

USFS GMUG Forest Plan Revision
Forest Assessments: Identifying and Assessing At-risk Species

Comments

by

James O. Cochran

for

Gunnison County

1. Page 13: The understory of healthy sagebrush shrub-lands includes not only bunch and sod grasses but a forb component as well.
2. Page 14: Another common weed transmission vector is motorized equipment, particularly tracked equipment such as dozers and excavators. The Gunnison Basin Gunnison sage-grouse Candidate Conservation Agreement (CCA) on Federal Lands (2013) includes protocols for cleaning equipment and specific vector management procedures, such as road grading prescriptions to reduce the transmission of non-natives (weeds).
3. Pages 71-72: The discussion of Forest Plan consistency with external plans for wildlife and other species stops at the State level. There is no discussion or consideration of local government plans that have area within or near the GMUG. A number of counties have plans that address wildlife and other species that should be taken into consideration by the USFS in this process. Examples include Gunnison County's wildlife section (11-106) of the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution (LUR), Montrose County's Gunnison sage-grouse development regulations, and the wildlife section of the Saguache County Land Development Code.
4. Pages 94-100: Though mentioned in the body of this document the Gunnison Basin, Gunnison sage-grouse Candidate Conservation Agreement (CCA) is not mentioned at all in Appendix 1, Gunnison sage-grouse. This document, developed with the USFS, which is signatory to it, should be of primary guidance in managing GuSG habitat within the Gunnison Basin on USFS managed lands. It includes cross-jurisdictional boundary management prescriptions for domestic livestock (cattle) grazing, weed control, and other landscape scale conservation actions of benefit to the GuSG. It is Gunnison County's recommendation that the CCA be formally adopted into the GMUG Forest Plan.