

Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force

Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Public Meeting

CSU, Lory Student Center

Fort Collins, Colorado

March 17, 2006

AGENDA

5:00pm Welcome

5:10pm Panel 1

***Jim Bedwell**, Forest Supervisor, Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest*

5:50pm Panel 2

***The Honorable Ben Pearlman**, Chair, Board of Commissioners, Boulder County*

***Jim Goodyear**, Colorado Division of Wildlife*

***Dawn Packard**, Headwaters Trail Alliance*

6:40pm Panel 3

***Roz McClellan**, Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance*

***Valerie Douglas**, Vice Chair, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition*

***Mark Morgan**, Morgan Timber Products*

***John Woodling**, West Slope Water Network*

***Greg Mazu**, Diamond Peaks Mountain Bike Patrol, Boulder Mountain Bike Alliance, International Mountain Bicycling Association*

7:40pm Break

7:50pm Public Comment

8:45pm Adjourn



**Roadless Areas Review Task Force
Fort Collins – Public Comment Meeting
March 17, 2006
CSU, Lory Student Center
1101 Center Avenue Mall,
Fort Collins, Colorado**

Meeting Summary

PANEL #1: FOREST SERVICE (FS)

Jim Bedwell, Forest Supervisor, presented information on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest (A-R) and the inventoried roadless areas.

General Information on the Arapaho-Roosevelt

- 1.5 million acres of federally managed lands
- Ranks among the top forests nationally for year-round recreational use
- Includes Colorado's first designated Wild & Scenic River
- Surrounds Rocky Mountain National Park
- Urban National Forest – nearly 29 million visits annually and a full range of multiple use management (eight times the visits at Rocky Mountain National Park); and many houses within Forest boundaries
- Key issues:
 - o Heavy demand for water resources and infrastructure;
 - o Fire and fuels management
- History of mining in the forest has led to a lot of roads and land fragmentation
- Timber harvest has been above the allowable limits due to pine beetle infestation

Revised Forest Plan

- Plan revision was completed in 1997, providing the current roadless area direction, and provides direction until the plan is revised, anticipated to be in 2012
- Plan revision was formulated through an extensive 5 year public participation and interdisciplinary process
- Next plan revision process will begin as early as 2008
- 330,200 acres of roadless were analyzed in 1997
- 8,551 acres were recommended for Wilderness
- Remaining 321,649 acres were allocated to management areas with varying degrees of permitted road activity

Roadless Areas

- Analysis for roadless designation considered: location, size, type of wilderness in the vicinity, recreation use trends and effects on recreation opportunities, wildlife, ecosystems, biodiversity values, potential sanctuaries for species with an inability to survive in less than primitive surroundings, and the effect on management flexibility

- 380,700 acres of roadless (includes changes since 1997 revision)
- 34% of A-R National Forest is Wilderness, Special Protection, or Category 1&2 areas
- Most of the 1997/2001 inventoried roadless areas remain unroaded at this time
- 39% is managed with a non-development emphasis (category/theme 1 & 2)
- 38% is managed with limited management activities (category/theme 3)
- 23% is managed with an emphasis on development (category/theme 4, 5 & 8)

Differences between 2001 Rule and Forest Plan

- Forest Plan direction allows new uses within some portions of roadless areas, if consistent with management area direction and after appropriate environmental analyses
- 2001 Rule does not necessarily allow for new uses, particularly those which require new road construction
- Existing uses (under permit) are provided for under Forest Plan and 2001 Rule
- Timber harvest: some is allowed or limited in the Forest Plan, none is generally allowed under the 2001 Rule
- Road Construction: some is allowed or limited in the Forest Plan, none is generally allowed under the 2001 Rule
- Existing permitted uses: allowed under both
- Approval of new uses with infrastructure: some is allowed in the Forest plan, none is generally allowed under the 2001 Rule

Jim Bedwell provided an example of a fuels reduction project to protect private lands and increase firefighter safety. The project was highly controversial because it was in a roadless area adjacent to a subdivision. It took 2 years to plan the project, including the public involvement processes. There was local support for the project. Due to the projects' proximity to private lands, no roads or landings were required to be constructed in the roadless area.

Mr. Bedwell concluded by stating that the challenges facing an urban forest require management flexibility to respond to situations quickly and changes over time.

Panel #1: Questions & Answers

Question – What are the impacts of the beetle infestation; what were the areas hardest hit?

Answer: The most impacted areas were on the west side of the divide, the Sulphur ranger district, Winter Park, Frasier, Granby and into the Stillwater area; predominantly lodgepole pine forests

Question – Do the roadless areas have roads?

Answer – Based on the best information FS has, there are 15 miles of closed roads (administration roads) and 6 miles open roads (West of Ft. Collins) and 23 miles of motorized trails (under 50 inches wide).

Question – Why was the fuels reduction project presented controversial, while having local support?

Answer – There is always controversy when entering roadless because of the potential effects, even if there is local support.

Question – How did the 2001 Rule affect the Forest Plan?

Answer – The 2001 Rule, had it remained in effect, would have taken precedence over the Forest Plan.

Question – Do categories 1, 2, & 3 allow grazing?

Answer – Yes, grazing is allowed in category 1, 2 & 3.

Question – Does the Forest Plan allow for treatment and commercial timber harvest?

Answer – The Forest Plan allows treatments based on management area allocation. Generally, categories 1 and 2 do not allow vegetation treatment, category 3 is limited, and categories 4, 5 and 8 allow for vegetation treatment.

Question – What are the allowable reasons for road construction?

Answer – The Forest Plan has prescriptions for road density, but does not direct specific roads or restrict any roads. Roads are allowable for recreation access and fuels reductions.

Question – Would the 2001 Rule reduce flexibility? Were roads built in the fuels reduction project presented?

Answer – No roads were built during the presented project. The 2001 Rule has some ambiguous language (“imminent threat of catastrophic event”) over which arguments of interpretation can be waged. The wrangling over interpretation makes it difficult to act.

Question – How long would it take to plan a similar fuels reduction project in a non-roadless area?

Answer – If focused on specific uses, a plan could be done in under a year. It was the challenges with treating a roadless area that took 2 years.

Question – What was the public’s primary objection to the fuels reduction project?

Answer – The primary issues were about entering an inventoried roadless area.

Question – How much area is closed to motorized recreation?

Answer – Less than half the roadless areas are closed to motorized recreation.

