



**Roadless Area Task Force
Deliberative Meeting #2
Department of Natural Resources
1313 Sherman
3rd Floor Conference Room
Denver, Colorado
10:00-12:15
Statewide Panel Presentations
12:45 – 5:00
*TF Deliberations***

FINAL AGENDA

Objective:

- **Task Force to receive presentations from panelists with a relevant statewide Clarify Issues and Generate Options for Agreement**
- **Task Force to agree to sign up for and create issue presentations for the next deliberative meeting, taking into consideration discussion held today**

10:00 Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda review

10:15 State Wide Panel Presentations- (:15 minutes per presenter)

- 1) DOW - most likely on T&E issues with and introducing the Arapahoe and Roosevelt Forest analysis into the record;
- 2) John Brejcha – State Land Board;
- 3) Vince Mathews - mineral and energy discussion;
- 4) Jon Beyer - Tri-state;
- 5) John Smeltzer - Colorado Wildlife Federation;
- 6) Greg Schaefer - Coal representative to present statewide perspective.

11:45 Discussion/Clarifying Questions for Panelists

12:15 LUNCH BREAK

12:45 Agenda Overview: TF Deliberations

12:55 Review/Confirm Report Format

Accept or modify outline

Assign initial drafting components (descriptive, non controversial)

1:10 Review: AR Memo

1:20 Issue/Considerations Presentations

Process: *Setting the table.* Identified individuals or teams will frame issues for TF discussion in brief, key-point overviews. Discussion emphasis will be on informing what issues/concerns workgroups will need to consider in formulating

Roadless Areas Review Task Force: Deliberative Meeting #2

their presentations for subsequent meetings, and should give clear direction on those areas that will be applicable both at the state wide and more site specific lines.

Workgroups will:

- Be developed, scoped and assigned milestones/deadlines.
- Delineate between those recommendations that are applicable statewide, and those that are applicable to a specific site.

1:20 **Overview:** (Joe Duda & Dave Ubell & Steve Smith)**Timber-treatment for fire fuels and insects; commercial logging**

1:25 **Discussion: Considerations for timber treatment for fire fuels and insects; commercial logging**

1:45 **Overview:** (Tom Compton and Dave Ubell)**Grazing allotments**

1:50 **Discussion: Considerations for Grazing Allotments**

2:10 **Overview:** (Russ George/DNR)**Coal /Gas leases**

2:15 **Discussion: Consideration for Coal/Gas leases**

2:35 Break

2:45 **Overview:** (Doug Young/Steve Smith)**Use of off road vehicles**

2:50 **Discussion: Considerations for use of off road vehicles**

3:10 **Overview:** (Eddie Kochman and Dave Petersen)**Wildlife and critical habitat (invasive species)**

3:15 **Discussion: Considerations for wildlife and critical habitat**

3:35 **Overview:** (Doug Young)**Access to and management of water facilities**

3:40 **Discussion: Considerations for access to and management of water facilities**

4:00 Break

4:10 **Overview:** (Dave Petersen)**Watershed protection**

4:15 **Discussion: Considerations for Watershed protection**

4:35 **Overview:** (Steve Smith) **Roadless Inventory Boundaries**

4:40 **Discussion: Considerations for Roadless inventory boundaries**

4:55 Next Steps

5:00 Adjourn



Roadless Areas Review Task Force
Deliberative Meeting #2
Pike, San Isabel & San Juan National Forests
April 14, 2006
Denver, Colorado
Meeting Summary

AGREEMENTS

<i>Final Report Format</i>	The Task Force agreed to the draft outline proposed by the report subcommittee, and agreed to begin drafting those sections of the report which are not recommendations. This includes introduction, background; land descriptions; public involvement and some of the addenda - state statute, process to develop recommendations, and a catalogue of materials received during the process.
<i>Assignments</i>	Section, drafters, clarification/agreement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction – Forest Service, Steve Smith and Josh Penry - context, historical overview (facts) – Forest Service will address national history, Josh Penry and Steve Smith will address state history ▪ Background – Forest Service, Steve Smith and Josh Penry – clarifications ▪ Description of Lands – Forest Service - reference the 2001 EIS and then incorporate the most recent Forest Service mapping, explain what differences exist and why (forest by forest) ▪ Public Involvement – Steve Smith, Eddie Kochman, Tom Compton, and BLM/DNR staff person – summarize the tone and trends of the public process and comments ▪ Addenda 2: Overall Process – The Keystone Center, Steve Smith – description of the process for achieving recommendations including, public meeting formats, Task Force process plan, etc. ▪ Addenda 3: Catalogue/Index of materials received/reviewed – BLM/DNR staff person, Steve Smith, Eddie Kochman, and Tom Compton
<i>Issue Working Groups</i>	
<i>Issue Working Groups</i>	<p>OHV/Recreation – Task Force agreed to expand the OHV use issue to incorporate all recreation issues.</p> <p>Wildlife and Critical Habitat (Invasive Species) – Task Force agreed this group will screen the possible recommendations for impact to wildlife and critical habitat.</p>

	<p><i>Watershed Protection</i> – Task Force agreed this group will screen the possible recommendations for impacts to watershed health.</p>
<p><i>Template for Working Groups</i></p>	<p>To ensure similarity in the output from the working groups the Task Force agreed to elements each group needs to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How the issue relates to the 2001 Rule; possible alternatives to the rule, modification of the rule (clarify application of the rule), or the rule as is ▪ Public comments – review comments and materials as a basis for developing further details ▪ Broad/big picture context, be comprehensive ▪ Statewide and site specific opportunities or recommendations ▪ Under what circumstance should/should not roads be constructed/reconstructed or maintained; under what circumstances would trees be removed; under what circumstances would access for tree removal be allowed
<p><i>Assignments</i></p>	<p>Issue Area: Working Group Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Timber:</i> Dave Ubell (point person), Joe Duda, Steve Smith and Diane Hoppe ▪ <i>Grazing Allotments:</i> Tom Compton (point person), Melanie Mills and Dave Ubell ▪ <i>Coal/Gas/Oil:</i> Russ George (point person), Steve Smith and John Swartout ▪ <i>Recreation/OHV:</i> Doug Young (point person), Steve Smith, Josh Penry, and Eddie Kochman ▪ <i>Wildlife (this group will review other groups for impact to wildlife):</i> Eddie Kochman (point person), Dave Petersen, Russ George and Josh Penry ▪ <i>Access to Water:</i> Diane Hoppe (point person) and Doug Young ▪ <i>Watershed Protection (this group will review other groups for impact to watershed health):</i> David Peterson (point person) and Joe Duda ▪ <i>Roadless Boundaries:</i> Steve Smith (point person), Melanie Mills, Doug Young and John Swartout ▪ <i>Utility Corridors (added at the meeting):</i> Russ George (point person), Diane Hoppe, Tom Compton and John Swartout
<p><i>Schedule</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ April 18th, Debrief conference call (4:00pm) ▪ May 18th, Public Meeting on the Routt NF (organizers: Steve, Tom and John) ▪ June 7th, Public Meeting, on the Rio Grande (organizers: David P. and Tom)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 8th (new addition), Deliberative Meeting #4, in Monte Vista ▪ June 21st, Public Meeting on the White River NF (organizers: Steve and Melanie) ▪ June 22nd, Public Meeting, on the GMUG NF (organizers: Dave U. and Josh) ▪ (? , <i>possible deliberative meeting</i>) ▪ July 19th, 9:00 – 5:00 pm, Deliberative Meeting ▪ ?, Public Meeting, to review/comment on recommendations ▪ ?, deliberative meeting to discuss public comments and revise recommendations if necessary
--	---

ACTIONS

- 1) The Keystone Center (TKC) will send emails:
 - a. Assignments for final report drafting and issue working groups
 - b. Request suggestions for speakers on the Routt national Forest
 - c. Schedule of Task Force meetings
- 2) The Keystone Center will draft the template for issue working groups to following when developing further detail on issue areas, based on discussions at the meeting and the adopted process plan.
- 3) DNR will contact tribes and invite them to comment, particularly the Southern Ute and the Mountain Ute tribes.

STATEWIDE PANEL SESSION

PRESENTATIONS

To provide the Roadless Areas Review Task Force (Task Force) more information on a statewide level, the first session was devoted to statewide presentations from organizations interested in minerals and geology, wildlife, electric generation and transmission, resource extraction, state land board land, and threatened and endangered species. The Task Force will continue to add time to their meetings to gather input on a statewide basis, thus allowing the forest public meetings to focus on forest specific issues.

Colorado Geological Survey, Vince Mathews (*see appendix A for a link to the presentation*)

Mr. Mathews presented extensive data comparing the demands, production rates, and import amounts of natural resources (oil, coal, natural gas, uranium, etc) for China and the U.S. and how Colorado contributes and is impacted (*to see an extended version of the presentation please go to <http://geosurvey.state.co.us/Default.aspx?tabid=481>*). The following are some key points:

- China's economy is growing significantly faster than the U.S.; and their domestic consumption will take a larger share of the world's production of minerals
- Increase in demand and decreases in production of natural resources has caused price increases (e.g., uranium as tripled)
- Demand for oil increases dramatically, while production in the U.S. peaked in the 1970s
- Demand for natural gas increases, production is flat, except in Colorado where it has increased
- 50% of U.S. electricity comes from coal
- Colorado's revenue from production of natural resource was \$11.8 billion in 2005, until 1995 production was under \$2 billion
- Colorado Statistics
 - Largest oil field west of the Mississippi (outside CA and TX) – Wattenburg.
 - Drilling permit requests have increased 93% in two years
 - 6th largest gas producer and 6th largest coal producer in the nation
 - 5th largest gas reserves in the nation
 - Largest reserves of coal bed methane and largest reserves of compliance coal in the nation

Mr. Mathews showed several maps of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest:

- Federal Oil and Gas Leases and Federal Units
- Areas with Approved Spacing Orders
- Existing Oil and Gas Fields
- Existing Oil and Gas Wells and Permitted Wells
- Areas of Undiscovered Oil and Gas Resources
- Known Mineral Deposits and Occurrences
- Areas Favorable for Selected Metallic and Nonmetallic Minerals
- Potentially Mineable Coal Resources

Colorado Wildlife Federation, Suzanne O'Neill (*submitted hardcopy testimony, see appendix B*)

The Colorado Wildlife Federation (CWF) is a statewide organization, who views their role as providing a mainstream statewide level voice in developing analysis of the complex issues before the Task Force. CWF's mission is to promote conservation, sound management and sustainable use of wildlife and wildlife habitat through education and advocacy.

