



## COLORADO

### Department of Natural Resources

Executive Director's Office  
1313 Sherman Street, Room 718  
Denver, CO 80203

May 22, 2018

Samantha Staley, Forest Planner  
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests  
2250 Highway 50  
Delta, CO 81416

RE: Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests Plan Revision - Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan

Dear GMUG Planning Team:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit cooperating agency comments for the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan. We appreciate your willingness to collaborate, coordinate, and address many comments from our staff during this revision process. The Colorado Department of Natural Resources (CDNR) submits the following comment letters prepared by two of our divisions: Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) and the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB).

On behalf of CDNR, I would like to emphasize the importance of some of the issues raised by CPW - specifically preserving security habitats, maintaining habitat connectivity and migration corridors, and continuing to protect wildlife populations by balancing sustainable trail use. We appreciate the proposed Wildlife Management Area designations and offer additional recommendations for other areas with high wildlife value that address many of these key issues.

As referenced by the CWCB, I appreciate the inclusion of the Pathfinder cooperation strategy as a management approach and also support the additional tools and strategies developed by the 2004 Pathfinder Project Steering Committee to protect instream flows. Additionally, I would continue to encourage the GMUG Forest staff to work with the CWCB to consider the possibility of utilizing its Instream Flow Program as an alternative method of flow protection for flow-related Outstanding Remarkable Values.

If you have any questions, please contact Amy Moyer at 303-866-3311, or division contacts. We look forward to continuing to work with you as this important planning process advances.

Sincerely,

Dan Gibbs  
Executive Director





# COLORADO

## Parks and Wildlife

Department of Natural Resources

Southwest Region  
415 Turner Drive  
Durango, CO 81303  
P 970.375.6702 | F 970.375.6705

May 22, 2019

### Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests

Samantha Staley

Forest Planner

2250 South Main Street

Delta, CO 81416

[gmugforestplan@fs.fed.us](mailto:gmugforestplan@fs.fed.us)

### RE: CPW Comments - Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan (April 2019)

Dear Sam:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide cooperating agency comments on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests (GMUG) Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan (April 2019). Colorado Parks and Wildlife's (CPW) mission is *to perpetuate the wildlife resources of the state, to provide a quality state parks system, and to provide enjoyable and sustainable outdoor recreation opportunities that educate and inspire current and future generations to serve as active stewards of Colorado's natural resources*. This mission is implemented through our 2015 Strategic Plan<sup>1</sup> and the goals it embraces which are designed to make CPW a national leader in wildlife management, conservation, and sustainable outdoor recreation for current and future generations.

CPW provided written comments on the subject matter assessments prepared as part of this planning effort on December 8, 2017, January 26, 2018, and March 9, 2018. In addition, CPW provided written scoping comments on June 1, 2018, comments on the Wilderness Evaluation Report on October 1, 2018, and comments on the Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Evaluation on March 22, 2019.

In our previous comments, CPW expressed concern over the failure to accurately characterize wildlife-related recreation and its socioeconomic importance in the context of other forms of recreation on the GMUG. We also expressed concern over the potential for fish and wildlife populations and wildlife-related recreation opportunities to be negatively impacted by increasing motorized and non-motorized trail densities and higher intensity trail-based recreation. CPW recognizes and appreciates the substantial efforts by GMUG staff to address these concerns and many of our comments. We greatly appreciate GMUG planning staff's incorporation of Wildlife Management Areas with route density standards into the Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan (PDRLMP). These Wildlife Management Areas will benefit wildlife and wildlife-related recreation and help CPW achieve its mission.

---


<sup>1</sup> Colorado Parks and Wildlife 2015 Strategic Plan (November 2015)  
<http://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/About/StrategicPlan/2015CPWStrategicPlan-11-19-15.pdf>



Please consider the following comments on the PDRLMP:

**General PDRLMP Concerns.** Despite significant progress on the subject matter assessments and PDRLMP, CPW remains concerned that we are not able to track many of our comments on the subject matter assessments into specific plan components, including Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines. The current PDRLMP lacks clear references to many of the subject matter assessments upon which it is based. CPW recommends providing more explanation and information regarding the link between the PDRLMP and the subject matter assessments that have been completed, and how they will be used and adapted over time.

