead. There is a net positive outcome from grazing allotments, including preserving open space and wildlife habitat, and reducing fuel loads. Managed grazing allotments are not contributing to the degradation of over-use of our national forests.

Dennis Larratt, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition (COHVCO) (*submitted hardcopy testimony*) – COHVCO represents 200,000 members and tens of thousands of out of state tourists who use motorized recreation to enjoy Colorado's forests. Members recognize the diverse interests and need of all forest users. COHVCO recommends the Task Force submit to Governor Owens that IRAs be released from IRA status, and allow management by the Forest Service using the Forest Plan and Travel Management planning processes. These processes are well established, require detailed analysis, involve environmental assessments, public input, administrative reviews and provide for appeals if errors are made.

The Task Force doesn't have time or resources to adequately review or do a thorough analysis of all the lands under consideration, nor consider expanding areas beyond the 2001 IRAs.

Mr. Larratt asked the Task Force to acknowledge that roadless areas are not without roads; while some roadless areas don't have many. COHVCO support the 11,000 acres Forest Service has recommended for wilderness designation (from the 4.1 million acres). Further, Mr. Larratt noted that there are no roads or trails open exclusively to motorized recreation. Of the approximately 14,000 miles of trails on Forest Service Lands: one-third are in Wilderness areas; one-third is off limits to motorized use; and one-third is managed for multiple-use (including non- and motorized recreation).

Questions & Answers for Panel 3

Question – Forest Products – Are there big enough timber resources to meet demand?

Answer: We have been declining in size over past 10-12 years as Forest Service projects have been shrinking. We could double our capacity tomorrow, but there needs to be a demand for more projects. Over 12 million acres worth of projects have been through NEPA processes for treatment, but have not been offered for sale. Timing and money have blocked progress.

Question – COHVC – Do you understand that when we are talking about roadless we are not talking about motorized recreation?

Answer: I believe roadless area designation is precursor to wilderness designation. There is no reason to keep lands in an IRA if they are not designated for wilderness. Forest plan could manage the differences.

Question – COHVCO, Forest Products and Conservation Trust- One size doesn't fit all. With respect to deferring to forest management plan revision process-would it be acceptable if an individual forest made a determination that all IRAs should be managed as roadless? If so, would it be acceptable if Forest Service determined that all roadless areas should be managed to protect their roadless character in their respective Forest Plans and what is the difference between Forest Service deciding this and the Roadless Areas Review Task Force?

Answer: Yes, it would be acceptable if the Forest Plan determined that all IRAs should be managed as roadless. The difference between the Forest Service deciding and the Task Force is that no panel, legislative or executive branch should micromanage. The Forest Plan revision processes work with stakeholders and is a well established process. The Task Force does not have the wherewithal to do detailed study and general recommendations may be good for some areas but not all areas.

Question – Forest Products – Is it possible to get specific information on where timber activity needs road building?

Answer: This could be done a case by case basis, but not with a general rule like the 2001 rule. The Forest Plan revision process can do this better than a general rule.

Question – Colorado Conservation Trust – Is there a central location for information about where roadless areas are adjacent to ranches or conservation easements?

Answer: There is no single source, but Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) is a good place to start. We have to gather the information for many places. This is a large data gathering effort including a multiplicity of local, state, and national organizations. John Swartout, Executive Director of GOCO and a Task Force member added that some of the data gathering has been done, but GOCO and Colorado State University have looked at protected lands on private land. The purpose was to provide a tool for planners and land trusts on what lands were high priority and let our constituents make that decision. In process now, and we already have lots of information.

Question – Colorado Wool Growers Association – Are you familiar with any interference with grazing allotment plans and roadless areas?

Answer: Conversion of roadless in Medicine Bow National Forest. When stocking supply camps we can use trucks. In those areas where we are restricted we have to use pack horses, which increases our overhead and labor costs. Many of these allotments are tied to private property. Property value would decrease without the allotment.

Question – Colorado Woolgrowers Association - There is no universal roadless area policy in place right now in roadless areas. If there is a restriction on grazing allotment within an IRA, isn't it coming from the forest plan?

Answer: The permits are renewed 10 years, annually. If an area has become roadless when the permit comes up for renewal, the permittee is allowed to renew but will have to use pack horses instead of trucks.

Question – The Nature Conservancy – How could the Task Force follow up with more detailed information

Answer: Mr. Bedford will put the Task Force in contact with the CSU program. Their master plan is an ecological assessment that reflects what nature remains, what threatens it and what least cost method is available to address the threats.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

People signed up to speak (62 signed up, 45 were called, 41 were present and spoke). Topics addressed included: recreation (motorized, hunting, fishing, bicycling, hiking), multiple use, access for - mineral resources and recreation for families including elderly and handicapped, support of/protection of current roadless areas, support for returning lands to Forest Service management/Forest Service planning processes, watershed health, economic value of roadless areas, future generations, impact of roads, population pressures, and wildlife and critical habitat values.

The comments are recorded in summary and reflect major issues, concerns, major themes, specific locations and specific actions.