CWF presented their judgments on seven issues. These judgments were informed by presentations, documents and discussions during Task Force meetings, CWF's scientific literature review of impacts that roads have upon wildlife (provided to the Task Force), and the study of habitat value maps (produced and provided to Task Force) for selected economic and at risk species superimposed onto roadless area maps for the Pike-San Isabel, San Juan, GMUG and Arapaho-Roosevelt national forests. The following are CWF's judgments:

1. Temporary Roads – The 2001 rule defines the term, but does not address restoration of these roads. CWF recommends if temporary roads are constructed that they must be restored within a reasonable timeframe (one year, with a two year limit) following completion of the prescribed function. Restoration success should be judged by roadless characteristics enumerated in section 294.11 and enforcement is necessary.
2. Imminent threat of wildfire – the 2001 rule does not adequately address Colorado’s wildfire challenges at the interface between forested land and urban/exurban areas. CWF recommends adjusting the 2001 rule language to the extent that temporary roads may be necessary for access to enable cutting and removing small diameter timber to reduce substantial risk of wildfire. These measures may also serve to improve wildlife habitat (e.g., through appropriate mixes of replanting materials to reduce concentrations of lodgepole pine).
3. Boundaries – CWF maps showing very high values and high value habitat for selected economic species and species at risk show where some habitat extends beyond the boundary of an inventoried roadless area boundary. One example is the very high value habitat of Gunnison sage grouse in the map for the GMUG. Another example is the very high value habitat map for the boreal toad that shows only two viable populations - the White Rock Mountain population (Collegiate roadless area, GMUG) and Cottonwood Creek population (Kreutzer-Princeton, PSI).
4. Watersheds and riparian areas – Cold water streams are critical to aquatic species habitat and to recreation uses. Adverse impacts of roads to watersheds include sedimentation, erosion, chemical runoff, migration barriers, failed drainage ditches, etc. Cold water streams provide habitat for Colorado’s native greenback cutthroat trout, Colorado River cutthroat trout and Rio Grand cutthroat trout. There are also cold water sport fisheries that offer high recreation opportunities.
5. Trails – CWF’s concern is that the 2001 rule is too broad and does not adequately address possible impact to critical areas. Some trails may be inappropriate or warrant seasonal closures when balanced against particular very high value wildlife habitat.
6. Process: Continue Active State Role – CWF believes it is imperative that the petition prescribe an active state role in Forest Service decision making processes affecting roadless areas, particularly those site specific decisions that could impact very high value wildlife habitat. The state should be meaningfully involved in the development and analysis of any Colorado specific rule.
7. Oil, Gas, and Mineral Leasing – CWF recommends that any leases in inventoried roadless areas be subject to a no surface occupancy restriction for lease activities performed within a roadless area. CWF believes it essential that authority be

conferred upon the state to ensure pre-final rule leases are reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine what, if any, new requirements should be imposed pursuant to the final rule, in accordance with the roadless values Colorado seeks to protect as stated in the petition.

The adverse impact of roads to wildlife is well documented in the scientific literature, and the weight of public comments made to the Task Force from September 2005 through March 2006 favor affirmation of the 2001 rule principles. CWF's final recommendation to the Task Force was to err on the side of continued protection for roadless areas.

Tri-State Generation & Transmission Association, John Beyer *(submitted a hardcopy presentation, see appendix A for a link to the presentation)*

Tri-State is a consumer-owned nonprofit cooperative that supplies wholesale electricity to 44 member rural utilities and operates approximately 5000 miles of transmission line. Forest Service lands are important for transporting electricity through a high voltage system to members in New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming. The facilities of concern are transmission lines, communication sites and access roads used to maintain facilities. Colorado's population is increasing and so is the demand for reliable power. Current transmission lines are operating at or near capacity, which means there is pressure to expand transmission lines. For example, Crested Butte is developing and growing into a larger destination ski resort and yet, currently, there is only one transmission line to service their needs.

Maintenance of facilities is critical for safe, reliable and cost competitive power. Roads are important to maintain the integrity of the electrical infrastructure. Maintenance is conducted on a routine, scheduled and emergency basis. Routine maintenance includes aerial and ground inspections, wood pole (core tests to ascertain the health of poles, every 15 years), vegetation control, erosion control, and electrical resistance. Ground inspections for potential repairs and vegetation control are performed by four-wheel or off road vehicles. Tall trees and branches can cause outages and fire. For example the recent large scale power outage in the north east and mid-west was started by a tree growing into a power line. Because of this there are now federal requirements for vegetation controls.

Emergency maintenance is performed under emergency situations such as power outages due to weather, equipment failure, accidents, mud/rock/snow slide or vandalism. Maintenance is not performed if roads are impassible or when serious damage may occur.

It is important to think of future infrastructure needs and consider current electrical systems that are important to Colorado residents. The Task Force needs to protect permits and allow for additional infrastructure when needed.

Arch Coal, Greg Schafer (submitted presentation via email, hardcopies were distributed; see appendix A for a link to the presentation)

The coal industry's concern is precluding future development. The 2001 rule language clearly precluded future development: "Where reserves of leaseables are known to occur in inventoried roadless areas, the alternatives are likely to preclude future development."

Colorado's coal is of exceptional quality, high in heat content, low in sulfur and mercury, and an important part of environmental compliance by many utilities. The GMUG 2004 coal resource development and potential shows there are mineable reserves to at least 2015, yet this does not consider adjacent unleased coal reserves. In the North Fork Valley there are three mines that generate 40% of the coal production in the state. The reserves in the North Fork Valley are expected to produce 16 million tons of coal a year for 48 years. In 2004, the coal resources in the Valley brought in excess of \$235 million in sales; \$35 million in taxes; and employed almost 900 people, providing \$76 million in employee pay and benefits. Roughly half of the taxes collected go to school districts, 16% go to city and county governments and 10% to the Colorado Water Conservation Board to provide water, mostly in rural areas.

Coal mining is among the most heavily regulated industries in the U.S. These regulations include posting a reclamation bond to ensure that reclamation of surface disturbance is completed. Coal mining is subject to strict state and federal laws for performance standards for protection water, vegetation, wildlife, etc. Operators work with the Forest Service to restrict motor vehicle access on temporary roads when requested.

The North Fork Valley coal mining district recommends the Task Force:

- Leave existing coal leases unencumbered by roadless designation (as was the case when the leases were issued);
- Allow surface access to unleased coal resources adjacent to existing mines for exploration, development, sustainability and health and safety need (consistent with current forest management plans);
- Better assess the coal resources west of the North Fork valley; and
- Remove the following specific areas from roadless status (a final map and the amount of acres proposed will be provided to the Task Force at the Grand Junction public meeting, June 22nd):
 1. Pilot Know landscape in the springhouse Park Inventoried roadless area;
 2. Electric Mountain landscape in the Electric Mountain inventoried roadless area;
 3. Terror landscape in Cunningham Creek (southern end) and Hubbard Creek (northeast section) inventoried roadless areas;
 4. Leroux landscape in the Currant Creek inventoried roadless area (some overlap into Grand Mesa Marcott landscape);
 5. Sunset unit in the Sunset inventoried roadless area; and
 6. Flatirons landscape in the new roadless inventory area #24 (separated from Sunset by road #711).

State Land Board, John Brejcha *(submitted a hard copy letter; see appendix C)*

The State Land Board completed further analysis of the parcels of state trust land and mineral rights adjacent to or within designated roadless area boundaries. Research was conducted on 70 parcels of surface ownership lands to determine if any roads to the parcels would come through a roadless area. Only one parcel (640 acres) fits this criteria, it is adjacent to a roadless areas and under current regulations would allow for the road to be maintained. The other 69 parcels have existing road access outside the adjacent roadless areas or do not have existing roads.

One potential solution to avoid any potential future impact would be to move the roadless area boundary to the north side of the existing road. This would eliminate approximately 70 acres from the roadless area. Another solution would be to allow the State Land Board to acquire those 70 acres south of the road from the Forest Service.

The State Land Board Minerals Section Manager evaluated mineral rights of the state trusts, the 77 parcels underneath surface land owned by the Forest Service within a roadless area. Of these, 18 were judged to have good or moderate mineral development potential, while the others were fair, poor or little or no potential.

Further research showed that of the good to moderate development mineral rights parcels, none of them are leased for mineral development. One reason for this is that the surface land is owned by the Forest Service and is within a roadless area and lessees are not willing to suffer the risk and negative fallout from such mineral development.

One solution to eliminate this impact would be to enter into a mineral rights exchange with the federal government. This would allow Forest Service to own and control these minerals within roadless areas and provide the State land Board to acquire mineral right that could be leased to provide income for the School trust.

The State Land Board recommends the Task Force support the suggested exchange transactions with the Forest Service, which will eliminate impacts to Colorado's state trust assets.

Division of Wildlife, Jim Goodyear and Tom Nesler *(submitted wildlife managers and biologists comments on the Arapaho-Roosevelt, and a Forest Service handbook on Forest Roads; see appendix A for a link to the presentation)*

Jim Goodyear updated the Task Force on Division of Wildlife (DOW) information. DOW mailed a CD of field comments from wildlife managers and biologists on the Arapaho-Roosevelt (and distributed hard copies). Mr. Goodyear summarized the synopsis letter of comments in one sentence: For a variety of reasons, the professionals in the field, and their supervisors, recommend that the protections historically afforded by the roadless designation remain on each of the 40 inventoried roadless areas; and that the multiple use-sustained yield management prescriptions/themes continue to enhance, benefit and sustain the wildlife values associated within these areas.

Rare species are, by definition, hard to find and difficult to manage. Invasive non-native species and habitat loss (fragmentation, contamination and elimination) play a key role in improving or stabilizing threatened or endangered species populations, therefore raising the potential for delisting.

Tom Nesler, Wildlife Conservation Section Manager, presented DOW's goal to keep species off the threatened and endangered species list by maintaining vibrant populations. Since 1978 nineteen species have been down-listed or de-listed. twelve of those since 2001. Success comes from bringing the best information to bear on Fish and Wildlife Service decisions and by putting active conservation programs on the ground and tracking recovery. Another key factor in success is maintaining and increasing the abundance and security of species habitat. This included decreasing habitat modification and destruction (this is the first factor, on the list of five factors, for listing a species as threatened or endangered).

Mr. Nesler reviewed many different species and their current status (on the list, de-listed, down-listed, etc.), including: amphibians, fish, birds and mammals. Some of the threats to these species are:

- Human disturbance in breeding areas, which can be distinct depending on the species (e.g., the boreal toad breeding ground is distinct and impacted by activity; sage grouse)
- Elicit stocking of other trout species
- Road crossings are a barrier for the health of fish populations (this can also be a benefit by keeping out invasive species)
- Roads, power lines and infrastructure cause an increase in raptor access

Mr. Nesler also provided a list of species they are watching for future success, including lynx.