Question – Would motorized recreation be limited under the 2001 Rule?

Answer – Motorized use is general discouraged in the 2001 Rule, the exception is for maintenance of facilities. If the 2001 Rule were reenacted FS would need to be more cautious; there would be pressure to be more cautious, even if that is not the letter of the law

PANEL 2: STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Boulder County Commissioner, Ben Pearlmen (*no submittal*) – Mr. Pearlmen provided copies of the resolution from Clear Creek County that supported protection of all inventoried roadless areas for recreation uses, wildlife habitat and quality of life values those areas provide. There is a similar sentiment in Boulder.

Boulder County includes Rocky Mountain Park and James Peak Wilderness area. The southern part of the Arapaho-Roosevelt forest has been historically heavy with mining. This history left behind many roads and land fragmentation. There are enough roads; no new ones need to be built. The northern part of was left mostly undisturbed (e.g., Button Rock Area) and contains the only river drainage without an accompanying road. In the north there is also a designated Research Natural Area, which is a higher level of protection than Wilderness. The last remaining sheep heard is in the Button Rock Area.

The concern expressed went to protecting and maintaining roadlessness; large areas, that create more buffers, and allow for better research. The historic road building has left little areas unroaded and those areas need greater priority and protection.

Boulder has a strong open space program and continues to purchase inholdings to ensure there are large tracts of land (federally and locally owned).

Road impacts watershed and water quality; sediment is the number one water quality problem. Boulder water comes from sources in the Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest. Jamestown's water source runs along county road 102J which creates water quality problems.

There were three fires before February; all of them were started by human action/inaction. There is great concern about opening up new areas to potential human activity that leads to fire.

There is an innate value of the landscape and roadless areas in Colorado. It is what draws visitors and new residents to the state. There are several specific areas of interest, to protect as roadless: Niwot Ridge ecological site, Iron Clads above Raymond, upper middle Saint Vrain, north and south of Brainard Lake, Caribou Ranch Open Space.

Colorado Division of Wildlife, Jim Goodyear (*submitted hard copy spread sheet of DOW/USFS tasks and document answering previously asked Task Force questions*) – In answer to some previous questions, Mr. Goodyear explained that DOW has been working with FS on habitat improvement, weeds, and fuel reduction (25 projects). Mr. Goodyear also clarified that 77 DOW managers were involved in the DOW report distributed to the Task Force on February 10th (also posted on the DOW website).

DOW is directed to protect, preserve, enhance, and manage wildlife. One difficulty is overcoming the belief that on public lands anyone can do anything. Mr. Goodyear

reiterated the recommendation that the inventoried roadless areas be maintained and managed for wildlife habitat, and when managed for other priorities that impacts to wildlife are lessened. The emphasis is on maintaining current protections and management.

As the world has grown it has become more complex and continually changes. As population grows there is higher demand for multiple use recreation in National Forests. DOW support sustainable yield concept – manage activities and wildlife habitat for “no loss”. DOW believes in managed activities; gone are the days of unregulated activities (e.g., a fish license in 1906 was one page, now there are 77 pages of fish regulations).

Dawn Packard, Headwaters Trail Alliance (*no submittal*) –The Headwaters Trail Alliance is a non-profit organization that represents Grand County on issues regarding trails and access to public lands. Member entities include the town of Winter Park, Frasier, Granby, Hot Sulfur Springs, Grand Lake and others. The Headwaters Trail alliance strives to represent all trail and public lands users and work toward balanced use; a fair spectrum of uses on public lands.

The life blood of Grand County’s economy is recreation. The economy is driven by access to public lands. Big game hunting brings \$1.5 million to local communities and 20,000 jobs, of which Grand County has a large share due to its excellent elk hunting opportunities.

The concern expressed was degradation of pristine lands and watersheds due to short term resource extraction and roads. This is not just an economic issue; it is also connected to the quality of life people are looking for in a community. It is important to maintain the integrity of the lands that exist currently.

Panel #2: Questions & Answers

Question - DOW – What are the specific details on threatened and endangered species in connection with roadless areas – not limited to, but particularly lynx and greenback cutthroat trout?

Answer – The Task Force can request a specific DOW person to speak directly to threatened and endangered and critical species. DOW can pull out each species from the priority wildlife map

Question – Boulder Commissioner and Headwaters Trail Alliance – How involved were you in the 1997 Forest Plan revision? Are you satisfied with how the FS is managing roadless areas under the Forest Plan?

Answer – Commissioner Ben Pearlman - was not involved in the plan revision, but is generally satisfied with how FS is managing roadless areas under the Forest Plan. FS is working in the right direction in managing challenges with urban, Front Range activities. BLM has been working with Boulder to sell some of their holdings to plug holes and create consolidated blocks. The concern is about wildlife and plants that make up the web of life.

There was input, in 1997, from the Headwaters Trail Alliance member counties, but the Alliance was not yet fully formed at that time. Grand County seems satisfied with how roadless areas are managed. The concern is loss of access and increased roads in roadless areas.

Question – DOW – Where is the DOW field report for the A-R?

Answer – A-R report is in progress. DOW intends to distribute the report following this Fort Collins public meeting and before the Task Force’s April deliberative meeting.

Question – Boulder Commissioner – Is there a Boulder County resolution?

Answer – Boulder will develop a resolution and provide it to the Task Force.

PANEL 3: INVITED STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Roz McClellan, Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance (*submitted hard copy testimony and report*) – Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance supports protection of communities and homes and the possible need for building temporary roads for fire management. Important resources in the A-R are recreation and water. Clear Creek and other watersheds supplies water for Golden and Denver and other Front Range communities. Recreation in the A-R is a world class draw – 6.7 million visitors a year; second most scenic corridor; two 14,000 foot peaks with bike trails; 1500 year old pine grove; the highest roadway; famous biking trails; mushroom hunting; naturally occurring ice sculpture; rafting on the Cache de le Poudre River and more. These recreational attractions support our tourism economy.

Motorized use decisions are made in a different forum than the roadless area discussion. Ms. McClellan’s understanding of the 2001 Rule is that there is nothing said about recreation on trails in roadless areas. In fact, there are snowmobile and ATV trails in roadless areas.