The following are the speakers, their place of residence and a few of the key issues and locations they touched on:

1. John Bongiovanni, Arvada, CO - environmentally conscious OHV enthusiast...worked with the interagency workshop that conducted research and collaboration with special interest groups regionally...recommend release of IRAs and return their management to Forest Service
2. Gary Spring, Denver, CO – bicyclist...endorses roadless area conservation...roadless areas are key to mountain biking economy, tourists come from outside and inside Colorado...the goal is to be in places that are not logged, or mined
3. Gene King, 4 Wheel Drive Clubs, Denver, CO – also on the BLM Resources Advisory Council...there are roads in roadless areas...keep areas open to multiuse...return roadless management to Forest Service
4. Pat Stucker, Parker, CO – fourth generation Colorado native...GMUG in particular...worked for years on an area that is roadless and open to multiple use
5. Vera Smith, Colorado Mountain Club, Golden, CO – Colorado Mountain Club, with 10,000 members recommends protection of roadless areas...the value is in un-roaded forest, they create experiences recreationalists seek - natural forests without sights and smells of cities...they provide economies to rural areas... public comment periods to date have overwhelmingly supported protecting roadless areas
6. Valerie Douglas, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition, Thornton, CO – recommends releasing lands back to Forest Service-they have the expertise and staff to deal with on the ground issues...stick to the 4.4 million acres and not additional areas

7. Logan MacMillan, Colorado American Institute of Professional Geologists, Centennial, CO – support the minerals maps provided to the Task Force on February 10th...concur with John Rold, the former state geologist...
8. Judy Moore, Colorado Springs, CO – protect wildlife...OHV user that has volunteered for restorations...multiple use includes all uses...handicap can now go into the forests...motorized recreation allows for cross generational recreation...allow Forest Service, Forest Plans and Transportation Plan to manage forests
9. Olivia Filipek, Denver, CO – 40 year Colorado resident... protect roadless areas for humans and wildlife ...crucial to protect areas free from development...concern for wildlife killed on roads...dwindling wildlife because no sanctuary...prefer hiking in roadless areas
10. Dan Miller, Golden, CO – Colorado native...motorized user...support protection of wilderness because there is too little wilderness and too many roads...need to protect wilderness from the pressures on all sides...don't want to see this state be any more overrun by people
11. Sharon Stackhouse, Indian Hills, CO – native Colorado...multiple user...motorized use is the only way some can enjoy the Colorado back county...motorized users have the least access to public lands...support access to all areas for multiple use...the key is awareness, education...protect lands for our children and not from our children...keep more roads open to accommodate outdoor recreation demands
12. Bob Averill, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, Arvada, CO – second generation Colorado native...recommends to return the issue to Forest Service for resolution in the Forest planning process
13. Beverly Agy, Wheatridge, CO – OHV user...public lands are public for everyone, for all types of users...must be available for everyone
14. David Parkes, Denver, CO – public educator...has experience in many National Forest Roadless areas around the state...roadless means open lands, untouched unspoiled; opportunities to see the last great natural places...there is power and grace in the quiet enjoyment in the untamed lands...do not further desecrate these areas...future generations need to be able to experience wild roadless lands
15. Tony Mattern, Littleton, CO – there is a human equation of being here...we are part of the equation...Forest Service does a terrific job...turn the lands back to Forest Service management
16. Josh Budimlyja, Colorado Springs, CO – Colorado resident...president of the Rugged 4 wheel drive club...all members enjoy coming to CO to recreate...it is not hard to find places that are away from the roads...roads are the destination, away from the cities is the destination, road don't need an end point...recommend fewer roadless areas
17. Elise Jones, Colorado Environmental Coalition, Denver, CO – conservation organization with 150,000 members...there is overwhelming public support for protection of roadless areas...in the past 5 years, Coloradoans submitted 96,000 comments in support of roadless areas protection...the reasons include – favorite places to recreate, drinking water, economy and the most important reasons is for future generations enjoyment of the areas
18. Brandon Hargrave, Colorado Quad Runners (OHV), Littleton, CO – third generation Coloradoan...OHV users are here to enjoy areas that can only be accessed by motorized vehicles, not to destroy...support FS management of lands