Wildlife is a resource for Colorado residents and DOW is working in partnership with Federal agencies to maintain and improve this resource.

Questions/Answers for the Statewide Panel

Question -Tri-State- Who pays for road maintenance on access roads?

Answer – When the facilities are shared the cost for maintenance is shared. Forest Service has requirements on major changes to roads or facilities that Tri-state complies with.

Question –Tri-State- How are trees trimmed?

Answer – Tri-State confers with Forest Service Ranger districts on the trimming activities. Sometimes Forest Service requests the trimmings be removed, sometimes they request the trimming remain.

Question –Arch Coal– For those parcels that Arch Coal is recommending for removal from the roadless area boundary, is it a portion of the parcel or the whole parcel?

Answer – Arch Coal is requesting the whole parcel be made available for leasing and access.

Question –Arch Coal– Will Arch Coal provide the amount of acres and management themes for the parcels being recommended for removal?

Answer – Yes, we will bring the acreage and management themes for the proposed parcels.

Question –Tri-State– What are the number of transmission facilities have that go through roadless areas today?

Answer – Approximately 6-9 transmission facilities are within roadless areas. They are in the process of gathering GIS data, and expect updated maps within two years.

Question –Tri-State– Who builds the access roads and are these road restricted?

Answer – Some of the roads existed prior to Tri-States using them for maintenance. All the roads in roadless areas are permitted by the Forest Service. Tri-State tries to not build new roads but looks for existing trails and roads to use. Some of the roads are restricted with gates/locks.

Question –Tri-State– What is Tri-State interpretation of the 2001 rule; are their facilities construed existing facilities and therefore preserved?

Answer – Tri-State's facilities are considered existing.

Question –Tri-State– What is Tri-State's interpretation of the 2001 rule language with regards to new transmission lines?

Answer – The rule says new transmission lines are permitted if they are for good of public health and safety; if they provide a need. For example, a potentially new line into Crested Butte may be considered for the good of public health and safety because currently the community relies on one transmission line.

Question –Tri-State– Would Tri-State provide clarifying language to the 2001 rule with regards to building new facilities and access roads?

Answer – We will work on clarifying language.

Question –Tri-State– Will the Energy Policy Act programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS) for energy corridors address the future infrastructure issues? Would the EIS trump the roadless rule?

Answer – The programmatic EIS could be good for large multi-state facilities, but not for local issues. The national study may not provide for another line into Crested Butte.

Question –Arch Coal– What activities would occur in the proposed areas for removal? Please send the information as soon as possible.

Answer – Some of the activities would be drilling test holes and vent holes and access roads to conduct the drilling. Drilling has been conducted in those areas for years. When BLM is contacted for a potential lease they have data accuracy requirements (e.g., may not have enough information to extract coal or put up a lease). Coal resources in the North Fork area have higher concentrations of methane gas and therefore need more ventilation for worker safety.

Question –Arch Coal– How many roads would be required?

Answer – Road requirement would not look like a dense spider web. Arch Coal would work with Forest Service to determine the appropriate number and placement of the roads. When deciding the location of a road, they would first look for existing roads, trails, etc, before considering new construction.

Question –Arch Coal – Are the proposed parcels for removal from roadless boundaries for new leases or existing leases?

Answer – The parcels would be areas that may be leased in the future, but are not currently leased.

Question –Arch Coal- Are there coal resources in other National Forests?

Answer – The North Fork Valley is where there are the greatest challenges.

Question –CWF– What are the standards for restoration – is this in FS plans? Would tree removal be limited to only small diameter trees?

Answer – CWF would rely on expert opinion in making judgments about tree removal and size of trees removed. CWF understand that the by-products of trimming activities could help improve wildlife habitat. Colorado's unique challenge of the urban interface is not adequately addressed in the 2001 rule.

Question –State Land Board– Where is the one state trust land whose access road divides a roadless area?

Answer – It is in Fremont County.

Question –CWF– Where should issues with trails be handled – a statewide rule or through Forest Service plans?

Answer – Forest Service plans can adequately address issues of trails, but the 2001 rule included these elements. There may be some areas that could be addressed with a statewide rule.

Question –Tri-State– Has Tri-State identified future potential corridors for upgrades?

Answer – There is a planning process to determine future needs. There must be flexibility to address the unknown future needs.

Question –State Land Board– Is there a willingness to exchange parcels? Are they exchangeable parcels?

Answer – If the parcels are in forest boundaries they are exchangeable, but don't know if they are in forest boundaries.

Question –DOW– What is critical habitat with regards to consultation for section 7 on threatened and endangered species?

Answer – It is difficult to designate critical habitat for any species, but loosely it is the defined space necessary for a species to be self sustaining. There is not a specific study on the possible benefit of roadless areas to critical habitat, but when human activity is limited the disturbance is decreased which improves the habitat. DOW is working to decrease the threats to species and de-list or keep a species off the list

Question –DOW– Is DOW comfortable with the activities prescribed by the Forest Plans or are there specific actions not covered by Forest Service guidelines?

Answer – DOW supports the two prongs of Forest Service plans - sustained yield and multiple-use. DOW staff has looked at 333 roadless areas so far, and the recommendation is to maintain protections for wildlife while knowing that other activities may occur.

Question –DOW– Where should the Task Force account for mitigation?

Answer – DOW's report (page 12) and a general statement about balancing uses to minimize negative impacts to wildlife.

Question – DOW- What would be the right place for DOW in the rule? What could the Task Force recommend for the federal rule?

Answer – The Task Force should recommend DOW be more involved in the process along with other members on decision making. DOW will develop some language for the Task Force. One good example is the BLM in the Roan Plateau language that says, "in consultation with DOW".

Question –DOW– what does "in consultation" mean?

Answer – (no answer)

Question –DOW- What kind of involvement (seat at the table) does DOW want to have for decisions on critical habitat?

Answer – Early consultation. Consultation needs to be far enough in advance to bring the best information forward early in the decision-making, and not after the decision has been made or implemented.

Question –CWF– What does CWF mean by the statement - a continuing state role beyond wildlife?

Answer – This means having conversations and compiling data and integrating the recommendations.

Question –Tri-State– Is there a map showing the 6-9 transmission lines in roadless areas?

Answer – Yes, and will be provided to the Task Force.

Question –Tri-State- Is it likely that new power lines will follow existing corridors?

Answer – Under normal circumstances the preference is to separate the lines so that one incident (storm or fire) does not take down all the power lines at once. It is not always possible to site lines in separate locations.

Question –Tri-State- Is Tri-State representative of electric generators/suppliers? Does the Task Force need to gather data from other electric generators?

Answer – It would be good to hear from other energy representative, (e.g., Xcel Energy, Colorado Rural Electric Association).

Question – Geological Survey– Does the geological survey have a recommendation?

Answer – Based on the data, our conclusions are that we are beginning to see tight supplies in mineral and energy resource because China is tying up the resources. Because Colorado is rich in natural resources there will be increased pressure to extract those resources.

Question –Geological Survey- Does the increased pressure mean there should be broad roadless protections or because of prices increases can we afford to be selective about equipment and location for extraction and protect wildlife? Can we take advantage of where we are to be more strategic in getting the resources out or lift protections to get them out?

Answer – Many of the companies that are mining Colorado resources are not U.S. owned. The question is if those companies’ allegiance is to Colorado or to their home country. The Task Force will have to weigh the benefits and costs of lifting restrictions or waiting.

Question –Geological Survey– What adjustments to the 2001 rule would you recommend?

Answer – Will provide this information to the Task Force.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Task Force ended the presentation session early and allowed the public to comment.

- Jerry Abboud, COHVCO – when thinking about mitigation the Task Force needs to consider the diversity of the interests involved and that they will have different ideas about mitigation. It will be difficult for some interest groups to provide mitigation suggestions. Consider whether the Task Force wants to give input on mitigation in the rule or leave those decisions to the Forest Service.
- Adrian Raudzens, Sierra Club and other of environmental groups – She delivered 15,000 pro-roadless area signed comment-post-cards (DNR accepted them).
- Diane Orf, Colorado Mining Association – The focus on the North Folk Valley is because of the strategic reserves. Because we don’t know about the needs that will arise in the future there needs to be flexibility in any rule for access to roadless areas address any future needs.

DELIBERATION SESSION

Final Report Format - Outline

AGREEMENT: The Task Force agreed to the draft outline for the final report and agreed to begin drafting non-recommendation/non-controversial sections of the report: Introduction; Background; Land Descriptions; Public Involvement and the addenda - State statute, process to develop recommendations, and a catalogue of materials received during the process.

It was asked whether Tribes had been contacted. No special efforts had been made to date. DNR will contact tribes and invite them to comment, particularly the Southern Ute and the Mountain Ute tribes.

Section Drafting Assignments and Clarification/Direction

Doug Young suggested a list of report sections that were non-controversial or did not include recommendations where drafting could begin. The Task Force discussed each of those sections, giving more clarity and direction to drafters, and volunteered to drafting committees.

- ***Section I. Introduction*** – a historical overview, the factual circumstance that led up to the Task Force recommendations; clarify the definition of roadless (using Forest Services documents to the Task Force);
- ***Section III. Background*** - clarify the “starting point is the 2001 rule” but not the default

Drafting Group (both I & III): Forest Service (Pam Skeels, point person) will use materials they have or have sent to task force to clarify the national process that led to the Task Force recommendations, the difference between the 2001 rule and Forest Plans, etc. **Josh Penry and Steve Smith (point person)** will draft the state process and clarify the “starting point is the 2001 rule”.

- ***Section IV.a. Description of Lands*** – The Task force discussed whether this section should start with the 2001 EIS inventory of the most recent Forest service maps. The 2001 inventory has been updated with new information and Forest Plan revision processes. The Task Force has heard the changes made to the boundaries for each forest and why the changes were made. This information just needs to be compiled.

AGREEMENT: reference the 2001 EIS and then incorporate the most recent Forest Service mapping, explain the differences and why (forest by forest).

Drafting Group: Forest Service.

- ***Section IV.c. Public Involvement*** – this section will describe the process – public meeting format, number of public meetings, etc. Although there are risks to

summarizing all the materials and meeting summaries, it is important that the body of the report reflect some of the tone, issues and trends of the meetings and materials submitted. DNR is working with Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) research arm to detail a staff person to DNR who will index, analyze and summarize all the materials. This could be incorporated into this section of the report.