Valerie Douglas, Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition (COHVCO) (*submitted electronic & hard copy testimony, see appendix B*) – Ms. Douglas is Vice Chairman of COHVCO, a member organization of 200,000 Colorado off-highway users. COHVCO recommends all inventoried roadless areas be released from roadless status and returned to FS management under the Forest Plan and Travel Management Plan. Forest planning and travel management processes are well established and require detailed analysis, environmental assessment, public input, and administrative reviews. COHVCO recommends the Task Force not expand roadless areas beyond the current inventoried areas because there is not enough time or money to conduct an adequate analysis of potentially new areas. The Task Force needs to recognize the current existence of roads and trails in roadless areas and recommend continuation of their multiple use management status.

The American population is growing. In Colorado, OHV registration increased by 9.14% from 2004 to 2005. In 2005, 143,600 OHVs were registered (including snowmobiles) and

an additional estimated 250,000 street legal four wheel drive vehicles. This means that one in eleven people in Colorado own an off-highway vehicle. These users contribute \$500 million to the Colorado economy.

Roadless areas are already protected by current forest plans and should not be viewed as precursor to Wilderness designation. Current roads need to be maintained for search and rescue access, fire mitigation, and fuels removal.

“Stay on the Trail” and Colorado Trail Patrol programs promote proper user ethic and responsible recreation that keeps wheels on the trails. These programs use highly trained volunteers to observe and educate the public for FS, BLM and the State. Currently, the patrol is comprised of 52 members.

National OHV policy was enacted in November 2005, which provides a forum for addressing OHV use issues. Roadless areas should be released from roadless status and returned to Forest Plan and Travel Management plan processes and direction

Mark Morgan, Morgan Timber (*submitted hard copy testimony*) – Morgan Timber does forest management contracting, logging, road building, sawmilling and fence manufacturing. Mr. Morgan started working as a logger to fund his college education and spent summers to fighting forest fires. He is also an avid big game hunter, fisherman and hiker and horse rider. Mr. Morgan’s perspective has shown him it is critical to make decisions locally; not one size fits all. Land use decisions need to consider the future needs of the community.

Colorado’s forest products industry employs about 2,500 loggers, truckers and mill workers and creates a gross product in excess of \$50 million annually. Secondary wood products manufacturers employ another 5,200 Coloradans, bringing the industry’s annual economic value to over \$750 million.

Roadless areas are under-managed (e.g., for insects and fuels); an easy way to do no management. Healthy forest management benefits wildlife, protects watersheds, and reduces fire fuels. FS need the flexibility to manage the forest effectively. The timber industry can be an effective tool to manage the lands and forests.

Mr. Morgan recommend the Task Force allow roadless area decisions remain at the Forest Planning level which respects the role of the State, local communities, affected stakeholders and the people of Colorado in decision making.

The 2001 Rule is extremely restrictive; a road may not be constructed or reconstructed in a roadless area and timber may not be cut, sold, or removed (except in narrowly defined circumstances). FS avoids projects in roadless areas due to the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement which is expensive and time consuming. Decisions in roadless areas are also most likely to be appealed or litigated.

Mr. Morgan recommends FS update its roadless inventory to be in line with the original intent (considered for wilderness) and if lands are not eligible for Wilderness designation remove them from roadless status. FS should also complete an accurate inventory of truly roadless areas, and not include areas with historic timber harvest and existing roads. FS needs the flexibility to implement management projects in roadless areas to meet forest health, forest rehabilitation or reforestation needs. A few examples include: East and West White Pine which are surrounded by homes and represent a large wildfire risk; areas adjacent to Comanche Peaks Wilderness area have over mature lodgepole pine and are at high risk of wildfire and pine beetle infestation; and Green Ridge East and West are totally surrounded by previous management activities, partially roaded and at high risk of wildfire and pine beetle activity.

John Woodling, West Slope Water Network (*submitted hard copy testimony and photo*) - West Slope Water Network includes Colorado Trout Unlimited, High Country Citizen Alliance, the San Juan Citizen Alliance and the Western Colorado Congress with a total membership of 13,800 individuals. Roadless areas provide valuable resources to the state and are important to wildlife, fish, skiers, campers, hikers, etc. These regions are the source of very clean, high quality drinking water to the state.

Drinking water supplies are extremely important; the cleaner the water is the less treatment is necessary and cheaper to supply to customers. Mr. Woodling began testing water in Colorado in 1973 when the concerns were suspended solids, fecal coliform bacteria, nitrate, nitrite and ammonia. These contaminants seemed attributable to road and building construction, and clearing lands. By the end of his tenure at the Colorado Water Quality Control Division in 1978 he was testing for Trihalomethanes which come from chlorinating domestic wastewater.

Some communities have lost usable drinking water supplies (e.g., Fort Morgan spent \$14 million to build a pipeline to bring clean water from the mountains to the plains and Thornton spent millions to build a reverse osmosis facility and a carbon filter). Other communities' drinking water comes directly from undeveloped mountain drainages with few roads. Roadless areas provide water that needs little treatment before delivery to customers.

Some drinking water supplies are threatened by oil and gas development, some by roadway runoff. The list of chemicals associated with plastics, detergents, cleansers, lubricants and others is numerous and unseen in roadless areas.

Water testing and treatment is very expensive. There is now a new class of chemicals which require new testing and treatment methods. One way to protect the water supply is to maintain roadless areas.

Greg Mazu - Diamond Peaks Mountain Bike Patrol, Boulder Bike Alliance, International Mountain Bicycling Association (*no submittal*) – International Mountain Bicycling Association is an international organization representing 32,000 mountain bikers. Diamond Peaks Mountain Bike Patrol's 50 members volunteered 520 hours on FS

trails and contacted 6,200 trail users. Boulder Bike Alliance has conducted 77 trail projects since 1991 and 12,500 hours. The goal of these organizations is to create better mountain biking opportunities through education and advocacy.

Mountain bikers, like hikers, equestrians and other shared-use trail users are seeking great isolated and scenic backcountry escapes away from noise, congestion and dust from motorized vehicles. There are many opportunities in the A-R National Forest roadless areas, trails in such areas as: Crosier Mountain roadless area, Comanche Adjacent S.E. roadless area, Green Ridge East roadless area. The trails in these areas are close to Wilderness areas so that one can experience similar feeling of isolation and quite. Bicycles are not allowed in Wilderness, so adjacent roadless areas are closest a mountain biker can get to a Wilderness experience.

There is a concern that roadless will become Wilderness, because bicycles are not allowed in Wilderness areas.

