



**DRAFT Agenda
Durango Public Comment Meeting
Roadless Areas Review Task Force
December 9, 2005
5:00 – 8:45pm
Tamarron Lodge
40292 Highway 550
Durango, Colorado**

5:00 Welcome and introductions

5:10 Panel #1: Forest Service

5:50 Panel #2: State and Local government

- Colorado Division of Wildlife – Jim Goodyear
- La Plata County Commissioner – Wally White
- Montezuma County Commissioner – Duane Finley

6:40 Panel #3: Stakeholder Groups

- Norm Birtcher, local timber industry
- Terry Fankhauser, Executive Vice President, Colorado Cattlemen's Assn (or local CCA representative)
- Mike Clark, Petrox Resources (oil & gas)
- Bill Shaw, Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition
- Mark Pearson, Executive Director, San Juan Citizens' Alliance
- Mike Murphy, local outfitter and hunter (hunting, angling, and related businesses)
- Mary Beaber, board member Silverton Mountain School (outdoor education and quiet use)
- Bill Vance, local rancher (ranching, grazing, and impacts of energy development)

7:40 Break

7:50 Open public comment period – public interested in speaking will fill out a speaker sign-up form and indicate topics which will be covered to allow the Chair to select a range of perspectives to hear from

- local elected officials invited to speak first (3-5 minutes each)
- citizens in general (1 minute each)

8:45 Adjourn



**Roadless Areas Review Task Force
San Juan – Public Comment Meeting
December 9, 2005
Durango, Colorado
Meeting Summary**

PANEL #1: FOREST SERVICE

Mark Stiles, Forest Supervisor for the San Juan National Forest and Thurman Wilson, Assistant Center Manager, presented general information on the San Juan National Forest. They also presented information on roadless areas and a few specific roadless areas. Mark Stiles summarized the public comment received during the Forest Management Plan revision which was generally in support of protection of existing roadless areas, while preserving opportunities for most of the activities currently taking place.

General Information Presented:

- San Juan is 1.9 million acres
- 415,000 acres are designated Wilderness
- 62,500 acres were designated as the Piedra Area by 1993 Colorado Wilderness Act (managed to maintain wilderness character)
- About 522,000 acres are inventoried as roadless

Roadless Areas:

- The revised forest plan will include a new roadless inventory and evaluations of each roadless area (whether they should be recommended to Congress for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System or managed for other uses)
- Roadless is not a management designation, it is an inventory finding
- Sizable un-roaded areas are more than 5,000 acres or more. Roadless areas between 2,500 and 5,000 acres were also identified (shown as a different color on the map)
- Roads are defined as motor vehicle routes greater than 50 inches wide, unless identified and managed as a trail
- Being inventoried as Roadless does not preclude motorized use, recreation use, mineral extraction or timber harvest
- Management of inventoried roadless areas is governed by Forest Plan direction, project-level decisions, and sometimes, valid, existing rights such as mineral leases or contracts

New Inventory:

- Expect to be complete by early February and will be provided to the Task Force for their deliberative meeting
- The inventory as mapped for the December 9th meeting probably within 95 percent of the version to be used in the Forest Plan revision
- There was not a lot of difference in acreage from the inventory of the 1970s, but the boundaries are quite different
- There is about a 5 percent difference in acreage between the 1970s inventory and the December 9, 2005 version of the new inventory. This difference is from RARE II

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

mapping errors, new roads that were built in some areas, and some roadless areas that were not identified in RARE II showing up in the new inventory

- San Juan Citizen's Alliance completed an independent inventory. The Forest Service (FS) has been working with them to address discrepancies between FS new inventory and the San Juan Citizen's Alliance inventory. The two versions are pretty close.

Management:

- Activities allowed in roadless areas are outlined in the Forest Plan
- 58% of roadless areas are in management areas for semi-primitive, non-motorized use
- 24% of roadless areas are in other management areas where roads are not likely
- 18% of roadless areas are in management areas where roads are expected
- 13% of roadless areas are in management areas suitable for timber harvest
- 4% of roadless areas are in areas leased for oil and gas
- 44% of roadless areas are in management areas open to snowmobiles
- One-third of the roadless areas include some motorcycle and ATV trails
- The draft for a new management plan should be available by late spring
- Participants that attended the public meetings on the new management plan communicated the value of roadless areas, the value of diverse uses, the value of restricted use, and the lack of need for any new large scale disturbances.