Drafting Group: **BLM/DNR staff person** compiling and analyzing materials, with review by **Tom Compton, Eddie Kochman, and Steve Smith (point person)**.

- *Addenda 1. State Statute SB 243* – will be cut and pasted into the body of the report
- *Addenda 2. Description of the Task Force Deliberation Process*

Drafting Group: **The Keystone Center** will draft the Task Forces process (public meetings, deliberative meetings, working groups. etc) and **Steve Smith** will review this section.

- *Addenda 3. Catalogue/Index of all Materials Received/Reviewed*

Drafting Group: **BLM/DNR staff person**.

ARAPAHO-ROOSEVELT MEMO OF ISSUES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Doug Young briefly reviewed his memo (see Appendix D) on the issues and possible solutions for the Arapahoe-Roosevelt National Forest. The memo was a result of Mr. Young's clarifying conversation with Arapaho-Roosevelt Forest Service staff. Mr. Young followed a similar format to the memos on the Pike-San Isabel and the San Juan with the addition of some specific language suggestions.

ISSUES – OVERVIEW, DISCUSSION & ASSIGNMENTS

The Task Force discussed the process for the issue working groups, the template that will create similarity among group reports, heard overviews of each issue, and volunteer for and provided further guidance to the working groups.

Process for Discussion – The Task Force will develop working groups to further scope issues identified for further deliberations and possible solutions. These issue working groups will develop key points to consider when deliberating over possible recommendations. This will be a way to “set the table” for the Task Force's deliberations; bringing all key points and possible solutions for consideration by the Task Force.

Template for All Working Groups:

The following are a list of principles for issue groups' work. These principles will help the final group reports be similar in nature. Each working group will articulate and/or consider:

- 1) How the issue and solution relates to the 2001 rule – Does the rule cover/solve the issue? Can the rule be modified to do so? Does another alternative need to be developed? These reports need to include a disclaimer on each one that refers to the statute's language that the starting point is the 2001 rule, but not the default.
- 2) All public comment - working groups should review all documents for reference to the particular issues (presentations, summaries, etc) to create a comprehensive list of key points for consideration
- 3) Bigger roadless landscape, the larger roadless context
- 4) Basic questions – under what circumstances should/should not roads be constructed/reconstructed and/or maintained; when would tree-removal be allowed (under what circumstances); etc.
- 5) Look statewide and site specific (are there adjustment for a specific forest)

Working groups should work to have neutral and comprehensive language, present all sides for discussion, and be wary of generalizations.

Issue Overview, discussion and Assignments

Timber

Joe Duda presented an overview of the issue (see appendix E). The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- The distinction between “imminent threat” and “real threat”
- Timber salvage/wildfires.
- When should trees be removed?
- When are roads appropriate? When should roads be restricted for recreation?
When are temporary road appropriate for fire or for some other purpose?
- Fuels management – more than just trees/fuels,

Group: Joe Duda (point person), Steve Smith, Diane Hoppe, Dave Ubell.

Grazing Allotments

Tom Compton presented an overview of the issue (see appendix F). The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- Access to permit lands during emergency events – fire, storms, flooding...using existing roadways or onto lands with no roads
- Changes in permit limitations over time (e.g., backhoes and bulldozers)
- Renewals – valid and existing rights cease to be “valid and existing” when it is renewed and therefore is subject to new rules

- Vacant allotments – Should Forest Service have the right to move/encourage to move one allotment to another for resource protection
- Viability of private land owners to stay on their land – for private land owners who have conservation easement on their property, they need access to grazing permits on Federal lands to stay economically viable

Group: Tom Compton (point person), Dave Ubell, Melanie Mills

Coal/Gas/Oil Leases

Russ George presented an overview of the issue (see appendix G). The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- Natural gas pipelines crossing roadless areas
- New Development – can TF preclude future leases...the 2001 rule allows for existing leases and disallows new leases
- When should a road be built for new development? What circumstances would preclude roads? What terms and conditions are necessary for new roads?
- Is there a timing component similar to the BLM Roan Plateau agreement?; should/could the Task Force design a process to go for the most accessible lands while saving some for future? The state has no control on when, nothing in the law allows the state to delay an application

Group: Russ George (point person), Steve Smith, John Swartout

Recreation/OHV

Doug Young presented an overview of the issue (see appendix H). Mr. Young suggested a broader scope for this issue, to include recreation and trails and non-system roads.

Agreement: Task Force agreed to expand the OHV use issue to incorporate all recreation issues.

There was discussion about removing this issue because the 2001 rule did not have provisions on recreation. The Task Force felt this issue would provide an opportunity to bring clarity on many of the recreation issues raise by the public comments which were extensive and require some response.

The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- Clarity on the ambiguities – using Forest Service definitions as a starting place
- What does it mean when nothing gets enforced? What are the implications/effects when there is little enforcement?
- Push Forest Service to determine what to do with non-system roads
- RS 2477
- Interplay between roads in roadless and the broader Travel Management Plan (separate and overlap)

Group: Doug Young (point person), Josh Penry, Steve Smith, Eddie Kochman

COVHCO offered to provide the Task Force information on the Travel Management Plan

Wildlife & Critical Habitat, Invasive Species

Eddie Kochman presented an overview of the issue and David Petersen presented an overview specific to invasive species (see appendix I for both) The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- This issue is different than the other issues because it is not focused on human impacts; it is more of an overarching/cross cutting issue. This issue is about how potential recommendations affect wildlife impacts
- Fish and Wildlife Service has been contacted, but they are deferring to DOW to address threatened and endangered species.
- Fish and Wildlife Service has authority under the Endangered Species Act regardless of roadless status
- Would be good for DOW to recommend a range of activities to allow and descriptions of how to mitigate for impacts?
- Is there controversy on this issue? What recommendation would the TF make on this issue? This is more a subset, a screen for all the recommendations. The issue is how developing roads effects wildlife, which must be considered by all working groups.

<p>AGREEMENT: The Task Force agreed this group will screen the possible recommendations for impacts to wildlife and critical habitat.</p>
--

Group: Eddie Kochman (point person), David Petersen, Russ George, Josh Penry, Joe Duda, in conjunction with DOW

Access to Water Facilities

Doug Young presented an overview of the issue referring to his Arapaho-Roosevelt memo (no overview submitted). At issue is construction of new facilities.

Group: Diane Hoppe (point person), Doug Young, and Jim Lohead (when possible)

Watershed Protection

David Petersen presented an overview of the issue (see appendix J). David observed that this issue was similar to the Wildlife issue in that there is no overt controversy. It is an overarching issue of how roads affect watersheds or how human disturbance impacts watersheds. The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- Threats to watershed are over vegetation, the thickness of the canopy, catastrophic wildfire impacts
- Need data on watershed health on a forest by forest, drainage by drainage level on what the impacts are (sediment, heavy metals, etc). Forest Service will have different levels of data depending on the forest and it is difficult to define “healthy” and “unhealthy”
- The TF needs a map that overlays watersheds with roadless areas – this was recently mailed to the TF

AGREEMENT: The Task Force agreed this group will screen the possible recommendations for impacts to watershed health.

Group: David Petersen (point person) and Joe Duda

Roadless Boundaries

Steve Smith presented an overview of the issue (see appendix K). The following are some clarifications or key points for the working group to consider further:

- There has been lots of input on the topic, so TF needs to be responsive
- What does the Task Force do with comments from folks that want boundary adjustments (additions or removals)? How to address proposals to take areas out (e.g., the areas suggested by coal industry)? Will the committee address additions AND removals?
- Is this a mapping or management question? The Task Force could address the underlying concerns for additions or removals. The Task Force could address policies that set the boundaries.
- Forest Service is require to re-inventory and change (if necessary) boundaries during Forest Plan revisions, in addition to any possible administrative changes/fixes. The Forest Service reviews and proposed inventory sent by any group in the plan revision process. Roadless areas tend to get smaller over time. There may be an area that has been restored to the point where it would meet roadless criteria and therefore would be added in during the plan revision inventory.

Group: Steve Smith, Melanie Mills, Doug Young, John Swartout; Point Person: Steve Smith

Additional Issue Group

Utility corridors (pipelines, transmission lines, electricity) – This topics was added during the meeting and a group was formed.

Group: John Swartout, Diane Hoppe, Tom Compton, and Russ George...Point Person: Russ

SCHEDULING

- **April 18th**, 4:00-5:00, Debrief Phone call
- **May 18th**, 5:00 - 8:45 pm, Public Meeting, Steamboat, on the Routt NF (organizers: Steve, tom and John)
- **June 7th**, 5:00 - 8:45 pm, Public Meeting, Monte Vista (maybe in Alamosa, due to hall availability), on the Rio Grande (organizers: David P. and Tom)
- **June 8th**, 8:00 – 2:00 pm, Deliberative Meeting #4, Monte Vista
- **June 21st**, 5:00 – 8:45 pm, Public Meeting, Glenwood Springs, on the White River NF (organizers: Steve and Melanie)
- *(June 22nd, possible deliberative time before the public meeting 12-3ish, if necessary, since we are all there already)*

- **June 22nd**, 5:00 – 8:45 pm, Public Meeting, Grand Junction, on the GMUG NF (organizers: Dave U. and Josh)
- (? , *possible deliberative meeting*)
- **July 19th**, 9:00 – 5:00 pm, Deliberative Meeting
- ?, Public Meeting, to review/comment on recommendations
- ?, deliberative meeting to discuss public comments and revise recommendations if necessary

Parking Lot

Implication of budget (FS) on enforcement – can this be included in the scope of the recommendations? It is not in the scope of the Task Force, but it needs to be addressed because the recommendations wouldn't need to be supported.

Special use permits (ski resorts, recreation that stays in one place) – Additional Issue Group

APPENDIX A: Presentation links

1. Geological Survey, Vince Mathews –

http://www.keystone.org/spp/documents/3650_4_14_06Vince%20Mathews.pdf

2. Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, John Beyer –

http://www.keystone.org/spp/documents/3650_04_04_06TriState_CO%20Roadless%20TF.pdf

3. Arch Coal, Greg Schafer -

http://www.keystone.org/spp/documents/3650_04_04_06Greg%20Schafer%20Task%20Force.pdf

4. Division of Wildlife, Tom Nesler -

http://www.keystone.org/spp/documents/3650_04_14_06DOW-SpeConSuccess-Roadless.pdf

APPENDIX B: Colorado Wildlife Federation, Suzanne O'Neill – Testimony
Colorado Wildlife Federation Presentation to
The Colorado Roadless Areas Task Force

April 14, 2006

Delivered by Suzanne O'Neill (Board Chair 2002-2005),
on behalf of the Colorado Wildlife Federation Board of Directors

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Task Force, thank-you for this opportunity to address you this morning.