Colorado is a significant destination for the mountain biking community. According to Colorado department of Transportation, bicycling is a \$1 billion industry. The small rural communities are gateways to biking in roadless area, such as Estes Park, Fort Collins/Loveland, and Red Feather Lakes benefit from bicycling tourism. They provide campgrounds, gas stations, hotels, restaurants, and stores that bikers utilize.

Panel #3: Questions & Answers

Question– Bicycling organizations – Could you provide a list of specific trails and areas that are important?

Answer – Yes, we could provide the Task Force with a list.

Question – COHVCO – What does “roadless areas be released from roadless status” mean? Roadless is not a status. What do you want done with them?

Answer – The recommendation is to release the lands to FS management.

Question – COHVCO – Is there anything in 2001 rule that prohibits maintenance of existing roads?

Answer – No, the 2001 Rule would not constrain maintenance, yet there are reconstruction preventions.

Question – COHVCO – Can COHVCO provide a list/map of trails that have been closed under forest plan because they were in roadless areas and a list/map of trails that might be closed under provision from 2001?

Answer – Yes.

Question – West Slope Water Network – Is there any technology that could assess the impact of roadlessness on Fort Collins drinking supply?

Answer – The Poudre River water, at headwaters, contains antibiotics in infinite small amounts and every step downstream adds more chemicals before reaching Fort Collins. Clear Creek has three treatment plants before reaching Golden, which

gradually increases the exposure. There are a lot of chemicals being found now that were not even around 15 years ago.

Question – Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance (SRCA) – In the citizen inventory of roadless areas report provided, there is a difference in roadless acres between SRCA and FS. Why is there a difference and is FS aware of these numbers?

Answer – The inventory methodology includes a smaller buffer (100 feet) than FS (300 feet), also SRCA cherry stemmed (drew a line around a road to include more land). There are about 25% more acres in the SRCA inventory. It is not known if FS is aware of the SRCA inventory and the difference in acres of roadless inventories.

Question – Morgan Timber – Have you worked in A-R? Have you contracted for fuels treatment in an inventoried roadless area? Are there obstacles for doing fuels treatments in an inventoried roadless area?

Answer – FS has limited resources and it is expensive to conduct fuels treatment activities in roadless areas due to the cost of environmental review and public involvement. Morgan Timber has had several contracts in the A-R, but none in inventoried roadless areas, with the exception of aggressively addressing fire issues (to build fire lines).

Question – COHVCO – why release lands to FS management, if under the 2001 Rule and under forest plans there is no restriction on motorized use?

Answer – OHV Policy will restrict use to only those designated routes that have had full environmental impact assessments conducted.

Question – COHVCO – Does COHVCO have a preference between management in the 2001 Rule and the Forest Plan?

Answer – We will get back to the Task Force.

Question – West Slope Water Network – Can you clarify the statement about cattle antibiotics in headwaters everywhere?

Answer – The assumption is that the source is cattle grazing on national forests.

OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

37 people signed up to speak (all were called, 30 were present and spoke) on topics including: economic impacts, preservation, recreation (motorized, hunting, fishing, bicycling, hiking), multiple use, wildlife, watershed protection, support of/protection of current roadless areas, watershed health, wild fire protection, future generations, impact of roads, population pressures.

The comments are recorded in summary and reflect major issues, concerns, major themes, specific locations and specific actions. The following are the speakers, their organizations (if they are affiliated), their place of residence and a few of the key issues and locations they touched on:

1. Gordon Rodda, Fort Collins, Colorado – moved to Colorado because of the opportunities for roadless areas recreation...attended the public meeting for the 2001 Rule and heard the concerns about the economic impacts negatively effecting small rural communities, yet in reality they have thrived on roadless opportunities.
2. Mathew Garrington, Environment Colorado, Denver, Colorado – Environment Colorado has 21,000 members, 7,000 members near the Arapaho-Roosevelt...grew up in Loveland...camped in Poudre Canyon and Buckhorn Canyon...the roadless rule does not prohibited OHV use, however there has been another process/forum to discuss OHV use – the 3 year process to develop a OHV plan...on the 2001 Rule there were 36,000 comments submitted from 21 communities.
3. Craig Stumbough, Larimer County 4 Wheel Drive Club, Fort Collins, Colorado – Larimer county 4 wheel drive club...have been 4 wheeling in A-R for 28 years and seen lots of trails closed...there is not enough trails...trails are closed because FS doesn't have the funds, private land owners, or floods wiped them out...concern roadless is precursor to Wilderness...only way to view some of the scenic vistas is on a vehicle.
4. John Smeltzer, Colorado Wildlife Federation, Fort Collins, Colorado – Vice President for Colorado Wildlife Federation...provided info that is species specific in A-R, green back cut throat trout and sheep...impacts of additional roads includes sediment...solitude is highly valued in hunting experience.
5. Al Johnson, Johnson Cattle Company, Livermore, Colorado – has had a ranch in this community for 30 years and is an A-R permittee...need to be able get into areas with vehicles...20,000 acre area with miles of fencing to manage...in the past few years FS has been treating weeds and permittees need to be able to tell FS where the weeds are...permits allow for access to take out dead animals and it is hard to move a dead cow without a motorized vehicle.
6. Ronald Harden, Loveland, Colorado – roadless areas are reservoirs for wildlife species whose habitat is declining...roadless areas provide a refuge, (e.g., northern grouse hawk and golden eagles - 1st tier nesting sites have disappeared.
7. Bill Miller, Fort Collin's Audubon Society, Fort Collins, Colorado – the focus is no just on birds, but all wildlife...more roads creates more fragmentations...recommend no new roads...only 6% of lands are more than 2 miles from any roads...roads result in soil erosion.
8. Gene Iley, Northern Colorado Trail Riders, Fort Collins, Colorado – Vice President for the Northern Colorado Trail Riders...OHV users have partnered with FS and others to maintain trails...this group also helps fund trail maintenance...sustainable means maintaining trails in harmony with environment.
9. Rick Inglis, Fort Collins, Colorado – was a hydrologist...pathways – roads provide an avenue for invasive species, vandalism, and development...the slivers of non-development need to be preserved...hydrology – roads are the worst thing for interruption of hydrologic cycle due to erosion and pollution from vehicles.
10. Tom Jackson, Fort Collins, Colorado – snowmobiler and ATV user...the concern is that eventually roadless will become Wilderness...14 million acres of National Forest in Colorado with 32 million visit annually...this means that roadless excludes 90% of users from 6% of the forest...would like to see responsible motorized use.