19. Ed Robinson, Lakewood, CO – support multiple use...encroaching development creates increased pressures...recommend expanding the concept and implementation
20. Meriel Drummond – fourth generation Coloradoan...recommend protection of the National Forests...in the Grand Valley you can see development has changed the experience...there is a huge impact on the environment and animals...think of our forests as an asset...optimizing our land means keeping it clean and roadless
21. Roderick Mead, Wheatridge, CO – vice president of rampart range motorcycle club...excuse the OHV community being gun-shy, they have learned through experiencing trail closures to be cautious...there is no clear-cut OHV language in the rule...further generations should enjoy OHV opportunities
22. David Bongioranni, Arvada, CO – passionate OHV user...concerned there will no access to experience forests with a motorized vehicle...recommend giving lands back to Forest Service mangement
23. Steve Green, Littleton, CO – it is possible to enjoy the forests without conflicts with other uses...when compared to the impacts of ski resort expansions, motorized user create less impacts, although both use fossil fuels...identify the true roadless areas before changing the rule or land status
24. John Rosapepe, Denver, CO – recommend supporting roadless areas as designated in 2001 rule...concerned about trout and water and more roads would cause problems...there are 16,000 miles of roads in Colorado forests...as a fish biologist I have seen impact of roads on fish through sedimentation build up
25. Elizabeth Lehmkuhl, Boulder, CO – have hunted elk in White River National Forest...road closures closed old camp, new camp includes travelers from all over...all appreciate revenues from out of state hunters...gas prices impacted the number of out of state hunters...support and encourage preservation of roadless areas to protect the world class hunting and fishing opportunities in Colorado
26. Jim Stanley, Fort Collins, CO – good to have areas with no motorized vehicles, but don't take away motorized use everywhere...both motorized and non-motorized use can occur...animals are as disturbed by motorized vehicles they are disturbed by hunters
27. Calvin Gane, Johnstown, CO – never had a problem finding back county areas without roads...there are less motorized trails than before...protect the beauty and wildlife of the state and the critical wildlife areas...protect access for elderly, children or folks with limited time to the National Forests
28. Rodney Lucero, Lakewood, CO – a Colorado native...recommend turning lands back to Forest Service, they can make the most educated decision about managing the lands...there are responsible OHV users...it is a great way for families to enjoy the National Forest...there are less available places to ride
29. Paul Moore, Denver, CO – a 40 year resident of Colorado...support roadless areas...healthy forests have less roads...balance short term profit of adding roads for extraction with long term benefits to residents and wildlife of not adding roads...restoration promises are not always implemented
30. Ann Bunnell, Audubon Society of Greater Denver, Littleton, CO – the Audubon Society recommends maintaining roadless areas in the 2001 rule and those additional areas recommended by citizen groups...concern about invasive species and degradation of water sources...create sustainable enjoyment and not boom/bust extraction cycles

31. John Schreck, Wayne, PA – is a Colorado native living in Pennsylvania...back county recreation is important to my family, particularly the Grand mesa National Forest...my family travels back to Colorado for motorized trips...without motorized use my family would not be able to experience all there is in Pike and San Isabel and San Juan National Forests
32. John Keables, Denver, CO – a 76 year Colorado native...recommend Task Force give some priority to roadless areas established in first inventory and consider that those areas have been designated non-motorized areas...consider past decisions and apply them to the future...the idea of just turning the lands over to the Forest Service needs to consider Forest Service is understaffed...don't give up the vision of roadless areas to Forest Service...roadless areas are good for a buffer zone...important to economies, general welfare and health of rural communities
33. Edward Lariviere, Golden, CO – need to be fiscal responsible...if there is a backlog of roadless maintenance why create more...wilderness areas are restricted, but roadless areas you can get in there and not see folks for days
34. Adriana Raudeens, Sierra Club, Boulder, CO – Sierra Club is the oldest and largest environmental organization with 800,000 members (24,000 in Colorado)...protect roadless areas as is roadless...while doing two seasons of research/monitoring of air and water we would have to toss any sample taken if someone drove up to the site at over 15mph because the samples would be too tainted...oil & gas companies are making record profits while residents are paying more to heat our homes and drive our cars
35. Dianne Orf, Colorado Mining Association, Denver, CO – there are high coal resources in GMUG - they are deep resources which means some minimal surface disturbance would be needed...the necessary roads would be minimal, temporary and completely reclaimed
36. John Movius, Milehi Snowmobile and Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition, Highlands Ranch, CO – Denver resident and owns property up in Grande Lake...a wildlife watcher, hiker, fisherman, snowmobiler...I am multiuse tax payer...consider multiuse enthusiasts and allow access for all outdoorsmen...if surround areas with roadless areas then effectively cut off those areas...recommend release roadless areas from IRA status and returned to Forest Service Forest Planning process and the Transportation Management plan
37. Joyce Hoskins, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition, Littleton, CO – recommend roadless areas be released form IRA status and returned to FS and under Trans Management Plan...as a senior citizen I enjoy Colorado's recreation opportunities through motorized use... environmental impacts will be lessened by allowing more use (dispersed)...keep trails open
38. Judy King, Lakewood, CO – there are irresponsible hunters and motorized users breaking rules and being loud... the only way to stop irresponsible use is to restrict access
39. Susan Jones, The Wilderness Society, Denver, CO – the Wilderness Society has 5000 members in CO and 150,000 members nation wide...consider the devastating impacts of roads on the landscape...poorly maintained networks lead to downstream issues...Forest Service already has a road maintenance backlog...we have ample roads now...protect roadless areas as roadless, as an asset for wildlife and water
40. Rebecca Dicksen, Boulder, CO – fourth generation Coloradoan...the state has changed significantly in her father's life time...the west is the last place for wilderness to flourish...recommend protection of roadless areas

41. Jeff Williamson, Golden, CO – release lands back to Forest Service management...I have not seen rule violators...concerned about road closures...many of the off-road clubs volunteer their time to help maintain the roads they use...law enforcement/emergency response needs to have a way to get into the back county...encourage returning lands to FS management

Note: based on the time allowed not all who signed up spoke.