The Colorado Wildlife Federation (CWF) is a statewide organization and we view our role in this public process to provide a mainstream statewide level voice in the developing analysis of the complex issues before the Task Force. Our mission is to promote the conservation, sound management and sustainable use of Colorado's wildlife and wildlife habitat through education and advocacy. In the immediate context, our major interest is in the wildlife habitat protection values and characteristics provided by inventoried roadless areas. The 2005 Rule lists as one of the petition criteria a description of how the recommended management requirements would affect fish and wildlife and their habitat in the inventoried roadless areas.

Our opinions, to date, have been informed through the presentations, documents and discussions during the Task Force meetings; our scientific literature research of impacts that roads have upon wildlife culminating in the summary literature review that we distributed to you; and discussions with our members. In addition, we studied the habitat value maps we produced and distributed to the Task Force for selected economic and at risk species, that were superimposed onto the roadless areas map for the Pike-San Isabel, San Juan, GMUG and Arapahoe-Roosevelt national forests. The maps reflect the Division of Wildlife's GIS data layers that form its "cumulative wildlife map."

At this juncture in the Task Force process, we wish to provide our judgments concerning the following seven issues. In accordance with the Colorado statute, we, too, have focused upon the former roadless area conservation rule (2001 rule) as the starting point. It is the baseline from which we have studied the substantive aspects of inventoried roadless area management.

Temporary roads

The 2001 rule defines temporary roads in §294.11(3), but does not specifically address restoration of temporary roads, nor does the explanation for the rule. In our view, temporary roads must be restored within a reasonable period of time, following completion of their particular prescribed resource management function. One year appears to be a reasonable period, with an outer limit of two years if extenuating circumstances are present. As to the character of restoration, several roadless area characteristics are enumerated in §294.11. Logically, restoration should achieve such of those characteristics that are relevant to the area in which the temporary road was constructed. Enforcement and imposition of penalties are needed if a temporary road is not restored.

Imminent threat of wildfire

Section 294.12(b)(1) of the 2001 rule provides that “a road is needed to protect public health and safety in cases of an imminent threat of flood, fire, or other catastrophic event that, without intervention, would cause the loss of life or property.” The explanation for the 2001 rule does not appear to contemplate the wildfire challenges that Colorado faces in its interface between forested land and urban/exurban areas. We believe an adjustment to the language in the 2001 rule is appropriate to the extent that temporary roads may be necessary for access to enable cutting and removing small diameter timber to reduce a substantial risk of wildfire and increase forest resistance to the spread of a wildfire. Such good forestry measures also can serve to improve wildlife habitat through collaborative expertise by U.S. Forest Service and Division of Wildlife professionals. For example, appropriate mixes of replanting materials will reduce the concentration of lodgepole pines. As noted above, temporary roads must be restored within a reasonable period of time.

Boundaries

The Colorado Wildlife Federation maps depicting very high value and high value habitat for selected economic species and species at risk that we distributed to the Task Force show some areas where it may be appropriate to examine inventoried roadless area boundaries. As is shown on the maps, there are areas where very high value habitat for a particular species or several species extends beyond the boundary of an inventoried roadless area (but within the national forest). For example, the map of very high value habitat in the GMUG national forests for the Gunnison sage grouse, a species of state special concern (not a statutory category), shows the importance of inventoried roadless areas and adjacent areas for this species. The maps of the Pike-San Isabel and GMUG national forests depict very high habitat value for the boreal toad, a state endangered species. In fact, two roadless areas offer the only two viable populations of this species according to the Division of Wildlife herptile coordinator. One is the White Rock Mountain population located within the Elk Mountains – Collegiate inventoried roadless area in the GMUG national forests. The other, the Cottonwood Creek population, is within the Kreutzer-Princeton (#107) roadless area of the Pike-San Isabel, the Collegiate Peaks Wilderness, and immediately adjacent areas.

Watersheds and riparian areas

Protection of roadless areas in which cold water streams originate or flow through is essential. Presentations by Trout Unlimited representatives as well as others, and scientific studies repeatedly emphasize the importance of preventing sedimentation, erosion, chemical runoff, migration barriers, and other adverse, cumulative impacts to cold water streams caused by adjacent roads. Cold water streams that course through inventoried roadless areas provide the majority of habitat for Colorado’s native greenback cutthroat trout, Colorado River cutthroat trout and Rio Grande cutthroat trout. The greenback cutthroat trout is a federal and state threatened species; the Colorado River cutthroat trout and the Rio Grande cutthroat trout are species of state special concern. In addition, cold water sport fisheries, offering wild trout and stocked brook, brown and rainbow trout have very high recreation value. Gold medal streams, as well, need special management protection.

Trails

The 2001 rule defines a road as a motor vehicle travelway that is greater than 50 inches wide, unless designated and managed as a trail. Under the definitions section, roadless area characteristics include “primitive, semi-primitive nonmotorized and semi-primitive motorized classes of dispersed recreation.” As we were asked to limit our presentation today to a statewide level brush, we shall confine our point on this issue at this time to state our concern that in some areas, the rule might be too broad. Some trails may be inappropriate or warrant seasonal closures, when balanced against particular very high value wildlife habitat. We also note that since our summary literature review was distributed to you on January 6, an additional study has been published that quantified beyond previous work the response of wildlife to all-terrain vehicles. Preisler, H.K., A.A. Ager, and M.J. Wisdom. “Statistical Methods for Analyzing Responses of Wildlife to Human Disturbance,” *Journal of Applied Ecology* vol. 43(1) (February 2006).

Process: Continued active State role

We believe it is imperative that the petition prescribe an active State role in the U.S. Forest Service decision-making processes – whether forest planning decisions or rulemaking to implement the petition – affecting roadless areas. We understand that the 2005 Roadless Rule provides a process for reacting to state petitions, including a federal rulemaking and accompanying environmental impact statement process. We believe that the State of Colorado’s role should not end with submission of the petition, but rather the State should be meaningfully involved in the development and analysis of any Colorado-specific rule. In addition, the petition also should insist on State participation in future site-specific decisions within or affecting inventoried roadless areas, particularly those that could impact very high value wildlife habitat.

Oil, gas and mineral leasing

Our impression is that any road construction restrictions imposed by the petition on new oil, gas and mineral leases in inventoried roadless areas may not be activated until the effective date of the final Colorado rule. Our understanding is that leases granted in inventoried roadless areas since the issuance of the 2001 rule contain a stipulation to the effect that development may be subject to additional requirements upon issuance of a final Colorado rule. We believe it essential that authority be conferred upon the State to ensure such pre-final rule leases are reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine what, if any, new requirements should be imposed pursuant to the final rule, in accordance with the roadless values Colorado seeks to protect as stated in the petition. In addition, a State role is also advisable to ensure that the stipulations are enforced. We also urge the Task Force to recommend that any leases granted in inventoried roadless areas after the effective date of the final Colorado rule be subject to a “no surface occupancy restriction” as to lease activities performed within an inventoried roadless area boundary.

Mindful of the complexity of the information presented to the Task Force that must be considered in the context of the petition criteria, we urge that you err on the side of continued protection for roadless areas. The adverse impacts of roads to wildlife is well documented in the scientific literature. In addition, the weight of public comments made to the Task Force from

September 2005 through March 17, 2006 favor affirmation of the 2001 rule principles. Mondo Business Group, Ltd. Report dated April 11, 2006.

As we listen to your plenary deliberations, view additional documents, continue our mapping of the remaining national forests, and confer with members and others, we anticipate offering additional written recommendations.

APPENDIX C: State Land Board, John Brejcha – Testimony

April 14, 2006

TO: Roadless Area Review Task Force

FROM: John Brejcha, Deputy Director
Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners

RE: State Trust Assets Impacted by 2001 Roadless Areas

As a follow up to my February 10, 2006 memo to the Roadless Area Review Task Force, the staff at the State Land Board has completed further analysis of the parcels of state trust land and mineral rights that are adjacent to or within the designated United States Forest Service (USFS) Roadless Area boundaries.

Our research included seventy parcels of surface ownership that were analyzed to determine if any roads to the parcel of state trust land would come through land within a Roadless Area. Only one 640-acre parcel fit this criteria and it is adjacent to a Category Three Roadless Area that, at least by the current regulations, would allow for the road to be maintained.

However, to avoid any potential future impact to this parcel of School Trust land one solution would be to move the Roadless Area boundary to the north side of the existing road. This change would only eliminate approximately seventy acres from the Roadless Area. Another solution would be to allow the State Land Board to acquire those seventy acres from the USFS that are south of the road.

The other sixty-nine parcels of state trust land either have existing road access from outside of the adjacent designated Roadless Area or do not have existing road access but with the best source of future access from land outside of the adjacent Roadless Area.

The State Land Board Minerals Section Manager evaluated the state trusts' mineral rights that are underneath surface land owned by the USFS within their designated Roadless Areas. The mineral rights of these seventy-seven parcels were analyzed to determine the likelihood of potential future mineral development. Eighteen of these parcels were judged to have *good* or *moderate* mineral development potential, while all of the others were of *fair*, *poor* or *little or no* potential. Attached is Table One that lists these parcels, the commodity contained within each one and a summary of the ratings standards.

Further research showed that, even though these minerals have good or moderate development potential, none of these parcels are leased for mineral development. We conclude that one of the reasons for this is that the surface land is owned by the USFS and is within a designated Roadless Area and that lessees are not willing to suffer the risk and negative fallout from such mineral development. A solution to eliminate this impact to the School Trust would be to enter into a mineral rights exchange with the federal government. This would allow for the USFS to own and thus control these minerals within their Roadless Area boundaries and would provide for the State Land Board to acquire mineral rights that could be leased to provide income for the School Trust.

Our conclusion is that by completing exchange transactions with the USFS we can eliminate these impacts to Colorado's state trust assets. We urge you to support that solution in your findings and recommendations at the conclusion of your meetings.