11. Lucy Meyring, Colorado Cattlemen's Association, Walden, Colorado – is Colorado Cattlemen's Association past president...grazing is a mandated use on the FS system...without accessibility to maintain allotments permittee are at risk of losing permits...grazing is a natural way to control fires.
12. Dr. Robert Streeter, Fort Collins, Colorado – representing self and grandsons...past work measured distance from roads, there was no single point more than 2 miles from a road...70% of the sites were within 2 miles of a designated road...the main concern is endangered species (e.g., greenback cutthroat trout) and that roads increase sedimentation which is bad for trout...FS need opportunities for manage for timber and fire.
13. Gene King, Colorado Association 4 Wheel Drive Clubs, Denver, Colorado – land use chair for 4 wheel drive clubs...was a member of BLM's Front Range Resource Council ...the 4 wheel drive clubs work and donate time to maintain roads and award grants for care and maintenance of Colorado trails...not asking for more roads, asking to maintain existing roads...recommend to return inventoried roadless areas FS management.
14. Dennis Larratt, Colorado Off highway Vehicle Coalition, Littleton, Colorado – for fiscal year 2007 FS's budget is going to be cut, 19% cut to trail budget, 18% to roads budget and 4% to historic...working to advocate to retain current budget...wilderness is the most expensive area to manage...roadless areas are the first step to wilderness designation and FS has suggested not to designate.
15. Kirk Cunningham, Boulder, Colorado – *(submitted written comments)*
hiker...concern is for who is going to pay for extra roads in roadless areas...FS has deficit for road reconstruction.
16. Bill Ikler, Nederland, Colorado – Colorado native...roadless becoming wilderness is a difficult and long process – I am working on wilderness designation process and it take a lot to get wilderness designation; worked on it for 9 years with a lot of collaboration...ski and hike to get away from cars...will cost a lot to maintain roads and they are not being maintained already.
17. Gordon Woelfle, Fort Collins, Colorado – problems with FS, they have done a lousy job in some respects...restrict motorized use to bringing out a dead animal...am a senior citizen, 5 heart attack and diabetic, motorized vehicle use is the only way for me to enjoy the forest...there was a time when a road was closed by bulldozer while I was hunting...enjoy hunting and need the roads to do so, amenable to paying for the access.
18. John Bohgiovanni, Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition, Arvada, Colorado – manage trails on a local basis...FS is knowledgeable about the issues at hand...most realistic approach is to allow local decisions makers through forest plan process...release land back to FS plan revision process and management
19. Caitlyn Patrick, Routt national Forest Group, Steamboat Springs, Colorado – Routt National Forest protection group...I have been rock climbing in A-R...it is important to have roadless areas surrounding the National Park, it allows for wildlife and watershed protection.
20. John Gascoyne, Fort Collins, Colorado – allow enjoyment for future generations...watched good agricultural lands go bad and it won't come back...need

to understand context of generational impacts...preserve what we have...keep roadless roadless.

21. Sharon Stackhouse, Indian Hills, Colorado – native Coloradoan...public access should be allowed to public lands...not discriminate against old, young or handicap by closing or restricting motorized use...existing roads in roadless areas need to be maintained for future generations...for many the road is the destination...motorized visitors can access much more miles of backcountry...protect our lands for our grandchildren not from our grandchildren...protect all uses.
22. David Lauer, Friends of the Poudre, Fort Collins, Colorado – member of board of the Friends of the Poudre...lots of areas in the watershed need to be kept roadless for water quality and health of wildlife Grey Rock, Greenridge east and west, Comanche Peak and North Lone Pine...the north fork of the Poudre is also important for possible reservoir enlargements.
23. Shannon Sawyer, NCTR, Fort Collins, Colorado – motorized, dirt bike use...Comanche peak (proposed wilderness) if designated will remove trails...support FS management, but they don't have enough man power so motorized user clubs volunteers time to clear trails...if trails are removed because of Wilderness designation than a new trail should be create to replace the lost trail.
24. Jeff Maslow, Wilderness Study Group, Boulder, Colorado – wilderness study from CSU recommends protection of all roadless areas...student run study group has support roadless areas...compiled important information on specific roadless areas and active roadless inventory.
25. Connor Bailey, Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project, Denver, Colorado – first Colorado experience was a five day hike in the Williams Rork roadless areas...roadless area are one of the reasons for coming to Colorado...the group studies connectivity for wildlife and found roadless areas are the best islands for wildlife to exist and so need to be maintained as well as all roadless areas.
26. Alison Gallensky, SRCA, Westminster, Colorado– Larimer River headwaters are important for fishing and water quality and the adjacent roadless areas.
27. Kevin Passmore, Hiking Club at CU, Boulder, Colorado – hiking club at CU Boulder...trips are often on public lands... it is appalling the lack of lands without roads...respect for FS management and shared use...shared use is the norm... and need to protect roadless areas.
28. Eric Frastick, Golden, Colorado – lots of changes in the landscape in Colorado...the value of roadless areas increases as development increases...law of supply and demand...Bard Creek IRA – 25,000 acres of alpine landscape...connected to Tarmegon IRA, with tailless 13,000 foot mountains...showed photo...also protect for drinking water.
29. Michael Maefee, Fort Collins, Colorado– natural scientist...economic issues – areas provide a place of protection for species that are sensitive allowing them to thrive, this saves money because it is cheaper to leave roadless areas instead of push the species to the point of getting on the threaten and endangered species list...FS does not have the money for current maintenance...the fastest growing outdoor recreation activity is birding watching that relies on roadless areas...roadless areas are America's grown jewels.

30. Casey Colbert, RMEC, Loveland, Colorado – Colorado native...recreate in A-R roadless areas, motorized user and mountain biker...concerned that roadless is stepping stone to Wilderness...the budget of FS - the most expensive areas are Wilderness, followed by roadless.



Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force
 Overview of Written Public Comments Received at the
 Fort Collins Public Comment Meeting

APPENDIX A: Summary of Comments

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Number of responses:	16		
Number of CO residents	16		
Number of non-CO residents	0		
Responses by forest	General Comment	10	63%
	Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests	10	63%
	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison National Forests	1	6%
	Manti-La Sal National Forests	1	6%
	Pike-San Isabel National Forests	1	6%
	Rio Grande National Forest	1	6%
	Routt National Forest	2	13%
	San Juan National Forest	1	6%
	White River National Forest	1	6%
Responses by topic of concern	Social and Economic Value	8	50%
	Special Designations	5	31%
	Recreation Management	7	44%
	Natural Resource Management	11	69%
	Other: (see below for specific responses)	5	31%

This document is a rough, broad-based overview of the themes expressed in the written comments received at the public comment meeting. This information is for summation purposes only, and should not be viewed as an empirical, scientific content analysis.

Colorado Roadless Areas Review Task Force
 Overview of Written Public Comments Received at the
 Fort Collins Public Comment Meeting

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	14
Retain Motorized Recreation	1
Retain Non-Motorized Recreation	3

General Comment Themes	Number of Responses
General	1
Public Involvement/Collaboration and Decision-Making Process	1
Environmental Emphasis	5
Special Designations	4
Job Creation/Economic Stability of Rural Communities, States, and the Nation	1
Legacy Values	1
Quality of Life	3
Use of Roadless Areas to Promote or Subsidize Industry	5
Reallocating Costs of Roadless Area Development to Meet Other Needs	1
Other Social and Economic Values	3

Responses by Topic of Concern: Other, please specify

1. Big game
2. Biodiversity, conservation
3. Biodiversity, conservation
4. Environmental Quality
5. Protection of all roadless areas

This document is a rough, broad-based overview of the themes expressed in the written comments received at the public comment meeting. This information is for summation purposes only, and should not be viewed as an empirical, scientific content analysis.

APPENDIX B: Comments from Valerie Douglas, Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition Vice Chairman & Colorado Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs, Inc. Representative to COHVCO

**COHVCO Foundation Director
Stay The Trail Campaign Manager
Colorado Trail Patrol Director**

Introduction

My name is Valerie Douglas. I am a fifth generation Coloradoan originally from Grand Junction, and I have lived in Thornton for the past five years. While my primary form of recreation is four wheeling in my jeep rock crawler, I also enjoy backpacking, mountain biking, rafting, horse back riding and downhill skiing in Colorado's forests and public lands.

As the Vice Chairman for the Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition, COHVCO for short, I represent nearly 200,000 Coloradoans of different user groups within the off-highway vehicle community. I am also a member of the Colorado Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs, Inc. (CoA4WDCI) and the Trail Ridge Runners four wheel drive club located in Longmont. All of the individuals I represent enjoy visiting our public lands with some form of off-highway vehicle. All of the organizations I am a member of and represent are volunteer organizations; COHVCO being the non-profit environmental organization focused on preserving and enhancing the opportunities of all off-highway vehicle users in Colorado since 1987. I am here representing the Motorcycle, four wheel drive, ATV and Snowmobile enthusiasts.

I need to reiterate to the task force that COHVCO does not expend its energy opposing other forms of recreation. COHVCO believes in multiple use on public lands. We recognize the diverse interests and needs of Americans and work to support their responsible recreation activities on public lands.

Recommendation Overview

COHVCO AND THE COLORADO ASSOCIATION OF 4 WHEEL DRIVE CLUBS, INC. BELIEVE THAT THE TASK FORCE SHOULD RECOMMEND THAT COLORADO'S INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS (IRAs) BE RELEASED FROM IRA STATUS AND BE MANAGED BY THE USFS USING THE FOREST PLAN AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PROCESSES.

Forest planning and travel management processes are well established and require detailed analysis, involve environmental assessments, public input, administrative reviews and provide for appeals if errors are made. Through this process the USFS can utilize a host of management prescriptions which can provide proper uses of public lands. Rule making by the Executive branch neglects this process, thus why the task force was created. However, the task force is relying and utilizing data skewed from special interest organizations and private parties with objectives outside of the intent and vision of the national forests, and ill qualified for the Wilderness Act.

The efforts of the task force are commendable; however the task force must rely on up-to-date data and information from sources untainted by special interest agendas. Furthermore, the task force should not consider expanding areas beyond the 2000 Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), as there is not adequate time or resources to properly analyze the existing IRAs, let alone additional areas outside of the 4.4 million acres under consideration. It would be unconscionable and reckless to recommend additional areas that have not been well studied.

Roadless Does Not Mean There Are No Roads

It is a huge concern within the off-highway vehicle community and the general public that the truth has not been fully explained regarding what actually lies within the IRAs. Incidentally, after calling the Canyon Lakes Ranger District office regarding the IRAs I was told by one of the Forest Service personnel that there were indeed no roads or trails within the IRAs. This simply is not true. The task force has done an absolutely terrible job of revealing the truth to the public that there are multiple use roads and trails within the IRAs. Many of the roads and trails contained within the 4.4 million acres of the IRAs have historical significance and multiple use recreation opportunities.

IT IS REQUESTED THAT THE TASK FORCE ACKNOWLEDGE THE EXISTENCE OF THESE ROADS AND TRAILS WITHIN THE IRAs, AND RECOMMEND THAT THEY CONTINUE TO BE MANAGED FOR THEIR MULTI-USE USES, INCLUDING MOTORIZED RECREATION.

Roadless Areas ARE the Precursor to Wilderness Designation

Each of the 8 Land and Resource Management Plans (forest plans) in Colorado evaluated and considered recommendations for potential wilderness areas. These evaluations included the consideration of the values of the areas as wilderness and the feasibility of management of the areas as wilderness and non-wilderness. Each evaluation and consideration for Roadless Areas, and the origin for their evaluation, is solely for the purpose of analyzing their suitability for wilderness designation, a designation entrusted exclusively by Congress.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement accompanying the 1997 Revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forest and Pawnee National Grasslands states, “The key elements analyzed [are the] capability to meet the intent of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the availability, suitability and manageability of these areas as Wilderness.” Our current forest plans make no such recommendation because the IRAs do not meet the requirements of the Wilderness Act of 1964. No new rule making is needed in Colorado to protect our unroaded areas of pristine beauty. They are already protected extensively by forest plans.