Appendix A – Summary of Comments

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Number of responses:	51		
Number of CO residents	50		
Number of non-CO residents	1		
Responses by forest	General Comment	40	78%
	Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests	8	16%
	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison National Forests	7	14%
	Manti-La Sal National Forests	2	4%
	Pike-San Isabel National Forests	10	20%
	Rio Grande National Forest	3	6%
	Routt National Forest	3	6%
	San Juan National Forest	3	6%
	White River National Forest	4	8%
Responses by topic of concern	Social and Economic Value	22	43%
	Special Designations	12	24%
	Recreation Management	21	41%
	Natural Resource Management	30	59%
	Other: (see below for specific responses)	16	31%

Comment Themes

Please note that any single comment may touch on more than one of the comment themes below and is recorded as such.

Comment Themes Indicating a Preferred Action	Number of Responses
Defer to 2001 Rule/Preserve Roadless Areas	37
Defer to Forest Management Plan	1
Retain Non-Motorized Recreation	10

General Comment Themes	Number of Responses
General	4
Public Involvement/Collaboration and Decision-Making Process	1
Environmental Emphasis	21
Multiple Use Management Emphasis	1
Special Designations	4
Job Creation/Economic Stability of Rural Communities, States, and the Nation	12
Legacy Values	13
Quality of Life	9
Use of Roadless Areas to Promote or Subsidize Industry	9
Reallocating Costs of Roadless Area Development to Meet Other Needs	1
Other Social and Economic Values	4

Responses by Topic of Concern: Other, please specify

1. Abundant wildlife, clean water and air, open space
2. Conservation
3. Conservation
4. Conservation of all roadless areas
5. Interconnected responsibility
6. Maintain existing roadless areas (and expand)
7. Maintain roadless status
8. Preservation
9. Preservation of all roadless areas
10. Protecting these roadless areas from further development
11. Protection of wilderness
12. Travel management
13. Water, streams
14. Wildlife
15. Wildlife habitat preservation
16. Wildlife management

Appendix B – Sara Duncan, Denver Water Testimony
TESTIMONY OF SARA DUNCAN
COORDINATOR OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
FOR THE DENVER WATER BOARD
1600 West 12th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204-3412

COLORADO ROADLESS AREAS REVIEW TASK FORCE
February 24, 2006

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you to address the important issue of forest roads and municipal water supply. The Denver Water Board is a municipal corporation that supplies water to one of every four people who live in Colorado. Denver Water's supply is dependent on water generated within the boundaries of watersheds located on Forest Service and other public lands. Denver's water system gathers diffuse surface flows originating on public watersheds and moves the water to treatment plants and drinking water systems sometimes located as much as 80 miles from the water's origin.

The organic act that created the United States Forest Service had two major goals. One was to reserve to the public forest land and resources and the other was to protect the watershed, including water for municipal purposes. It is the second of these basic goals that I wish to discuss today.

There are three basic road issues that affect Denver Water on Forest Service land. The first is the need for access to water facilities on forest land. The second is to protect the municipal watershed from degradation caused by fire and attendant erosion. The third road issue is to assure forest, and therefore watershed, health by limiting roads their adverse consequences. Our views on these issues do not allow us to be simply characterized as "road" or "no road" proponents.

First, Denver Water has benefited from being allowed to use public land for water supply. The handout maps show the integral features of Denver's water supply, water delivery and forest and other public land management. Many of the roads shown on the maps were built by Denver Water in order to construct and maintain conduits, dams, reservoirs, ditches, diversion structures and siphons. These roads continue to be used to repair and replace critical elements of Denver Water's system. The maps illustrate that existing roadless areas do not interfere with our water operations. We cannot however, speak for other water systems.

Of more concern than existing roadless areas is a fear that areas not officially designated as roadless, but treated by public land managers and by federal rule as roadless, will make future water development impossible in locations where Denver water has held rights for generations. Gold areas outlined in the maps are designated inventoried roadless areas, but not designated as roadless, overlap future Denver Water development areas as outlined in purple. It is unclear whether some of these proposed facilities will be allowed to move forward in areas treated as roadless without official designation as such. There are many areas where future conduits or pipelines cross identified roadless inventory. For example, in the Williams Fork River Basin, Denver Water owns a right of way over federal land to extend the existing Williams Fork

project. Due to several factors, including de facto roadless designation, Denver has been unable to use the right of way or the associated water rights owned by Denver.