HD Mountain

- HD Mountain was the area of greatest conflict between valid existing rights and preservation of un-roaded character
- 20,000 acres including lower elevation ponderosa pine, cultural resources, limited surface water, and potential for soil loss
- Unique in that almost the entire area is leased for oil and gas (last one approved in 2003)
- Currently completing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for coal bed methane development. The draft EIS on the North San Juan Basin received 68,000 comments. The final EIS is expected soon.

Hermosa Creek Area

- The largest roadless area in Colorado.
- Two-thirds is undeveloped with no motorized trails (west side). The east side has more motorized development. One of the most famous mountain bike trails in the country bisects the area. Almost everyone wants to see the area remain undeveloped, but there are differing opinions on how much motorized and mechanized use is appropriate.

Panel #1 Questions & Answers

Question – Which RARE process was used for the new inventory?

Answer – The inventory process is outlined in the Forest Service Land Management Planning Handbook. Criteria or the “key decisions made in the inventory process to determine what is undeveloped” was provided to the Task Force.

Question – The fourth key decision is adjustments to boundaries to eliminate slivers. Was part of the Treasure Mountain area eliminated using the sliver criteria?

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

Answer – The area that was first pointed out was not included in either RARE II or the new inventory. An adjacent area was included in RARE II but not the new inventory. The FS could not identify why it was not included looking at the map. The one mile minimum width was considered too restrictive and some areas were added back into the inventory. *NOTE: Following the meeting, FS determined that a piece of private land and a mining claim created a sliver.*
ACTION: Forest Service will provide a map of “sliver” areas removed to the Task Force.

Question – When will the analysis be ready?

Answer – The expectation is spring.

Question – Should management prescriptions give discretion to construct or reconstruct roads for forest health (bug suppression) and transportation of hazardous fuels?

Answer – Forest Service would look at individual units.

Question – For the HD Mountain area, what is the link between land use plans and the Northern San Juan Basin EIS process?

Answer – The two processes were started separately and due to schedule changes have coincided. The Northern San Juan EIS for natural gas will consider specific wells (56 known locations & 240 unknown locations) and necessary roads and pipelines. The land use plans are focused on general use and activities, and how to manage over the long term.

Question – Do valid and existing rights impose legal constraints on management decision?

Answer – Yes, to not recognize valid and existing rights would be considered breach of contract or statutes.

Question: What was the process to designate areas that are “recommended for wilderness”?

ACTION: FS will try to get this information to the Task Force prior to the first deliberative meeting in February.

PANEL #2 – STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Colorado Division of Wildlife – Jim Goodyear

The Division of Wildlife (DOW) is a primary state agency responsible for wildlife and wildlife management in Colorado, with authority from the state legislature. DOW’s basic management principles include maintaining a healthy diversity of abundant wildlife; quality, quantity and conservation of wildlife habitat essential to maintaining the state’s diverse wildlife populations and related uses; and science based decision making that considers impacts to local communities as well as other social and economic concerns. DOW presented a map of USFS roadless areas in San Juan National Forest with high priority habitat for threatened and endangered and economically important species (21 species). DOW touched on several key issues and concerns:

- Consider wildlife and wildlife habitat
- Colorado economy is benefited by wildlife
- Federal rule states wildlife will be considered
- Habitat is comprised of good food sources, clean water, and safe shelter for living and raising young

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

- Roads in forests can negatively impact certain wildlife or modify their behavior, and roads provide access for wildlife recreation; this is why forest planning is done carefully
- Forest roads that slice through high-quality or essential wildlife habitat impact wildlife by fragmenting, or contaminating or eliminating the habitat
- Weeds and non-native species are more apt to start along roadsides and spread, changing the habitat (e.g., grazing wildlife does not graze on non-native species)

La Plata County Commissioner – Wally White

Mr. White stated that there was no official position for La Plata County and he will speak from his own perspective and not that of the La Plata County Commission.

- Committed to the importance of roadless areas and what those areas protect in the context of population pressure
- Recommend protecting all current roadless areas
- People move to Colorado to enjoy roadless areas
- Roadless areas provide opportunities for tourists
- Prosperity of rural areas is connected to roadless areas
- La Plata County relies on the tourist industry
- The Narrow Gauge Railroad passes through two roadless areas
- Opening up roadless areas can cause negative impacts to wildlife herds
- Clean watersheds are important to local communities
- Forest Service cannot maintain current infrastructure, why allow more infrastructure they are unable to manage

ACTION: Will provide more local detail on specific areas.