TABLE ONE

FOREST	COUNTY	COMMODITY	POTENTIAL	SECTION	TWNSHP	DIR	RNGE	DIR
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	2	37	N	9	W
APA-ROOS	LAR	U-V	MODERATE	3	8	N	74	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	3	37	N	9	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	4	37	N	9	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	COAL	GOOD	9	36	N	3	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	9	36	N	3	W
APA-ROOS	CLR	METALS	GOOD	16	4	S	75	W
PIK-SAN	FRE	METALS	GOOD	16	20	S	71	W
PIK-SAN	LAS	O&G	GOOD	16	31	S	68	W
SAN JUAN	LAP	O&G	MODERATE	16	37	N	8	W
GRD-UNC	SMI	O&G	MODERATE	16	42	N	10	W
MED BOW	JAC	COAL	MODERATE	21	6	N	76	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	33	36	N	3	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	33	38	N	9	W
SAN JUAN	ARC	O&G	MODERATE	34	38	N	9	W
SAN JUAN	LAP	O&G	MODERATE	36	36	N	3	W
SAN JUAN	LAP	U-V	MODERATE	36	37	N	6	W
GRD UNC	HIN	METALS	GOOD	36	44	N	6	W

For a tract to be rated as “moderate” it must have essential elements for minerals to exist such as rock type or trapping mechanism or near-by exploration activities but geologic control is insufficient to determine if minerals exist under the tract. In most cases a rating of moderate would justify a step wise expenditure to further identify prospective targets. For a tract to be rated as “good” it must have the elements included in a rating of moderate plus near-by production on trend. In neither case is it assured that mineral exists or if it does exist, that it can be produced economically.

APPENDIX D: Arapaho-Roosevelt memo, Doug Young
MEMORANDUM

To: Roadless Area Task Force Members
From: Doug Young
Date: April 10, 2006

Re: **Issues on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest**

Following the public meeting on March 17th, I met with Deputy Forest Supervisor Jackie Parks, and forest planners Ken Tu and Roger Tarum to discuss the issues we heard at the public meeting. We walked through the major issue areas and discussed how they affect this forest. As with similar memos from Dave Peterson on the San Juan National Forest and Steve Smith on the Pike San Isabel National Forest, at the end of each issue area are my personal suggestions on how we might want to address the issue or begin that conversation.

Roadless Area Inventories – According to officials in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest (ARNF), the areas currently considered as inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) were determined by the ARNF during the Forest Plan revision completed in 1997. That is, 38 inventoried roadless areas comprising about 330,230 acres (since this inventory, 33,200 acres have been designated as wilderness or other special designations leaving a total of **297,030** acres as inventoried roadless (this forest also acquired managerial oversight of about 60,000 acres of roadless in the Williams Fork area from the Routt National Forest, but these 60,000 acres are still being counted by the Routt).

Roz McClellan of the Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance stated at the Fort Collins Task Force meeting that they conducted a roadless area inventory which resulted in about 25% more acres than the Forest Service inventory. Mark Morgan of Morgan Timber and Valerie Douglas of Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition indicated they believe the Forest Service inventory is inaccurate because it included many roaded areas.

The differences between people's perception over how much roadless area exists on the ARNF is related to differences in inventory criteria and the age of the inventory. The Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance stated that their estimate of 25% more roadless acres was due to different inventory methodology and gave an example of utilizing a 100 foot road buffer rather than 300 feet the ARNF utilized. The ARNF utilized a 300 foot buffer from roads due to regulations allowing dispersed camping within 300 feet of an open road. In addition, Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance cherry-stemmed roads to include more roadless acres, while the ARNF eliminated roadless areas that were dog legged (narrow long pieces of unroaded areas surrounded by roads or other human features). The ARNF did not include dog legs because narrow pieces of land are affected by the sights and sounds of the adjacent roads and land such as these are difficult to manage separately from the roaded portion.

The areas the ARNF is currently considering as inventoried roadless areas were inventoried and mapped in the early 1990s as part of the Forest Plan revision process. At that time, the best

available information was used and many reviews were conducted with ARNF staff and the public to ensure accuracy. All roads (Forest Service system and non-system roads) were considered in the ARNF inventory. The Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition and Morgan Timber implied the roadless inventory was inaccurate because they know of roads that exist within IRAs. It is likely that they are thinking of user created routes or temporary roads that did not have a long term use that were created since the early 1990s when the current IRAs were identified. The ARNF does not consider user created routes to be part of the official road system.

The roadless direction in the Forest Plan was formulated through extensive public participation which lasted between 1992 and 1997. Officials with the ARNF have indicated their desire for “management flexibility” to address and respond to forest health conditions and recreation management challenges. In addition, they believe that growing challenges and limited budgets require efficient resource management and the recognition that forest-wide issues such as the roadless issue are best addressed at the Forest Plan level during the revision process. They have also indicated that the ARNF may begin the next Forest Plan revision as early as 2008.

Possible solution: Affirm the Forest Service’s inventory (minus the designations made since the Forest Plan Revision in 1997).

Another possible solution: Encourage citizen groups to work with the Forest Service regarding the revised inventory associated with the next Forest Plan Revision process.

Another Possible solution: Recommend the Forest Service look carefully at any and all citizen inventories and consider making revisions to the inventory as part of this Task Force process prior to the Plan Revision process.

Another possible solution: Recommend that the areas recommended for wilderness in the 1997 Forest Plan be considered for wilderness designation by Congress.

Hazardous Fuels Program – At the Fort Collins Task Force meeting Jim Bedwell, Forest Supervisor, provided an example of a fuels reduction project near the Town of Granby that entered a portion of an IRA. The purpose of the project was to provide defensible space near private homes and increase firefighter safety. Concerns were raised during the meeting whether fuel reduction projects within roadless areas could occur under the 2001 Rule.

The 2001 Rule clearly prohibits road construction within IRAs except for a limited set of circumstances. In the particular example Jim Bedwell provided, there were no roads constructed within the IRA to achieve the project objectives. However, this was feasible only due to the fact that the landings and roads were placed on private land downhill of the IRA. If the private lands happened to be uphill of the IRA, then it is likely road construction within the IRA would have been needed to achieve the project objectives. Some would point out that road construction is allowable within IRAs if “*needed to protect public health and safety in cases of an imminent threat of flood, fire, or other catastrophic event that, without the intervention, would cause the*

loss of life or property” per 36 CFR 294.12(b)1. However, debate surrounds the interpretation of the word “imminent.”

The 2001 Rule also clearly prohibits timber harvest within IRAs except for a limited set of circumstances. It is debatable whether the project Jim Bedwell used as an example would have been able to occur under the 2001 Rule. Many would point out the exception under 36 CFR 294.13(a)1, which states the cutting of small diameter timber is allowed if it is “*to maintain or restore characteristics of ecosystem composition and structure, such as to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire effects, within the range of variability that would be expected to occur under natural disturbance regimes of the current climatic period.*” However, this project occurred in the lodgepole pine ecosystem, which is an infrequent, high intensity fire regime.

The hazardous fuels program for the ARNF overlaps with many of the IRAs. Within the next four years (FY2007-2010), the ARNF has identified approximately 12 projects under the Accelerated Watershed/Vegetation Restoration Program that could occur within, adjacent, or near IRAs. The ambiguities of the 2001 Rule provide a platform for arguments of interpretation. Management flexibility needs to be considered to allow for hazardous fuels objectives to be efficiently met. As such, these ambiguities should be clarified to ensure consistent expectations and implementation.

Possible solution: Revise the language of the 2001 rule regarding road and road reconstruction to drop the word “imminent” and add the words “temporary,” “insects and disease” so that it would read:

“ . . . a TEMPORARY road may be constructed or reconstructed in an inventoried roadless area if the Responsible Official determines that . . . a TEMPORARY road is needed to protect public health and safety in cases of an imminent A threat of flood, fire, INSECT OR DISEASE EPIDEMIC, or other catastrophic event that, without the intervention, would cause the loss of life or property.”

In addition, revise the 2001 language regarding timber cutting to reflect the same language above (as revised), that is:

“ . . . timber may be cut, sold, or removed in inventoried roadless areas if the Responsible Official determines that one of the following circumstances exists.

strike:

~~to maintain or restore characteristics of ecosystem composition and structure, such as to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire effects, within the range of variability that would be expected to occur under natural disturbance regimes of the current climatic period.~~

and replace with:

the cutting, sale or removal is needed to protect public health and safety in cases of ~~an imminent~~ A threat of flood, fire, INSECT OR DISEASE EPIDEMIC, or other catastrophic event that, without the intervention, would cause the loss of life or property.

Motorized Recreation – The Travel Management Rule, adopted November 9, 2005, addresses motorized recreation activities on National Forests and is a separate policy from the Forest Service roadless policies. Valerie Douglas of Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition indicated there were a far greater number of existing open roads and motorized trails within the IRAs than the Forest Service estimated. It is likely that many of the off-highway vehicle users believe that implementation of the 2001 Rule would not affect their recreation opportunities within IRAs because the 2001 Rule allows for existing motorized use to continue and does not prevent the maintenance of those routes. However, most of the roads Valerie Douglas is considering to be existing valid routes are likely to be non-system or user created routes. The Forest Service would not consider managing for the existing motorized use on non-system or user created routes if the 2001 Rule were implemented. This is due to the 2001 Rule definition of road construction and Forest Service policy. The 2001 Rule defines road construction as an “*activity that results in the addition of forest classified road miles*” (36 CFR 294.11). Forest Service policy in conjunction with the Travel Management Rule (aka OHV Rule) would drive the designation of those non-system or user defined routes as system or classified roads or trails if the ARNF were to manage them as valid motorized recreation opportunities. This designation would not be allowed under the 2001 Rule due to the prohibition on road construction.

The revised Forest Plan in conjunction with the Travel Management Rule would allow for greater management flexibility in addressing off-highway vehicle use on non-system or user created routes than the 2001 Rule. This would be mainly due to the ability for the Forest Service to manage desirable non-system motorized routes rather than forcing a closure of all non-system routes regardless of desirability. The Travel Management Rule requires the Forest Service to manage motorized recreation use through the designation of motorized routes. The designation process will be a site-specific review of all motorized routes and will include many opportunities for the public to get involved.

Possible solution: Recommend that when it comes to new roads and road reconstruction regarding motorized recreation in IRAs, follow the 2001 rule prohibition. When it comes to motorized recreation on trails (as opposed to roads) in IRAs, recommend that this be allowed to continue subject to Forest Management controls and politics. When it comes to motorized recreation on non-system roads in IRAs, recommend that those be closed. When it comes to motorized recreation on non-system trails in IRAs, that the continued use of such non-system trails be subject to the 2005 Travel Management Rule process.

Water Facilities – Authorized existing water facilities within IRAs would be allowed to continue operations under the 2001 Rule or current Forest Plan direction. The Statewide Water Supply Initiative Report developed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board may be useful in identifying potential impacts on future water facilities from roadless policies. If new water

facilities are proposed within an IRA, it is likely it would not be allowed under the 2001 Rule due to the roads needed to maintain such facilities.