**Wildlife Management Areas and Interactive Story Map data layers.** In many instances, the Wildlife Management Area boundaries provided by CPW were rough approximations. CPW's rough approximations contrast the more precise polygon boundaries provided for other management zones (i.e., the Continental Divide Trail buffer) displayed in the interactive story map. CPW would like to assist the GMUG planners and clean up some of the Wildlife Management Area boundaries to make them more precise. This effort would remove some of the smaller polygons formed when intersecting CPW's coarse Wildlife Management Areas with other polygons used in the development of the management areas. In the example map below, the "Wildlife Management/Co Roadless Area" shown in dark blue could be expanded to include the "CO Roadless Area" shown in purple just to the west. This boundary alignment is important as we have already received comments from the public concerning the suggested polygons we provided to the GMUG.



Note that CPW will be improving the delineations of priority wildlife areas over the next five years, in particular with respect to elk, deer, bighorn sheep, and moose. The improvements will be based on: 1) new Herd Management Plans, 2) modeling/mapping of ungulate distribution via collar data, and 3) crucial habitat prioritization mapping. CPW recommends incorporating language in the Plan that allows for some degree of adaptive management to the Wildlife Management Area boundaries to accommodate these updates.

## **Part I: Social and Economic Environment**

### **Socioeconomics (pg 8)**

**FW-DC-SCEC-01:** Please include sustainable wildlife populations as one of the commodities provided by the forest. Please also include hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching as recreational opportunities. Please see CPW's 12/8/17 comments on Socioeconomic Sustainability.

**Recommended Additional Objective:** Please add an objective that includes maintaining CPW's big game population objectives on the GMUG in order to provide long-term sustainable economic benefits to local communities.

## **Part II: Ecological Sustainability**

### **Key Ecosystem Characteristics, Connectivity (pg 12)**

**FW-DC-TEV-18:** Meeting this Desired Condition requires acknowledgement of anthropogenic activity as a barrier that increases habitat fragmentation for many species (lynx, big game, predators, etc.) and incorporation of specific Standards and Guidelines designed to preserve connectivity - such as seasonal or volume of use restrictions and facility density restrictions in known migrations routes or critical movement areas. In addition to the "see also Wildlife DC XX-XX and OBJ-XX" reference, connectivity desired conditions and objectives should also be incorporated into the rangeland plan components (i.e., fencing criteria), and transportation components (i.e., route density limits and mitigation (crossing structures) for high volume routes.

Please incorporate specific Standards and Guidelines designed to maintain habitat connectivity for large terrestrial wildlife (predators and big game) based on the best available science. CPW staff can assist with developing Standards and Guidelines.

### **Terrestrial Ecosystems and Vegetation (pg 14)**

Please incorporate Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines for sagebrush. While there are few large blocks of sagebrush on the GMUG, it is a significant vegetative component on the fringes of many tracts of GMUG lands.

Please incorporate a Desired Condition for Alpine Uplands to preserve security habitats for animal/insect species. The exposure and openness of Alpine Uplands lend them, and the species that use them, susceptible to disturbance from human activities. Visitor use of Alpine Uplands can be managed in a way that increases security habitat for wildlife. This may involve trail re-routes or limitations on visitor usage. FW-OBJ-TEV-25 references Recreation Management plans, and FW-GDL-TEV-27 references ground disturbance; CPW recommends incorporating specific Standards and Guidelines that address managing human activities and facility (trail) placement to minimize wildlife displacement and habitat fragmentation in Alpine Uplands. Note that the bare soil/vegetation desired condition listed in the previous paragraph for Montane-Subalpine Grasslands (FW-DC-TEV-24) may also apply (or nearly so) for a desired condition in Alpine Uplands.