Montezuma County Commissioner – Gerald Koppenhafer

Dr. Koppenhafer recommended management decisions made locally to be most responsive to situations when they occur.

Panel #2 Questions & Answers

Question – DOW – What is the ability of DOW to define the impacts of roadless areas on wildlife?

Answer – DOW has a good working relationship with the Forest Service and provides details on impacts to wildlife in individual roadless areas.

Question – DOW – What are the characteristics of low elevation areas that make them a priority?

Answer – Lower elevation tends to be critical winter range.

Question – DOW – Is the map based on RARE II inventoried areas or revised Forest Plan areas?

Answer – The DOW map used RARE II inventoried areas.

ACTION: Provide a map that shows the 21 species habitat overlain on the revised Forest Plan roadless areas.

Question – La Plata County – Will the La Plata County Commissioners submit something in writing to the Task Force?

Answer – The La Plata County Commissioners are considering a resolution in opposition to changing roadless areas.

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

Question – La Plata County – Which inventory will the Commissioners be supporting, 2001 or the current rule?

Answer – The resolution would be in opposition to the current rule and support the 2001 rule.

Question – Montezuma County – What does local control look like within existing legal and regulatory framework?

Answer: The answer will be provided to the Task Force in writing.

ACTION: Provide the Task Force with comments submitted during the FS process.

Question – Montezuma County – What flexibility is needed in the rule for management of the Forest? *Answer* – There is support for flexibility.

Question – DOW – what are the habitat requirements for the 21 species?

Answer: DOW will provide the answer in writing.

ACTION: DOW will supply information on habitat requirements for the 21 species.

Question – Montezuma County – Are there management prescriptions that should be different?

Answer – There are permits in roadless areas that require maintenance (e.g., cleaning water sources is important) and locals know the best timing to go into those areas. The concern is about restrictions on local authorities and those restrictions impairing the work of locals.

PANEL #3 – INVITED STAKEHOLDER GROUP REPRESENTATIVES

Mike Murphy, local outfitter and hunter (*provided testimony in writing*) – Mr. Murphy is a 40-year resident with 27 years as an outfitter. Local outfitters want to maintain protection in San Juan National Forest. There are 112 permitted outfitters in the area; 50 depend on the Columbine district.

- Roadless areas provide big game range and mid-elevation range
- As road density increases, bull-to-cow and cow-to-calf ratios decrease
- Winter range habitat is in roadless areas
- Oil and gas development can decrease mule deer population on winter ranges
- Good habitat is essential for opportunities to trophy quality animals
- Elk is at an all time high
- Roads create increased hunting pressures and limitations (limited seasons and timing)
- Roadless areas can extend hunting seasons
- Spend resources on repair and upkeep of existing roads, not build new roads that cannot be maintained. The backlog of road maintenance is estimated at \$7 million.
- Economic benefits of hunting and angling are permanent while extraction benefits are finite.

Norm Birtcher, local timber industry – Mr. Birtcher is employed by Western Excelsior, which uses lower grade aspen and creates erosion control materials. Western Excelsior is the second largest private employer in the area (Wal-Mart is number one).

- Support of multi-use
- Allow the FS flexibility to manage the different interests

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

- 20% of total forest acreage is suitable base for timber production (suitable base outside roadless areas is enough for a small business if managed appropriately)
- The Stoner Area is significant to environmentalists
- Legitimate roadless areas need to remain roadless
- Maps shows insect infestation and serious forest health concerns
- Lack of fire and logging has created an overly dense forest ripe for disease and fire
- Recommend allowing the Forest Service to work in roadless areas and leave decision making in local hands.

David Montoya, Colorado Cattlemen's Association (*no written submittal*) – Mr. Montoya has a ranch in the Durango area.