Second, roads are important in forest management to prevent, control and remediate damage from fires. Since 1996 Denver Water has been the victim of six fires in its Upper South Platte watershed, a major water supply source for Denver Water. The effect of these fires on Denver's system has varied, but the overall result is one of degraded water quality. For example, approximately twenty miles of the South Platte River is now subject to soil erosion that has severely reduced water quality, increased stream turbidity, and diminished reservoir capacity due to decrement of burned forest soil and foreign debris from the fires. The cost of mitigating fire impacts to date is in excess of \$9M with all costs to be paid by our customers. Denver Water will spend at least \$10M beginning in 2007 in order to dredge fire-caused sediment in Strontia Springs Reservoir. In order to provide you with a sense of fire damage to water quality, I have included a several pictures of Denver's system before and after remediation.

In order to maintain the physical integrity of water and of water collection systems, it is imperative that public lands are not subject to the fires that so frequently occur in our watersheds. To that end Denver Water supported the federal Healthy Forest Initiative with an emphasis on forest thinning and land treatment with the cooperation of the Forest Service, the land owner and the state. Due to the nature of the thinning equipment, some roads are necessary, especially to remove the cut timber and brush. Additionally, once a fire has burned in a watershed, roads may be necessary in order to implement meaningful erosion controls. These controls may include straw bales and log sediment dams, tree contour and directional felling, hydro-seeding and mulching, salvage and rock sediment dams. Denver Water is not advocating more permanent roads, but some temporary and ultimately reclaimed roads for forest management are essential in order to protect watershed and forest values.

Third, Denver Water acknowledges the great importance of roadless areas for public lands. Some roads make it easier for human activity resulting in catastrophic damage to watersheds. Fire, as discussed above, is the most dramatic example. Harm to ecosystems may also be caused by vehicles that do not stay on roads or by human-created conditions harmful to wildlife and plants. In those areas where Denver Water's watershed is adjacent to a designated Wilderness Area, the health of the watershed is seldom in question.

Fourth, it is impossible to analyze roadless issues on behalf of all water users. Nonetheless, rather than ask for specific areas to be roadless, this Task Force could identify conditions that indicate whether roads are needed. Naturally the Task Force will want to address its own issues, so the following are only suggestions of issues worthy of consideration prior to permanent designation of a roadless area:

- Protect the watershed by limiting points where sediment can degrade rivers, springs and wetlands.
- Respect water rights and attendant facilities. Identify areas that require maintenance, repair or replacement in order to continue water collection. Allow continuance of existing roads, but certainly consider imposing conditions to protect the watershed.
- Allow roads for development of conditional water rights, but identify roads needed for construction only and require those roads to be reclaimed as part of any development plan.
- Remove land from roadless inventory or a Forest Management Roadless Plan when there is a conflict of use. It is difficult to prescribe a roadless designation on land

identified for future water development when water rights and even federal rights of way have been granted.

- Encourage public land managers and water supply agencies to work efficiently in identifying both needed roads and roads that could be reclaimed.
- Encourage water suppliers to evaluate their conditional water rights for feasibility and yield.
- Encourage temporary roads for healthy forest activities, such as thinning and fuel removal. Temporary roads may also be useful for remediation on fire-damaged area in order to control sediment and to protect water quality and watershed values. The time is long past when roads need to be considered a permanent feature of any forest. Once roads have served their purpose, remediation is a legitimate and enforceable goal.

It is hoped that a list of conditions could be applied in the future in order to allow land managers, water suppliers, and other interested parties to discuss the importance and practicality of roadless areas prior to designation.

Again thank you for allowing Denver Water to testify on this important issue.

Appendix C – John Rold, Former State Geologist Testimony

ROADLESS REVIEW TESTIMONY (2/24/06)

John W. Rold

INTRODUCTION

I appreciate the Task Force's invitation to furnish mineral resource potential information and recommendations on Colorado's National Forests Roadless Inventory process for your consideration. My name is John W. Rold. I live at 2534 S. Balsam St., Lakewood, CO, 80227. Ph. 303 985 1996, Email Jwrold@aol.com. Although I belong to several wildlife and conservation organizations as well as several geological organizations and I have discussed the matter with various individuals, I submit this material as a private, and I believe, informed citizen. My efforts were redoubled when I read Federal Register/Vol. 70. No. 92 / May 13, 2005 Page 25656 which stated "***Every comment received is considered for its substance and contribution to informed decision making, whether it is one comment repeated by tens of thousands of people or a comment submitted by only one person.***" (Bold indicates my emphasis.)

The following indicates my experience and knowledge of the subject. As the State Geologist and Director of the Colorado Geological Survey from 1969 to 1993 I advised decision makers on the designation and boundary changes of numerous Wilderness Areas. During that time my staff and I became involved in most of the significant and controversial land use issues in the State. Raised on a ranch west of Salida I have hunted big game and fished in national forests during much of my life. Most of three summers while in high school and after I returned from the Navy, I worked for the Forest Service in the old Cochetopa Forest now renamed Pike-San Isabel. Research and field investigations as State Geologist and later for various clients took place in and near various Forests. I have attended and led several professional geological field trips through many of the Forests in Colorado.