Regarding Roads There is Minimal Risk to Colorado

The 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule estimates that 1,076 miles of roads would be constructed in roadless areas nationally over the next 10 years. The roadless areas in Colorado represent 4.4 million acres. That represents only 7.6% of all Roadless Areas

nationally. Statistically, less than 9 miles of road construction will occur in Colorado's IRAs per year. This equates to LESS THAN 1 mile of road per forest per year in Colorado. Despite inaccurate claims that Colorado will lose its pristine areas to development, additional rule making is not needed to evaluate the effects of less than 1 mile of road construction per year on Colorado's 11 forests.

Multiple Use of the Forest

'Multiple use' as defined in forestry terms means managing a forested area to simultaneously provide more than one of the following resource objectives: fish and wildlife, wood products, recreation, aesthetics, grazing, watershed protection, and historic or scientific values. Colorado forests are designated as multiple use forests, and COHVCO and the CoA4WDCI strongly supports this designation. Grifford Pinchot, the first Chief of the USFS, even recognized this need and designation.

Multiple use recreation involves several activities including off-highway vehicles, hiking, mountain biking, developed and dispersed skiing, equestrian, and many other activities. It must be recognized and acknowledged by the task force that all forms of multiple use recreation impact our public lands.

Growing Demographics

The American population is growing, and with that growth also comes change. Part of the growing American population includes and increase use in public lands. The change in population also includes an increase of off-highway vehicle purchases and use. This includes everything from the Nissan XTerra to the Big Bear ATV, to the KTM 300 XC, to the custom fabricated rock crawler.

To put Americas growing population into perspective for Colorado, OHV registration increased from 2004 to 2005 by 9.14%. 110,000 in-state OHVs were registered in 2005, and this number does not include the snowmobile registrations. With snowmobile registrations included, there were 143,600 OHVs registered in the state. Of the estimated 4,665,117 people within the state of Colorado, according to the US Census, that equates to 1 in 32 people in this state own an off-highway vehicle. Please note that these numbers do not include street legal four-wheel drive vehicles, such as Toyota's, Nissan's, Hummer's, Jeep's, Dodge's, Ford's, Honda's, Chevy's, GMC's, Lexus's, Mercedes', Porsche's, etc.

While the easiest and irrational answer to containing the growing demographic of multiple use of the forest is to close currently open areas, such as the IRAs, it is not the smart or logical route in order to handle the situation. The task force should recommend to the governor that the Inventoried Roadless Areas be released from IRA status and allow the Forest Service to manage the lands under proper forest plan processes.

Safety Factors within IRAs and Wilderness if the Status is Not Reversed

The task force has not taken into consideration the safety factors of users of the forest if the IRAs remain in roadless status. By allowing the IRAs to become truly roadless in status you are effectively inhibiting Colorado's Search and Rescue team to extract

individuals in need of their assistance. You are putting every forest user, whether it be a hiker, mountaineer, spelunker, equestrian rider, snow shoe-er, mountain biker, OHV user, etc. at risk of receiving efficient and effective life saving techniques.

In situations when helicopters cannot be utilized for extraction by Search and Rescue, four wheel drive trails and vehicles are utilized as the backup plan. Helicopters oftentimes cannot fly in the spring, summer, and fall months in Colorado due to atmospheric activity within the area, specifically lightning. Case in point: in 2003 a father and son were climbing Blanca Peak. Shortly after they had summit the mountain a storm rolled in and lightning accompanied the storm. Both the father and son quickly took action to find lower ground so they would be less likely to be struck by lightning. Unfortunately the father did not reach lower ground in time and was struck by lightning and killed. Due to the lightning continuing in the area, Search and Rescue could not utilize a helicopter for the recovery efforts and called upon the four wheel drive community to assist in the recovery. Without the ability to maintain the road Search and Rescue would have not been able to recover the body. The 2001 Rule would not allow for maintenance or road reconstruction on several Forest Service roads in which Search and Rescue rely on to complete their duties.

Fuels Concerns and Fire Mitigation

Roads within the current IRAs need to be able to be maintained for, if any reason this reason, fire mitigation. The Haymen fire taught Coloradoans that fire is a force that cannot be reckoned with, but it can be mitigated. Roads are necessary for the Forest Service and timber industry to extract “tinder box” and beetle infested timber. Without the maintenance of roads within the IRAs you are essentially tying the hands of the USFS and timber industry to effectively remove areas of high concern for potential forest fires. It would be irresponsible as a citizen of Colorado, and especially a member of this task force to recommend anything other than to take no action and release the IRAs back to the Forest Service for this reason alone.

Many of the conservation groups insist that fires are part of the natural rebirth of the forest. This may have been true in the 1700’s, but in 2006 and going forward this is certainly not the case. Not only is there a concern for human life because our forest is now considered an urban living environment, but flora and fauna issues and depletion occur when a forest is on fire. So much to the point that we have situations similar to the center of the Haymen burn area where the ground is so fragile post-fire that it is practically impossible to rehabilitate the burn area without human intervention. Do what you can to prevent another massive forest fire, and to do so requires that as a task force member you recommend that there be no action taken and the IRAs be released back to the Forest Service to fall under proper and legal planning procedures.

Stay The Trail™, Colorado Trail Patrol and Responsible Recreation

COHVCO and the CoA4WDCI support the protection of wilderness areas where wilderness characteristics exist. Both organizations promote proper user ethic and responsible recreation, and with that ethic in mind the Stay The Trail™ program and Colorado Trail Patrol have been created.

Stay The Trail™ is a responsible recreation campaign designed to educate OHV users on proper user ethic of their vehicles, and to respect our public lands. The campaign was designed by the Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition, Colorado State Parks, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, the COHVCO Foundation, and the Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance. The program's focus is to educate the public, including the non-motorized community, on off-highway guidelines for motorized vehicles. The program encourages users to Keep Your Wheels Where They Belong™ and to stay on the trail. The program also reinforces knowing where to ride or drive, and what trail is appropriate for your vehicle. For example, a single track trail meant for a motorcycle is not meant for an ATV to drive on. Likewise it is never okay to create your own route unless you are in an authorized area where that is permitted. The program also focuses on watershed issues and how they relate to motorized recreation, specifically trail braiding, or trail widening, which is strongly discouraged. The motorized community recognizes the significance of water shed issues and drainage, and is working to be sensitive to areas at risk of high run off during the spring months. However, motorized recreation does not increase water shed issues, the amount of precipitation the state receives increases water shed issues.