- Opposed to additional wilderness areas
- Concerned about how roadless areas are managed
- Grazing permits require the permittee to maintain improvements (water development, fencing, etc.); roads are required to achieve permit requirements

Bill Shaw, Colorado Off-Highway vehicle Coalition

- Support multi-users, motorcycle, ATV, Jeeps, and snowmobiles
- 49% of the trail users in Colorado are motorized
- ATV use has been growing in double digits
- Desire to enjoy public lands responsibly
- San Juan's are a major draw
- There are out-back routes that are congested
- Need to develop a system of trails that disperses users and reduces conflicts
- Working with BLM and FS to develop a broad vision for the future of the San Juan
- Closing areas to motorized travel is unrealistic
- Current inventoried roadless areas need to be managed for multi-use

Kristi Zeler, La Plata Energy Council (*submitted written testimony*)

- Support multiple use
- Oppose roadless designation because it is a de facto wilderness area (wilderness is designation given by Congress)
- All roadless areas should be kept multi-use for the San Juan forest management plans
- Need to be able to consider roads for general use and specific roads
- Oppose additional lands being added
- All should remain available for multiple use
- Natural gas leases in HD Mountains are important
- All roads and infrastructure for natural gas are managed by FS
- Recommend that inventoried roadless areas should be managed for multiple use

Mark Pearson, San Juan Citizen's Alliance (*submitted written testimony*) – The San Juan Citizen's Alliance conducted an independent inventory and are in general agreement with the Forest Service.

- Fish Creek was missed in 1970s inventory, should be identified as roadless
- Existing areas – Black Hawk Peak (town of Rico and Silver Creek – community water supply for Rico from Silver Creek);

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

- Colorado Trail goes through roadless areas
- Hermosa is largest roadless area, maintained as primitive undeveloped area managed for recreation
- HD Mountains have the most significant low elevation, low old growth ponderosa pine, and the last sliver of San Juan Basin that is not used for natural gas extraction
- Ice Lake watershed provides community water supply
- Treasure Mountain has been identified as the most important corridor for Colorado lynxes

Joe Griffith, Colorado Mountain Club (*submitted written testimony*) – The Colorado Mountain Club is a statewide organization of 10,000 people. Its purpose is to collect and disseminate information and advocate for preservation of mountain areas.

- Strongly support preservation of roadless areas, economically and aesthetically
- Agree with 2001 designation and expansions
- San Miguel - connects, contains great peaks for hiking, the Colorado Trail passes through and the old Silverton to Rico trail
- Commercial exploitation value can not come close to the values for hunting, fishing and hiking
- East Animas roadless area gets heavy recreational use
- West Needle, includes Molas Pass, is an excellent recreational area
- Piedra roadless area includes good white water experiences - rafting and boating
- Forest Service's budget has been cut and so are less able to manage
- Value public lands for wildness and beauty
- Need the management skills of FS and BLM and the ranger in the field

Bill Vance, local rancher (*submitted written testimony*) – Mr. Vance represented the HD Mountain Coalition, a group of all types of users working to keep HD Mountain roadless area roadless. Mr. Vance owns a 360 acre ranch (hay) in the heart of the HD Mountains. Two sides of his range abut the HD mountain roadless area.

- HD Mountains is steep and rugged terrain, and classified as having high potential for erosion by the Forest Service draft EIS
- Impacts to economic viability of the farm
- Water resources are impacted by road and well development, they cause erosion and the sediment clogs waterways and endangers water rights
- Drilling along the outcrop will decrease ground water supply (seeps and wells) and may create methane seeps
- HD mountains is a migratory route for elk and roads and gas wells would destroy wildlife habitat and choke the migration corridor
- The amount of natural gas extraction is so small it is not worth destroying the values of roadless areas
- HD mountain is a beautiful area

J. Paul Brown, Colorado Wool Growers

- Set aside for multiple uses – grazing, mining, timber, hunting and recreation
- Allow flexibility for national security, disease, weed control, wildlife management

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

- Allow local public land managers with public input decide where roads should be developed

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

The room was filled to capacity. 47 People signed up to speak (all were called, 38 were present and spoke) on topics including: recreation (motorized, hunting, fishing, bicycling, hiking), access (emergency service, forest health, quality), support of/protection of current roadless areas, industry/energy alternatives, erosion impacts on ranchers, water quality for wildlife and farmers, flexibility of roadless areas, economic value of roadless areas, wild life (protection, habitat fragmentation, connectivity, ecosystems), weeds, future generations, impact of roads, and oil and gas mining leases.