#### **Fire management Emphasis Areas (pg 20)**

In the list of Enhancement Emphasis Areas (pg 21), please add non-historic designated trails (i.e., Continental Divide Trail). Given the management restrictions being considered for a 0.25 mile buffer of the trail, natural ignitions could ease the burden placed on vegetation and wildlife management efforts in the future.

In the Protection Emphasis Areas (pg 21), please reference local community wildland fire protection plans where they exist.

#### **Native species Diversity (pg 22)**

**FW-OBJ-SPEC-69 (pg 23):** Please include “increase contiguous habitats by removing redundant transportation routes.”

**FW-GDL-SPEC-72 (pg 23):** Please incorporate specific design standards for facilities that are important to maintaining habitat connectivity. For example, for fence designs please reference the design standards found in CPW’s Fencing with Wildlife in Mind (2009), <https://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/LandWater/PrivateLandPrograms/FencingWithWildlifeInMind.pdf>. CPW can also provide species-specific route density standards to maintain habitat connectivity.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-73 (pg 23):** Please change this guideline to a standard, and incorporate reference to the specific disturbance buffers described in CPW’s Recommended Buffer Zones and Seasonal Restrictions for Colorado Raptors (2008).

**FW-DC-SPEC-80 (pg 25):** Please incorporate a Desired Condition of maintaining CPW’s herd management objectives in order to provide sustainable big game populations and quality hunting opportunities that, in turn, provide long-term sustainable economic benefits to local communities.

**FW-STND-SPEC-81 (pg 25):** CPW recommends placing bighorn sheep Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards, and Guidelines in the At-Risk Species Section, not the big game



section. Note that Standards and Guidelines for effective separation between domestic and bighorn sheep should include specific buffer distances for Tier 1 and Tier 2 herds and be consistent with the bighorn sheep addendum/appendix that is under development.

**FW-STND-SPEC-82 (pg 25):** CPW recommends applying this Standard in addition to, not instead of, specific buffer distances for Tier 1 and Tier 2 herds.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-83 (pg 25):** CPW recommends converting this guideline to a Standard. Note that there is a new CPW Species Activity Map (SAM) update scheduled for summer 2019 that CPW can provide to GMUG planners.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-84 (pg 26):** CPW recommends defining security habitat in terms of vegetative type composition. For elk, this would include areas free of roads and trails as well as forest patches >250 acres. In some cases, the forest patch size could be decreased if other disturbances (via roads and trails) are not influencing. In some cases, large patches of open non-forested areas serve as refuge to elk if the concern is predators.

**Recommended Additional Big Game Objective (pg 26):** Over the life of the GMUG plan, remediate 50% existing fence to a wildlife friendly state. This includes the removal of defunct fencing spans or implementing current best management practices documented in "Fencing With Wildlife in Mind" (CPW 2009) on existing or new fence sections. Site-specific issues include: raising the bottom strand between select fence posts of pronghorn habitat (Cochetopa hills/pass area) and using a PVC pipe "goat bar," lay-down sections, or drop-down segments between posts, and converting old, mesh sheep fencing to wildlife friendly 4-strand barbed wire to ease access for juvenile ungulates.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-85 & FW-STND-SPEC-86 (pg 26):** CPW recommends placing these Standards and Guidelines pertaining to boreal toad and Gunnison's prairie dog under the At-Risk Species section. Note that non-native plague is one of the greatest limiting factors to Gunnison's prairie dog conservation. Please add a new Standard or Guideline for Gunnison's prairie dog that requires CPW and the USFS to cooperate on a plague vaccine delivery program to conserve Gunnison's prairie dog colonies.

### **At-risk Species (pg 26)**

CPW will provide additional comments when species of conservation concern list is final and the At-Risk Species section is completed. CPW recommends that the PDRLMP reference the recently completed State Wildlife Action Plan for a list of At-Risk Species and potential threats. <https://cpw.state.co.us/aboutus/Pages/StateWildlifeActionPlan.aspx>

CPW recommends moving bighorn sheep to this At-risk Species section.