The Colorado Trail Patrol was formed in 2005 for the off-highway vehicle community. It is a group of highly trained volunteers that are the on-the-ground educational force behind the Stay The Trail™ campaign. These volunteers are specifically trained to observe and report situations to the Forest Service, BLM and Colorado State parks. They are also trained in a greeter program that allows them to interact with the public at trail heads, encourage responsible recreation, hand out trash bags to assist in trail cleaning, and be overall stewards of the off-highway vehicle community. The pilot program received great review from the Boulder Ranger District, and has been launched state wide as of 2005. Currently there are 52 members of the Colorado Trail Patrol that are various forms of OHV users.

Responsible recreation initiatives are alive and thriving in Colorado. In 2005 the OHV Registration program provided \$1.4 million in grants for motorized recreation education and trail maintenance. An additional \$750,000 in grants from snowmobile registrations will be used for winter trail grooming and upkeep. Responsible recreation is flourishing; motorized recreation users have volunteered over 12,000 hours for road and trail maintenance across the state in 2005 alone. There are multiple other projects occurring statewide on USFS land to assist the Forest Service in the management of its multiple use trails, including COHVCO working with major non-motorized groups to gain additional funding for improvements of all types of recreational trails on USFS lands in Colorado.

There are No Motorized Routes in Colorado Except for Our Interstate Highways

The only true motorized route within the State of Colorado that ONLY allows motorized recreation to occur on it is the Interstate Highways. All other roads within the state of Colorado allow for both motorized and non-motorized use. Off-highway vehicle recreationist must share all routes open to their use with other user groups, and we happily do share those routes. Because all routes are open to multiple use, and are used

as multiple use routes, they should be labeled as Multiple-Use routes instead of motorized routes.

There are no roads on USFS land that are specifically open to motorized use only. Francisco Valenzuela, Region 2 Recreation Planner for the USFS, has provided a rough breakdown of the uses of the approximate 14,000 miles of trails on Forest Service land in Colorado. He estimates that roughly 1/3 of the trail mileage is located in Wilderness areas and off limits to motorized recreation. One third of trail mileage is managed as off limits to motorized recreation. One third of total trail mileage allows both motorized and non-motorized uses. Of the 14000 miles of trails within Colorado, only 4662 miles allow motorized recreation, and the majority of that mileage is consumed by access roads to backpacking, hiking, and fishing destinations that all users of the forest utilize.

With the enactment of the National OHV Policy in November of 2005, all USFS land nationwide will restrict motorized recreation to designated routes. The National OHV Policy is further reducing the 4662 miles of motorized recreation on USFS land within Colorado.

THE TASK FORCE MUST TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE IMPACTS OF THE NATIONAL OHV POLICY AND REALIZE THAT MULTIPLE USE USERS WILL BE EFFECTED BY ITS IMPLEMENTATION, THEREFORE UNDERSTAND THAT MANY OF THE AREAS IN QUESTION WITHIN THE IRAs WILL NOT ALLOW MOTORIZED RECREATION WITHIN THOSE AREAS PER THE NATIONAL OHV POLICY. REGION 2 OF THE FOREST SERVICE HAS ALREADY STARTED TO IMPLEMENT THE POLICY WITHIN COLORADO, AND THE TASK FORCE SHOULD RECOMMEND A RELEASE THE IRAs FROM ROADLESS STATUS TO ALLOW THE FOREST SERVICE TO PROPERLY AND LEGALLY DESIGNATE AREAS OPEN OR CLOSED.

Economic Impacts

The Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition retained Hazen and Sawyer in 2000 to conduct an *Analysis of the Economic Contribution of Off-Highway Vehicle Use in Colorado*. In 2000 it was found that motorized recreation, meaning the use of all terrain vehicles (ATVs), dirt or dual sport motorcycles, snowmobiles, and four wheel drive vehicles contributed \$500 million annually to Colorado's economy. Since 2000 OHV Registrations have grown by 98%, and with that growth brings an additional increase to Colorado's economy. The study was conducted on both resident and non-resident households that participate in motorized recreation in Colorado.

Other factors need to be taken into consideration regarding economic impacts. There are over 150 ATV, dirt or dual sport motorcycle businesses within Colorado, and another 80 four-wheel drive businesses that will directly be affected by the decision made by the task force. Many of these businesses are small-business owned and operated entities that risk survival depending on the recommendation the task force makes.

Wildlife Considerations

Despite what many of the conservation groups have strongly suggested, off-highway vehicles on trails and roads in the forests do not kill wildlife, predators of wildlife kill wildlife. The majority of OHVs do not go fast while on Forest Service roads and trails to even injure wildlife because of individual safety concerns. ATVs and motorcycles risk injury from handle bars and four wheel drive vehicle users prefer to crawl at average speeds of 3 mph when recreating on a road or trail. Wildlife is not in danger of death or dismemberment from off-highway vehicles.

Furthermore, it must be noted that wildlife is impacted very little by motorized recreation. Wildlife is impacted by hunters and anglers that utilize multi use routes in the forest for their sport, but motorized recreation in general has very little to no influence on wildlife.

Soundscape, which refers to the area in where sound is emitted to, has been considered in reference to impacts on wildlife and OHV use. While there have been no studies conducted in Colorado regarding the concern, it has been noted in studies conducted on public lands in other states that noise in reference to wildlife impacts was very insignificant.

For example, in 2004 a study was conducted in Yellowstone National Park on the effects of snowmobiles on wildlife within the park. The study was conducted by Yellowstone for Resources and Montana State University and is attached for your review. In brief, the study concluded that snowmobiles had minimal impact on wildlife within the Park. Of the 2,239 interactions studied:

- <1% of wildlife showed a defense reaction
- 4% had a flight reaction
- 9% traveled
- 11% showed attention or alarm
- 18% looked and resumed normal activity
- **58% had no apparent response**

In short, the effect of motorized recreation has minimal impact on wildlife.

Summary

COHVCO and the CoA4WDCI appreciate the opportunity to offer input to the Roadless Area Review Task Force, and appreciate the time and effort expended by all parties involved.

COHVCO AND THE CoA4WDCI, FOR ALL REASONS STATED ABOVE, BELIEVE THAT THE ROADLESS TASK FORCE RECOMMEND THAT THE INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS BE RELEASED FROM IRA STATUS AND BE MANAGED BY THE USFS USING THE FOREST PLAN AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PROCESSES.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our comments.

Colorado OHV Registrations

In State OHV Registrations - this does not include
snomobile registrations