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

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

1. James Harmon, Mayor of Bayfield, Bayfield CO – resolutions from local governments to not drill in the HD Mtn...old growth forests cannot be replaced
2. Roger Pennington, President of the Upper Pine River Fire Protection District, Bayfield, CO – access for snowmobile, hunting, and fishing...keep roads for fire protection/suppression
3. Wendy Miniaga, Town of Dolores Trustee, Dolores, CO – the Town of Dolores passed a resolution in support to protect San Juan roadless area (unanimous)...recommend Governor protect roadless areas
4. Rebbecca Koepen, Ignacio, CO – HD mountains should allow ATV use on intelligently designed roads...leave decision to land managers...support roadless areas remaining roadless
5. Ed Zink, Boulder, CO – Hermosa roadless area...consistent message is to keep it roadless, keep it for multiple use...find some way to create permanency, so do not have to go through this again
6. Cindy Dunbar, ? – roadless areas need to be protected...our legacy...no deterioration of roadless areas...permanently remain roadless
7. Harry Regal, Durango, CO – been through this several times...consensus to protect roadless areas...address the needs of the ranchers...roads to stock ponds were removed from roadless areas...fires are caused from roads, boundary areas are most important for fire protection
8. Kaelan Grigg, Rico, CO – wild places need to be protected...hunting, fishing, hiking, camping...road development and use negatively impact wildlife habitat...only way to preserve heart of wildlife areas is to protect roadless areas
9. Phyliss Snyder, San Juan basin Farm Bureau, Cortez, CO – oppose to roadless areas...there are already wilderness areas and rough areas that are naturally roadless...retain and maintain new roads...the less acres accessible for recreation, than more damage on those areas where recreation occurs
10. Michel Cochran, Dolores, CO – roadless areas are not roadless...grazing exists on current allotments in roadless areas...management activities protect the forest...support decisions on local basis...maintain existing roadless areas

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

11. Sid Snyder, rancher, Cortez, CO – there are more people in the forests and they need to have a place to go...roadless areas put pressure on roads we already have...in America we can choose where we go
12. Dennis Pierce, Durango, CO – consider that there are mining interests in roadless area
13. Bob Marion, Mancos, CO – hunting & fishing opportunities in roadless areas...Storm Peak, Western edge of Hermosa, Fisher, Black Hawk Mountain and (?)gobel - add/protect all these areas for elk winter ranges
14. Michael Burke, Durango, CO – 25 year resident...geologist/engineer...roadless areas are rugged terrain...sensitivity to landslides...Sunner Mesa is surrounded by roadless areas...roads have caused erosion and landslides
15. Mike Troast, Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition, Denver, CO – there is an increase in motorized users...keep areas open to motorized recreation and manage them as such
16. Pete Turner, Durango, CO – 41,000 people in this county...look into the future and future growth demands and protect the landscape... economically, people come to Colorado for the landscapes and quality of life...roadless areas serve as a buffer for wilderness areas which keep impacts down on wilderness areas
17. Paul Bendt, Durango, CO – in the U.S., 2% is protected as wilderness and in the 2001 rule 2% is protected as roadless...this is a small amount for the future generations...Colorado has more roadless areas than national average...roadless areas have difficult terrain and they don't lead to anywhere...protect for future generations...protect roadless
18. Scott (for Jeff Widen), ? – allow Forest Service to conduct environmental clean ups and repair roads in roadless areas...preserve roadless areas
19. Brad Bartlett, Durango, CO – protect roadless areas as proposed by Forest Service and in the 2001 rule...Forest Service's charge is create/manage for sustained use ...support HD Mountain roadless area
20. Carolyn Johnson, owns a horse and cattle ranch, ? – her horse and cattle ranch abuts the national forest...concerned about roads in national forests...roads create contamination and erode wildlife which does not return...protect roadless areas
21. Jim Fitzgerald, farmer, Bayfield, CO – impact of roads on early run off (much earlier) and this effect on farmers (water is earlier in the growing season)...HD Mountain area is a great large place, when roads are added it gets smaller...resistance to drilling in HD Mountains area
22. Scott Graham, Durango, CO – think long term, beyond short term extractions of international companies...no compromise on this issue, protect the roadless areas
23. Patricia Condiotti, Durango, CO – Hermosa, San Miguel and West Needles areas are important...tourism fills the economic base of the area...tourists believe those areas will be there their children
24. Root Routledge, Bayfield, CO – opposed to the economics of resource extraction which does not consider next generations...support local decision making...invest in the future...keep roadless areas roadless
25. Travis Stills, Durango, CO – support roadless areas, protected from mining, timber industries...roadless areas are precious...protect all roadless areas for those interested in roadless areas
26. Matt (for Rick Lane) – roadless areas important for quality hunting...roadless designation does not take away local control...preserve roadless areas...off-road vehicle use is not