I became interested in the Roadless Review process because I believe it is the largest and most critical land use decision to be made in my lifetime and I was concerned that the consideration of the mineral and other resource potential of the area would not be adequately evaluated.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

My observations of the press coverage and conversations with hunting and fishing sportsmen, environmentalists, USFS personnel and retirees, DOW retirees and personnel, and ATV and 4WD enthusiasts indicate that **the growing proliferation of illegal roads forms the major support for Roadless designation.** Most agree that **this problem could be mitigated by a vigorous program by the USFS and DOW of blockage and reclamation, education and enforcement.**

The Federal Register/Vol. 70, No. 92, May 13, 2005 Page 25655 sets a high hurdle for the Task Force when it states “*The State petitions under this final rule must include **specific information and recommendations on the management requirements for individual inventoried Roadless areas within that particular State.***”

Because of the mountains of information in the literature and submitted by government agencies and the conflicting interests of the public, the extremely short time frames force the Task Force into an almost insurmountable task. There is hardly time to properly evaluate the conflictive data you will receive. It's almost like a thirsty man attempting to drink from several fire hoses at once.

It appears to me that the Task Force will have difficulties meeting the requirements and the deadlines unless it schedules additional and longer meetings.

The varying scales of maps available to the public and the poor definition of boundaries between adjoining parcels make it very difficult for members of the public who do not have GIS or Autocad capability to adequately evaluate individual tracts. I am certain the Task Force members will experience the same problems as they attempt to evaluate specific inventoried tracts. The Task Force should require that any maps submitted as testimony show at a legible scale the inventoried parcels and their numbers, Forest boundaries, USFS administered lands not inventoried, Wilderness Areas, inholdings and sufficient culture that one can locate and accurately identify the parcels.

Some of the Forests are in varying stages of their Forest Planning process. This appears inconsistent to me. What will occur if the Task Force and Governor designate a tract as multiple use and a near future Forest Plan designates the parcel as Roadless or vice versa?

At the last Task Force meeting the Forest Service alluded to “Themes” as classifications for various levels of allowable activity. How does this fit the Task Force evaluation where it appears it has only two choices-Roadless or multiple use?

I support the Task Force decision made at their last meeting to not consider additional parcels nominated now but not included in the USFS Roadless inventory. The late consideration now would be unwise. It would be difficult for governmental agencies and the public to timely determine the location of and make reasonable comments on them.

Roadless designation allows new road construction under several exemptions. It does not allow any new road construction for future oil and gas exploration or development, power and telecom transmission facilities, commercial timber harvest or oil, gas or water pipelines. Roadless designation therefore essentially forecloses such activities. Even under multiple use designation such activities are already heavily regulated by USFS and State agencies.

Legally defensible boundaries should be established between Roadless designated lands and multiple use designated lands that can be described in text, shown accurately on maps and be readily recognized on the ground. If not endless controversies will arise.

The Roadless Rules make an exception to prohibition of road construction when a road is needed in relationship with current mineral leases on lands. “The outstanding rights exception also includes **rights of way under R.S. 2477 and rights granted under the Mining Law of 1872. 66 Fed. Reg. at 3255**”. Regrettably several people have told me that exercising those legal rights of access and road building involve a complicated, expensive, lengthy and frustrating process. Extensive and expensive lawsuits arise from conflicts arise over this language (Stupak-Thrall vs United States), to the detriment of private parties.

Ever since establishment of the Forest Service in the early 1900s the Service’s mission has been “Multiple uses of the land’s resources”. The Roadless Rule with its numerous restrictions appears to depart from that longstanding mission.

I much prefer the land use concept of “Multiple Sequential Land Use”. It could be applicable to many lands being considered for Roadless. A good example of multiple sequential land use would be a coal strip mine in northwest Colorado. The land’s original phase was wildlife habitat and grazing. Mining then developed the second stage, resource recovery. Reclamation then created the third stage of wildlife habitat and grazing which had better productivity for wildlife habitat and grazing than did the original ground. Many of the lands inventoried for Roadless if they were designated multiple use, could go through a resource production phase of varying lengths of time for minerals, oil and gas or commercial timber resource extraction and then return to the current use.

At the last Task Force meeting the question was raised concerning whether a rancher could have access if a bulldozer were required to repair a ditch or head gate. He was told that he would be allowed to walk a bulldozer into the location. I believe those bulldozer tracks would be an open invitation for an ATV or 4WD pickup to follow them and pioneer an illegal road. I believe this situation would be better handled if the area were designated multiple use and the rancher were allowed to build a private road under USFS specifications with a lockable gate to prevent access by others.

DISCUSSION OF THE MINERAL RESOURCE POTENTIAL CONCEPT

Many feel that additional mining can not occur in Colorado. They feel that all the mineral deposits have been discovered and mined out. That belief is unfounded. Granted prospectors and explorationists have combed the area for the last 150 years. However, they have only looked at the surface and shallow near surface. Except for uranium, explorationists have only discovered two significant mineral deposits where they were not led to the discovery by surface indications. They were the Henderson Mine near Empire and the Bulldog Mine near Creede. In other words, except for uranium, the discoveries of all but two of the significant mineral deposits in Colorado depended on the conditions exposed by the present level of erosion. If geologists were to wait until another 200 feet of rock were removed by erosion, there is no telling the number of additional deposits that would be revealed.