CPW recommends incorporating Colorado River Cutthroat Trout as a species of conservation concern in the At-Risk Species section. CPW would like to insure that the plan properly

addresses Cutthroat Trout conservation and is happy to comment as soon as this portion of the plan is available for review.

**Recommended Additional Objective:** Create, update, or obtain (if already available) species distribution maps (i.e., habitat suitability, niche modeling) for 25% of the species listed in the GMUG's list of species of conservation concern every 5 years. This information is critical for applying a science-based and objective approach to quantifying the degree of impact that future land-use decisions have on wildlife.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-113 (pg 30):** CPW highly encourages this seasonal closure to maintain the Gunnison sage-grouse population.

**FW-GDL-SPEC-114 (pg 30):** CPW recommends incorporating a Standard or Guideline referencing the best available science as it exists today. For Noise disturbance thresholds for grouse, see Blickley et al. (2012) Experimental Evidence for the Effects of Chronic Anthropogenic Noise on Abundance of Greater Sage Grouse at Leks. Conservation Biology 26 (3): 461-471.

### **Part III. Multiple Uses and Ecosystem Services of the Forests**

#### **Designated Trails (pg 34)**

##### **Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST)**

**Desired Conditions and Objectives:** Please add an additional Desired Condition and specific Objective tied to maintaining wildlife security and distribution along the CDNST. Many species, including mule deer, elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goat, and moose, rely on high elevation habitats along the CDNST in the late spring/summer/fall to achieve optimum body condition, and raise robust young. Unregulated increased interest and use of the CDNST over time is likely to result in the displacement of big game into less optimal habitats, particularly in alpine habitats where security is compromised by open landscapes and high volumes of trail users.

**FW-OBJ-DTRL-145 (pg 34):** Please incorporate in this Objective a desire to minimize road and trail densities and maintain habitat connectivity and wildlife security areas along the CDNST.

**FW-GDL-DTRL-150 (pg 35):** CPW recommends incorporating a similar Guideline to address the impacts of management activities on wildlife security and distribution along the CDNST. Habitat manipulation and management along the CDNST may be warranted to address concerns regarding wildlife security and displacement. Scenery management techniques are not likely to be effective for addressing wildlife security and displacement.

**FW-GDL-DTRL-157 (pg 35):** CPW recommends incorporating a similar Guideline that exempts habitat manipulation to improve or restore wildlife migration corridors and habitat (ungulate and Canada lynx). The volume of CDNST users will likely lead to

increased fragmentation of the habitat. Habitat manipulation may be used to minimize this impact and help to mitigate the impacts of increased trail user volumes on wildlife. Restoring/maintaining wildlife migration corridors and habitat that cross the CDNST will help preserve the integrity and character of the CDNST in itself.

**Recommended Additional Objective for CDNST:** Develop a system for monitoring visitor volume/usage of this trail within two years following the release of the Final Forest Plan, to guide management decisions and promote sustainable trail use and maintenance.

#### **Energy and Mineral Resources (pg 36)**

**Recommended Additional Desired Condition or Objective:** Energy and mineral development activities on the GMUG are planned and conducted in a manner to avoid impacts, and to minimize and mitigate the extent and severity of impacts that cannot be avoided (this is consistent with legislation recently authorized by the Colorado General Assembly through SB19-181).

**Recommended Additional Standard of Guideline:** Incorporate lease stipulations and/or mineral development conditions that provide for development planning to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to wildlife resources, such as CPW's Recommended Lease Stipulations for Oil and Gas within the State of Colorado (2010).

#### **Lands and Special Uses (pg 40)**

**Recommended Additional Desired Condition:** Recognizing that the ecosystem characterizing the GMUG covers a larger extent than the GMUG property boundaries, all GMUG land management activities are considered within the context of the management activities of neighboring public lands managed by, but not limited to, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, State of Colorado Lands, and neighboring forests.