Roadless Areas Review Task Force

debated in roadless areas - they are allowed...under the 2001 rule, roads can still be built for public safety

27. Veronica Egan, Great Old Broads for Wilderness, Durango, CO – old people don't need roads to get into the back county...roadless areas should be protected/preserved for seven generation...Americans have an incredible legacy of public lands/areas that provide people a place to get away from roads
28. Jim Judge, archeologist, Durango, CO – fully protect the San Juan National Forest from any more/future/new roads...national energy and mineral needs will not be resolved by roads in the forest...opposed to new roads for timber cutting...oppose off-road vehicle use
29. Jerry McGeorge, Creepor Jeepors, Durango, CO – find resolution so we do not go through this process again
30. Sandy Young, La Plata County outfitter, Durango, CO – recreation use has grown by incredible amount and this is not such a big county...grazing on chemical free resources is important...don't need more roads...Dutch Creek logging road has opened the area to motorized users that don't adhere to non-motorized use rules
31. Vi McCoy, Durango – there is abuse of wild areas...preserve lands at local level...establish iron clad legislation to eliminate drilling and extraction for ever...wild areas are on the endangered list...no room for compromises...leave lands primitive
32. Tom Jones, Durango – local control would be good, but authority works back up to national level
33. Tom Knopick, outfitter/fisherman, Durango, CO – roads create erosion and sediment which is bad for water quality, bad for fish, and bad for anglers...support status quo...in particular, Colorado cut throat trout in the Hermosa area
34. Mondique Digiorgio, Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project, Mancos, CO (*submitted materials*) – conservation science...roadless areas are important for the local and state economies...roadless areas connected to each other and wilderness...wildlife linkages are priority areas
35. Thad Miller Pagosa Springs, CO – temporary roads sound good, but in practice those roads are used after they are closed, they create new trails
36. Tom Whalen, Outdoor Education, Fort Lewis College, Mancos, CO – roadless areas are not big areas...14 million acres of national forest, 4 million roadless area, in Colorado 30% of total forest is roadless areas...not enough wilderness to make it equitable for all users (those users who want to use roadless areas have less)
37. Ted Carl, Durango, CO – oil, gas and mining are not good neighbors (contaminated abandoned mines and wells polluting the ground water)...roadless areas need to remain roadless...once a road is established the scar is there for generation, roads do not repair themselves quickly
38. Micheal Carrol, Durango, CO – roadless areas provide diverse bicycling opportunities...support protection all roadless areas...multiple use, does not mean every use, every where...ask the Governor to work with the delegation to protect roadless areas as wilderness areas

APPENDIX A – Summary of Written Comments Received at the Durango Public Comment Meeting

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Number of responses:	24		
Number of CO residents	24		
Number of non-CO residents	0		
Responses by forest	General Comment	10	42%
	Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests	1	4%
	Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison National Forests	1	4%
	Manti-La Sal National Forests	1	4%
	Pike-San Isabel National Forests	1	4%
	Rio Grande National Forest	1	4%
	Routt National Forest	1	4%
	San Juan National Forest	17	71%
	White River National Forest	1	4%
Responses by topic of concern	Social and Economic Value	13	54%
	Special Designations	8	33%
	Recreation Management	14	58%
	Natural Resource Management	17	71%
	Other: See attached	1	4%

Comment Themes

Comment Theme	Number of Responses
General	2
Defer to 2001 Rule/Preserve Roadless Areas	18
Environmental Emphasis	10
Multiple Use Management Emphasis	1
Retain Non-Motorized Recreation	2
Job Creation/Economic Stability of Rural Communities, States, and the Nation	4
Special Designations	2
Legacy Values	1
Quality of Life	6
Use of Roadless Areas to Promote or Subsidize Industry	8
Global Economy	1

Responses by Topic of Concern: Other, please specify

1. Environmental (*this was the only "other" topic of concern identified*)