Possible solution: Given this potential prohibition on road construction for new water facilities in IRAs, it may be worth considering a new exception to the 2001 rule related specifically to access to water facilities—both existing and future. Such a new section could read:

“A road could be authorized related to existing or future water facilities in order to access, maintain, augment, construct or otherwise benefit from water rights associated with such facilities. All regulations and laws related to road construction and reconstruction associated with such water facilities shall still apply.”

APPENDIX E: Timber, Steve Smith, Joe Duda and Dave Ubell

Timber, fuels, and logging

Issues related to forest condition and safety raised in presentations and comments to the task force include response to fire and other emergencies, reduction in built-up fuels, and commercial logging potential.

Response to fire and other emergencies--The Roadless Area Conservation Rule of 2001 allows for road construction and reconstruction in response to certain forest emergencies if, "...a road is needed to protect public health and safety in cases of an imminent threat of flood, fire, or other catastrophic event that, without intervention, would cause the loss of life or property".

Reduction in fuels build-up--The roadless rule of 2001 appears to allow for selective removal (and even sale) of excess volumes of small trees and vegetation in order to reduce fire danger, including:

- "...the cutting, sale, or removal of generally small diameter timber is needed for one of the following purposes and will maintain or improve one or more of the roadless area characteristics as defined..." or
- "...To maintain or restore the characteristics of ecosystem composition and structure, such as to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire effects, within the range of variability that would be expected to occur under natural disturbance regimes of the current climatic period..." or
- "...the cutting, sale, or removal of timber is incidental to the implementation of management activity not otherwise prohibited by this subpart..."

The effect of these provisions is somewhat subject to interpretation. Some citizens and some organizations have commented, for example, that the combination of allowing select thinning and not allowing roads may be in conflict and that the allowance for cutting only small diameter trees may be either ineffective or insufficiently scientific.

Forest health and administrative flexibility--Three of the forest supervisors addressing the task force so far have suggested the need for greater flexibility in implementing treatment of forest conditions, especially in the wildland-urban interface. Restrictions and delays appear to be of particular concern where that WUI overlaps with inventoried roadless areas.

Corresponding comments submitted by some citizens and by some organizations have suggested that decisions about forest health treatments should be made by national forest managers.

Roads for fuels reduction--Whether the rule allows for construction of roads for the purpose of fuels reduction may need clarification. The combination of the rule's allowance for road construction in response to "imminent threat" and the rule's allowance for removal of small diameter trees to reduce danger--depending on how those phrases

are interpreted or clarified--may or may not be sufficient authority for both response to immediate emergency and preventive response to fuels build-up and corresponding fire danger.

In any case, tree cutting and road construction inside roadless areas often is controversial and so subject to more extensive public discussion or even resistance.

Relevant geography--Since the Forest Service is generally under-funded for direct administrative fuels treatment, the agency's priority treatment is to be focused on national forest lands within the wildland-urban interface, that is, near communities and concentrated numbers of homes. To better understand the scale of the fuels reduction question, the task force should learn more about how extensive the overlap between that WUI and inventoried roadless areas is--or isn't.

Commercial logging and materials markets--Historically, small diameter trees and other small vegetation have not commanded much place in wood markets, possibly due in part to low cutting volumes offered by the Forest Service, making fuels reduction projects unattractive to commercial timber cutters. This has left most fuels reduction projects to the Forest Service itself, again, with funding insufficient to match the treatment needs.

New markets for small timber or wood chips--posts, poles, direct fuels, bio-conversion fuels, etc. may help bridge the fuels treatment funding gap through increased commercial interest. Also, as noted above, new technology may allow removal of a wider variety of tree sizes without construction of roads. At least one speaker addressing the task force suggested that increasing commercial value of certain cutting projects may facilitate forest work by private companies.

APPENDIX F: Grazing Allotments, Tom Compton and Dave Ubell

Thus far, testimony received from Colorado Farm Bureau, Woolgrowers, and Cattlemen's organizations, as well as several individual ranchers, has been fairly consistent. Although there remains some confusion regarding the exact nature of what a Roadless Area designation really means, these agricultural groups have concerns about unencumbered access to grazing allotments. They have stated that Allotment Management Plans are essentially contracts which individual permittees have entered into with the Forest Service. These contracts require the permittee to construct and/or maintain various range improvements such as water developments, fences, and in some cases corals of similar livestock holding facilities. Failure to construct or maintain these improvements can result in the loss of the grazing allotment which could be financially disastrous for an individual rancher. They have requested that they be allowed to construct sufficient roadways to permit equipment such as backhoes or bulldozers in those areas where water developments must be constructed and/or maintained or where new fence construction is required. It is my understanding they would like to see language in the final Task Force recommendation which permits these activities.

The Forest Service has indicated that these allotments come under the general category of "valid and existing rights" in the 2001 Roadless Rule and therefore would continue to be managed accordingly. For example, on Forest Service official indicated they would have no problem with a rancher "walking a CAT" into an area for construction and/or maintenance of improvements.

One additional concern often expressed to me, though not in public testimony, is the variation in actual allotment management from one Ranger District to another, even within the same Forest. This is an additional reason why livestock interests would appreciate language in the final recommendation which reinforces the necessity for occasional "road" construction into allotments in order to fulfill the requirements of allotment management plans.

APPENDIX G: Coal/Gas/Oil Leases, Russ George

- The 2001 Rule does not suspend or modify any existing lease authorizing the use and occupancy of NFS lands. Existing authorized uses, including existing oil and gas leases, would be allowed to operate within the existing parameters of the lease.
- The 2001 Rule would have, if still in effect, preclude new exploration and development of areas not under lease at the time of the 2001 Rule was published in the Federal Register.
- 2001 Rule would allow directional drilling and underground development.
- Some raised concerns that “existing legal right” existed in law but that the USFS made exercising those legal rights all but impossible. Not specific to oil and gas and probably best left to USFS to address rather than to have this issue a part of State Recommendations
- The TF has re-affirmed the Colorado statute which says that the 2001 Rule will be the starting point for deliberation.
- The issue, therefore, is straight forward:
 - No one has advocated restricting existing leases (being more restrictive than 2001 Rule) and we probably don’t have the legal authority to do so – even if we wanted to.
 - The question then becomes
 - Do we want to preclude exploration and development of currently unleased oil and gas reserves within IRAs or...
 - Do we want to allow for some level of exploration and development and
 - If yes, what additional protection of constraints should be placed on oil and gas development in existing IRAs?

APPENDIX H: OHV Use/Recreation, Doug Young

OHV Issue

The Task Force has heard a wide range of input regarding off-road vehicle recreation in roadless areas (and national forests generally). This input has ranged from (1) halt all OHV recreation in roadless areas, (2) halt all NEW OHV recreation in roadless areas, (3) let the Forest Planning process determine where OHV recreation should occur in roadless areas, (4) preserve all existing OHV recreation in roadless areas, (5) expand OHV recreation in other areas of national forests if it is restricted in roadless areas, (6) leave this issue up to the 2005 Travel Management Rule process.

Some of this input seems based on some confusion about (1) the definition of roadless, (2) what is or is not allowed regarding OHV recreation on roadless areas in existing Forest Plans or under the 2001 rule, (3) the Task Force's authority in this area.

Clearly, the 2001 rule did not preclude OHV recreation on system trails in roadless areas. It would have precluded the construction of new roads for use by OHV recreation. As regarding the closing of non-system OHV trails, the 2001 rule is silent. As a result, some public comment has suggested that the Task Force defer to the 2005 Travel Management Rule (or individual Forest Planning processes) to address this issue--as well as the issue of creating new OHV system trails in roadless areas.

As for the scope of this issue as it relates to the Task Force, the issues are:

Should the 2001 rule's allowance of OHV recreation on system trails in roadless areas be preserved? If not, in what way should the 2001 rule be modified?

Should the 2001 rule's prohibition on new road construction in roadless areas for OHV recreation use be preserved? If not, in what way should the 2001 rule be modified?

What, if anything, should the Task Force recommend regarding non-system roads and trails in roadless areas? Should this be left up to the 2005 Travel Management Rule and/or Forest Planning processes? Or should the Task Force recommend that these be closed in roadless areas as they may impact other roadless area values?

APPENDIX I: Wildlife and Critical Habitat (and invasive species), Eddie Kochman and David Petersen

April 13, 2006

TO: COLORADO ROADLESS TASK FORCE

FROM: DAVE PETERSON, EDDIE KOCHMAN

SUBJECT: Proposed process, issues and criteria for development of Roadless Task Force petition recommendation for **Wildlife Species and Critical Wildlife Habitat.**

1. FEDERAL PEITION RULE REQUIREMENT (Number six out of eight, October 7, 2005)

“A description of how management requirements (for inventoried roadless areas) would affect fish, wildlife and their habitat.”

2. ISSUE DISCUSSION

Inventoried roadless areas in each National Forest in Colorado contain a diverse number of wildlife species, as well as the critical habitat to support these species. These species range from elk, mule deer and cutthroat trout, which are actively pursued by hunters and anglers, to species such as the boreal toad and Canadian lynx. Certain of these species have been listed as threatened, or endangered, under the National Endangered Species Act and others have been shown to be in decline. A stated purpose of inventoried roadless areas is to protect critical ecosystems and the wildlife species that depend on them.

The authority to manage wildlife has been legislatively delegated to the Colorado Division of Wildlife. This responsibility includes wildlife on lands administered by the United States Forest Service. The only exceptions are wildlife under private ownership and those species listed as federally threatened, or endangered. To facilitate the Task Force process, the Division of Wildlife did undertake an evaluation of each roadless area in each National Forest, regarding the importance for wildlife and critical habitat. The evaluation was conducted by field staff (biologists, researchers, district and area wildlife managers) that had first hand knowledge of each area. This information has been submitted to the Task Force in both written and verbal reports by Mr. Jim Goodyear (Division person assigned the statewide coordination responsibility) and was also made available to the public through the Division’s web site. The information presented up to April 14, 2006 shows that the majority of field staff recommends maintaining each separate roadless area on the GMUG, San Juan, Pike-San Isabel and Arapahoe-Roosevelt Forests.

Data from the Division of Wildlife, US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service; together with public input, serves as the basis for the final petition recommendation regarding inventoried roadless area with the 2001 Roadless Rule.