Whereas we can not wait for millions of years, the future discoveries will depend on geologic projection of surface data, geophysics, geochemistry and exploratory drilling of the clues seen on mineral resource potential maps such as those prepared on five of the Forests.

Geologists prepare mineral resource potential maps using the best available geologic information, geophysical information and geochemical data. They then compare these results with similar models constructed from similar information derived from developed deposits in similar geologic environments. The maps do not show specific deposits or even prove that they exist. However, they do portray areas and geologic features where conditions are favorable for certain mineral deposits to occur.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN ROADLESS DESIGNATION

Many factors should be carefully considered by the Task Force before it designates a tract as Roadless.

These include but are not limited to:

Location and density of inholding parcels; Are they homesteads or patented mining claims that provide clues to deeper or adjacent mineral deposits?

Mineral claims, patents or leases;

Location of active and abandoned mining activities;

Oil and gas leases and production;

Mineral Resource Potential information;

Critical wildlife habitat;

Current and projected commercial timber and forest health;

Location of recent timber sales;

Current and future water development facilities;

Current and future power lines;

Current or future needs for oil, gas, or water pipelines and aqueducts;

Current or future communication facilities;

Potential un-mitigatable environmental impacts;

Which of the above have legal rights to future access?

The lack of or inadequacy of the above data should require that the tract be designated for multiple use and managed as such by the Forest Service until such information is available. Roadless designation would be difficult to change but management and withdrawal of Forest lands is standard practice.

IMPORTANCE OF MINERAL PRODUCTION

Few members of the public realize the major economic impact should the leasable mineral resource areas be designated as Roadless. The Colorado Geological Survey indicates that in 2005 Colorado produced **\$10.3 billions of mineral values**. Regrettably there is no breakdown as to what percentage of this derived from original patents of Forest Service land and what came from other private or State lands. Production from mines and oil and gas fields naturally declines and ultimately ceases. Therefore without discovery and development of new mines or oil and gas fields within the 4.4 million acres of inventoried Roadless, we will lose much of that income stream and consumers will not receive the benefit of using those resources. Except for current mineral claims and leases, Roadless designation forecloses any new leasable mineral exploration on Roadless inventoried lands.

Coal provides one economic example. At least four of the State's largest coal mines abut Roadless areas and their growth and existence depends on using those lands. Last year Colorado produced an estimated **\$800 million worth of coal** (*Colorado Coal Fact Sheet, Colo. Mining Assoc. and Colorado Geological Survey Mineral and Mineral Fuel Inventory Report, 2005*). The coal industry employed **2,116 employees** with a **payroll of \$184,647,792**. Coal producers paid over **\$8 million in property taxes**, nearly **\$10 million in severance taxes**, nearly **\$8 million in Abandoned Mine Land fees**, and nearly **\$42 million in Federal and State royalties**. Much of this revenue will be distributed to local governments and school districts. Yes, the Roadless designation of many of the tracts would have a high price tag for workers, local businesses, local governments and the State of Colorado.

Many people considering minerals only look at the quantities produced and do not evaluate the societal needs and benefits to the consumer public. The Mineral Information Institute has published per capita consumption quantities of those energy commodities that could be produced in Roadless Areas only from currently held leases. Their data indicates that the typical family of four annually consumes 4,280 gallons of petroleum; 29,692 lbs. of coal; 289,402 cubic feet of natural gas and one lb. of uranium. One can determine the total annual consumption in Colorado by multiplying the per capita consumption numbers by the 4.3 million population of the State. Consumers in Colorado annually use: 4.6 billion gallons of petroleum; 319 billion lbs. (1,596 million tons) of coal; 310.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas and 1,075, lbs. of uranium.

Economics should not be the overriding factor in the Roadless decision making but the monetary values are so large that they should be given serious consideration. The Federal Register / Vol. 66. No. 9 January 12, 2001 Page 2368 admitted "*Exploration for and development of leasable*

minerals (such as oil, gas, coal and geothermal) on areas not already under lease would likely be limited because roads are often needed for these activities. In the short-term, up to 546 direct and 3,095 total jobs could be affected, with direct annual income effects of \$36 million and total income effects of \$128 million. Payment to states could be reduced by about \$3.2 million per year.”

The same Federal Register stated “*Between 308 and 1,371 million tons of coal resources on the GMUG and Manti-LaSal National Forests could be unavailable for development as a result of this rule.*” If one takes **849 million tons**, the average between their two resource estimates, and multiplies it by the current approximately **\$17 per ton price** for that coal, the result is **\$14.4 billion lost** if the parcels are designated Roadless. Much of that would have gone to State and local governments.

The above cited Federal Register also stated “*An estimated mean of 11.3 trillion cubic feet of undiscovered natural gas and 550 million barrels of undiscovered oil resources could also be affected.*” My investigations indicate that the word “**would**” should be substituted for the word “**could**” in that sentence.