3. ISSUES RELATED TO MANAGEMENT OF FOREST LANDS & ROADLESS AREAS

a. Long- term destruction and fragmentation of critical habitat and ecosystems from a variety of sources, including road construction and use of motorized vehicles. Examples can include loss of breeding and calving areas for elk and destruction of spawning and nursery areas for cutthroat trout. Such areas have been identified in maps provided by the Division of Wildlife.

b. Habitat disturbances, at periodic times, that force wildlife to migrate to less suitable areas. A growing example is the increased use of motorized vehicles, which often results in big game leaving forest lands and moving on to private lands. Further analysis of this issue is needed by the Division of Wildlife and the results presented to the Task Force.

c. Permit activities that deteriorate levels of water quality, destroy wetlands, and detrimentally alter spawning areas for aquatic species. Road construction, lack of road maintenance, uncontrolled motorized travel, discharge from mining/oil/gas operations and poorly managed timber harvest can all result in water quality and wetlands issues.

d. Increased destruction of habitat, fragmentation of habitat and greater levels of human disturbance have the potential of pushing certain wildlife species toward threatened, or endangered status, either at the federal, or state level. Selected species currently do have federal status as threatened, or endangered. Maps and data provided by the Division of Wildlife and Forest Service do delineate habitats used by certain species. The Division has evaluated these critical habitats in relation to specific roadless areas. Important species include the Canada lynx, cutthroat trout (greenback, Colorado and Rio Grande), Preble's jumping mouse, pine martin, southwestern willow flycatcher, black-footed ferret, bald eagle, Mexican spotted owl, Pawnee montane skipper, northern goshawk and boreal toad. While the gray wolf issue is still developing, it is becoming increasingly apparent that over time this species will inhabit portions of Colorado and protected roadless areas could become very important in management of this species. The Gunnison sage grouse (habitat primarily on BLM and private lands) may have portions of habitat extending on to forest lands. Also, there are a number of threatened and endangered plants that do occur on federal lands and should also be given consideration. To date no information has been provided on these plants.

c. The issue of increased population growth in Colorado presents significant problems for wildlife and the management of wildlife. It also presents major issues for federal land managers. This impact is evidenced by increased use of Colorado's National Forests for a variety of activities. Unfortunately, the current budget capability of the Forest Service is not adequate to meet management needs for recreation and activities such as road maintenance and enforcement of illegal motorized use. As current habitat is diminished state wide from many sources, including loss of agriculture land to development, increased second homes in mountain areas, and increased oil/gas/mineral development, wildlife are increasingly being pushed into marginal habitats and on to private lands. The Division of Wildlife is well aware of this issue. Maintaining roadless area rules have the

potential of providing a partial, but significant, solution to issues facing wildlife in Colorado.

d. Invasive species (both animal and plant) are invading all forest lands, including roadless areas. The Forest Service recognizes this as a major threat, along with unmanaged recreations, which includes illegal use of motorized vehicles. This issue needs further definition by both the Division of Wildlife and the Forest Service regarding the threat to wildlife and wildlife habitat. **Note:** separate proposal being prepared by Dave Peterson

TO ADDRESS THE STATED ISSUES THE TASK FORCE NEEDS TO RELY ON FACTUAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE, FOREST SERVICE AND FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. THE DATA AND MAPS PROVIDED BY THE DIVISION REPRESENT A VERY PROFESSIONAL ANALYSIS BY FIELD STAFF AND PROVIDES THE TASK FORCE AN IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITY. AT SOME POINT IT IS ASSUMED THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE WILL MAKE OFFICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH COULD GUIDE THE TASK FORCE.

4. TASK FORCE FINDINGS

Describe findings, including information provided by the Division of Wildlife, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and the results of public input. The description of findings and interpretation of public input would strive to be factual, objective and meet the requirements of the federal petition requirement. To date no presentation has been made by the Fish and Wildlife Service with emphasis on implications of the Endangered Species Act and official critical habitat. It is proposed that at least one staff from both the Division and Forest Service participate in work team created by the Task Force to address the petition recommendation for wildlife and critical wildlife habitat.

5. 2001 ROADLESS RULE ANALYSIS

The 2001 Rule is stated as the “starting” point in Senate Bill 243 for deliberations by the Task Force. Variations from the 2001 Rule would be based on factual information and public input. **Task Force options at this point regarding the 2001 rule could be to accept, modify or reject provisions of the Rule.** From a wildlife and critical wildlife habitat standpoint it is recommended that a **pro/con analysis** be completed using available data. The results would form the basis for discussion by the Task Force and a final petition recommendation.

Pro/Con analysis: Maintain provisions of 2001 Roadless Rule
Abolish provisions of 2001 Roadless Rule
Modify provisions of 2001 Roadless Rule

NOTE: Analysis **only** applies to issue of **wildlife species and critical habitat** within inventoried roadless areas in each Colorado National Forest.

6. FINAL TASK PETITION RECOMMENDATION FOR WIDLIFE SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT

Stated petition recommendation with basis for recommendation.

Draft completed by: _____

Final completed by: _____

Dave Peterson, Eddie Kochman-April 13, 2006

INVASIVE SPECIES, David Petersen

This extremely complex and scientifically subtle topic can only be sampled here, and perhaps is best presented using personal examples.

Imagine a small road or motorized trail penetrating a wild and healthy forest inhabited by elk, bears, birds, and myriad other creatures: a natural, functioning ecosystem. Many people would think: “Just one little road or trail; what harm can it do? And it makes recreational access so much easier.” But as studies have repeatedly demonstrated, it's not just the road that's of concern, but a band of disturbance extending at least 200 yards either side of the road, magnifying our “one little road” into a 400-yard wide linear ecosystem disruption. In extreme circumstances, roadway “edge effects” can extend up to a mile in width.

By studying roadway edge effects over the long-term, research has revealed that roadways are primary vectors for invasive species invasion. For example, trapped in the tire treads and dried mud under vehicle fenders may be invasive weed seeds and/or microscopic pathogens picked up from other areas, some of which will be deposited along our little road to sprout and spread and out-compete native wildlife forage. More subtly, due to increased sunlight, the subsequent drying of soil, and consequent vegetation alterations along road-cuts, native bird reproductive success and numbers have been shown to drop radically, in conjunction with an increase in nest-parasite species and other undesirable invaders.

On my backyard mountain near Durango—a biotic metaphor for forests everywhere—roads opened for timber harvest have facilitated a plague of invasive plants. Among the most aggressive are thistles, notably the Canada (*Cirsium arvense*) and musk (*Carduus nutans*) varieties, which love nothing better than the disturbed soil of a fresh road-cut or skidder trail in which to invest and launch a hostile take-over. Ecologically, what makes invasive plants noxious is their unsuitability as wildlife food along with their voracious success in crowding out biologically benevolent native species, thus decreasing both biotic diversity and wildlife forage.

Forest roads also facilitate the invasion of noxious fauna. In addition to the negative shift in bird populations mentioned above, on my local mountain, mosquitoes have proliferated in the wake of logging, beneficiaries of the hundreds of water-holding dents and ditches left by skidders. Also within the realm of small noxious wildlife are plant-attacking pathogens that use new roads to invade virgin territory.

APPENDIX J: Watershed Protection, David Petersen

Overview: Watersheds are natural catch basins for rain and snow. Healthy watersheds maximize the soil's absorption of water to replenish aquifers, while channeling surface run-off into natural drainages, streams, and rivers from which it can be collected in reservoirs. Functional watersheds minimize evaporation, flooding, siltation, and soil erosion. Efficient absorption requires a porous sponge-bed of topsoil. Vegetation — from mosses and lichens at the highest altitudes, to mature forests farther down — provides shade to slow surface warming and evaporation, and a web-work of natural baffles to retard run-off and facilitate soil absorption. Vegetation also acts as a natural water filter.

Threats: Any force that acts to compact soil, disturb natural topography, destroy or inhibit vegetation, introduce pollutants, create unnatural drainages or increase erosion and siltation, works against watershed efficiency and health. Primary human-caused threats include roads, clear-cutting, motorized vehicles from road graders to ATVs, and chemical pollution. Anyone who's visited a road under construction, or an active logging operation, can testify that the air smells of petrochemicals and the soil is stained with petroleum leaks, spills, and dumps. In the long run, forest roads receive a perpetual replenishment of chemical pollutants from motorized traffic. Exhaust-borne pollutants include lead, aluminum, boron, cadmium, copper, iron, manganese, nickel, titanium, and zinc, all of which have been shown to infiltrate plant tissues 200 yards and more from source roads, and to contaminate subsurface as well as surface water.

Significance: When the functional integrity of a watershed is damaged, everyone and every living thing downstream is likewise damaged — including aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, ranchers and farmers who rely on irrigation water for crops and livestock, individuals and municipalities that depend on springs, wells or streams for drinking water, the efficacy and longevity of reservoirs, and the public health and economic welfare of municipalities large and small. Finally, healthy watersheds are essential to meeting standards designated by the Colorado Water Quality Commission.

Maintaining large expanses of natural, undisturbed, high- and mid-altitude terrain, increasingly found only in wilderness and roadless areas, is crucial to long-term watershed integrity and productivity. For a telling example, a FS study conducted in the White River NF rates only 31 of 121 inventoried watersheds there, a mere one-quarter, as "functional," while more than two-thirds of these minority functional watersheds, 69 percent, lie within road-free terrain.

Recommendations for subcommittee action:

1. Research, document, and summarize all significant aspects of watershed health, including function, vectors of pollution and topographic damage, and conflicts with other needs and uses (including, ironically, engineered water collection and delivery systems). Research should include FS, DOW, and public testimony, supplemented by published studies and consultation with experts.
2. Within the realm of Taskforce authority, determine how watershed integrity can best be assured in perpetuity.
3. Present the Taskforce with findings and draft-alternatives for possible best actions, both statewide and forest-specific as necessary.

APPENDIX K: Roadless Boundaries, Steve Smith & Doug Young

Boundaries and inventory issues

Variations of questions about the accuracy of Forest Service roadless lands inventories have been presented to the task. Simplistic as it sounds, some commenters say that the FS inventory includes some lands that do not qualify while others contend that the FS missed some lands that should be included in the inventory.

The Roadless Area Conservation Rule of 2001, our deliberations starting-point, addresses the inventory question essentially in the form of maps of inventoried roadless areas accompanying the rule and, by reference, definitions and guidance included in the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 294--SPECIAL AREAS.

At its most basic definition, the Forest Service roadless inventory is to include parcels of national forest land, individually 5,000 acres or larger (may be smaller if adjacent to existing wilderness) and containing no roads.

Possible issues for the task force to consider include:

Clarify details of national forest inventory standards and boundaries. Clarify how up to date FS inventories are.

Consider whether and how inventories prepared by citizen organizations or other sources in preparing task force recommendations.