These numbers might be more meaningful to decision makers if they are converted to dollars. Multiplying the 11.3 trillion feet of gas by this week’s price of **\$7.18 per Mcf** (thousand cubic feet) results in an amount of **\$81.1 billion cost** of Roadless designation. Multiplying the 550 million barrels of undiscovered oil by last week’s price of **\$59.88 per barrel** results in additional cost of Roadless designation in the amount of **\$32.9 billion**.

USFS numbers show a nationwide total lost opportunity cost of Roadless designation for mineral resources alone **could be as much as \$128 billion**. That would not pay off the national debt but would have a major impact on the economy of Colorado and the Nation.

One should also recognize that coal resources quantities and location are known with a fair degree of accuracy. Statewide the coal resource occupies a very small percentage of the inventoried area. Surface coal mines can readily be reclaimed so most of the disturbed area would be reclaimed in a few years. Even though the location and certainty of undiscovered oil and gas are less certain than for coal, the areas of possible undiscovered oil and gas occupy in the neighborhood of only 10% of the statewide inventoried area. The actual footprint of disturbed areas would be even less.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN ON TRACTS NOT DESIGNATED ROADLESS

The land would still be controlled and managed by the USFS and various State agencies. Wildlife and fisheries would still be managed by the Division of Wildlife. Forest management for fires, disease, beetle infestation, invasive species and selected timber harvest could be accomplished without special dispensation of permits. Illegal roads would still be illegal. Existing and future illegal roads could be addressed by **blockage and reclamation**. New illegal roads could be decreased or prevented by a program of intensive education **and enforcement**. Endangered plants could be avoided or mitigated. Endangered animal species could be avoided or their habitat mitigated. Some areas could be explored for oil, gas and leasable minerals after permitting by the Forest Service and Colorado Mined Land Reclamation (CMLR) or Colorado

Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC). If unsuccessful, roads and drill pads would be reclaimed. If successful, the development would be permitted by the USFS and the COGCC and CMLR. Necessary access roads permitted by USFS, drill pads or disturbed sites ultimately would be reclaimed.

If any of the above discussed activities foresee significant environmental impact they now and in the future would require an EA (Environmental Assessment) or an EIS (Environmental Impact Assessment) before permitting. This would prevent the environmental degradation envisioned by some. Resource extraction technology and practices such as directional drilling and closed circuit operations are improving and ensure reduced environmental impact. Companies' culture and environmental awareness are improving.

SUMMMARY

Designating appropriate tracts as multiple use would incrementally benefit local communities, local businesses, local governments and ultimately the consumers in our society. I firmly believe that a judicious designation of a relatively few of the several hundred inventoried tracts and 4.4 million acres as multiple use, would allow recovery of a significant amount of our mineral resources with only a small impact on the wildlife and other environmental resources.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Rold

Appendix D – John Bartmann, Colorado Woolgrowers testimony

The Keystone Center
Attn: Roadless Area Review
1628 Sts. John Road, Keystone, CO 80435

February 1, 2006

Re: Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force

The Colorado Wool Growers Association (CWGA) represents a broad range of sheep operations from across Colorado. Many of these historic ranching operations have utilized Forest Service grazing allotments for decades. Grazing allotments are an integral part of western range operations and are an important component of maintaining the vitality of our national forests. Managed grazing can reduce hazardous fuel loads and the spread of noxious weeds. In the wake of forest fires, sheep grazing can help re-generate pine seedlings, and recycle vital nutrients back into the soil. Sheep are a safe, natural, and effective alternative to chemicals; and are an important land management tool for large landscapes.

The CWGA advocates for responsible, multiple-use of our federal lands. The Roadless Areas Review Task Force recommendations should support the activities identified in the Forest Service Allotment Management Plans. Allotment Management Plans are developed as a result of careful consultation between local Forest Service staff and the owners of the allotments. In order to maintain a proper grazing management program that benefits the environment, livestock, and wildlife; ranchers need access (via trucks, ATV's and horses) to their livestock, allotments, trailing routes, fences, and watering points. Curtailing access greatly increases overhead costs for our land stewards.

The utilization of grazing allotments results in a net positive outcome for the Forest Service, ranches, and local communities. The broader benefits include preserving open space and wildlife habitat for everyone to enjoy; as well as reducing fuel loads to help minimize the impact of forest fires. Managed grazing allotments are not contributing to the degradation or over-use of our national forests. While we recognize management parameters may need to shift to address issues in certain high-use areas; these changes should not negatively impact the use of grazing allotments by Colorado ranchers.

In closing, we would like to thank the members of the Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force for their time and commitment to this project.

Sincerely,

John Bartmann
CWGA President

CC: Jeff Eisenberg, PLC Peter Orwick, ASI Terry Fankhauser, CCA
Bonnie Kline, Executive Director, Co. Wool Growers Association, Co. Sheep & Wool Authority,
8833 Ralston Road, Arvada, CO 80002, 303-431-8310, 303-431-2156 fax, 303-638-0596c;
5268 2000 Road, Delta, CO 81416, (970) 874-1433, (970) 874-4170 fax