#### **Range (pg 42)**

**FW-OBJ-RNG-199 (pg 42):** Maintaining 10% of fencing every 10 years is not adequate to maintain functioning fences and prevent trespass grazing. CPW recommends a more substantial Objective and maintenance schedule to maintain fences. (See recommendation for an additional Big Game Objective on page 5 of this comment letter).

**Recommended Additional Objective:** CPW recommends adding an Objective to provide forage and residual cover for wildlife consumption, hiding, and nesting cover. It is particularly critical to adjust stocking rates while drought conditions persist and vegetation is slow to recover. In drought conditions wildlife populations get a smaller portion of the available vegetation production when stocking rates remain unchanged. This has negative consequences for wildlife.

**FW-GDL-RNG-208 (pg 43):** Please incorporate a specific reference to wildlife-friendly fencing practices and CPW's publication "Fencing with Wildlife in Mind" (CPW 2009).



**Recommended Additional Objective:** Domestic sheep allotments with a medium or high risk of contact with bighorn sheep will be evaluated for a broad range of alternative management actions to minimize risk of contact.

**Recommended Additional Standards and Guidelines:** CPW recommends incorporating as Standards and Guidelines the specific management recommendations for land management agencies found in the WAFWA Recommendations for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Wild Sheep Habitat (Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Wild Sheep Working Group. 2012).

**Recommended Additional Standard:** Vegetation monitoring of allotments shall be conducted on an annual basis at a statistically representative sample of sites following sampling methodologies similar to the BLM AIM program. If the monitoring indicates that vegetation production is declining beyond the annual 10-yr average or curing out earlier than the 10-yr average, then reduced stocking rates will be implemented within 30 days to minimize the likelihood of exceeding desired utilization rates or decreasing available forage for native wildlife for consumption, hiding, and nesting requirements.

#### **Recreation (pg 44)**

**FW-DC-REC-213 or Additional Desired Condition:** CPW recommends adding language to reflect that recreational activities, particularly those outside of recreation emphasis management areas, be planned and conducted in a sustainable manner that does not degrade or adversely impact other forest resources, including wildlife.

**FW-OBJ-REC-214 (pg 44):** Access portals do not completely mitigate ecological impacts associated with increasing use. In some cases, the improved infrastructure at access points may draw more human visitation. Increased volume of users on the trail results increased disturbance and displacement of wildlife. This is important as many of these trails dissect ungulate summer and birthing habitats that are critical to maintaining wildlife populations. With the increased interest in climbing 14,000 ft peaks, CPW recommends including language describing the potential need for future use limitations and regulations to address crowding and unacceptable ecological impacts; similar to the language included in FW-STND-REC-217.

**FW-GDL-REC-219 (pg 45):** The ROS designation in many areas is based largely on current established roadways/routes. As written, this Guideline does not allow for management activities to move an area to a more primitive ROS setting. This Guideline could interfere with a project designed to improve the road system to be more sustainable. Proposals to realign/reroute a particular trail within a designated Wildlife Management Area to increase security areas for wildlife could also potentially change the ROS to a more primitive level. CPW recommends deleting this Guideline or modifying it to allow for management activities that potentially improve habitat conditions and result in a more primitive ROS designation.

**FW-GDL-REC-221 (pg 45):** CPW recommends adding to this Guideline a provision requiring that special use events be avoided during high use big game hunting seasons. CPW staff can assist determining the highest use hunting seasons for a particular area.

**Recommended Additional Objective:** Within five years following the release of the Final Forest Plan, implement a program for monitoring visitor volume/usage in each management zone. This monitoring system or would be part of a larger visitor volume/usage monitoring system GMUG wide.

**Recommended Additional Guideline:** New trails proposed in semi-primitive areas will be evaluated and planned in a manner that minimizes fragmentation of wildlife habitat and wildlife movement corridors between Wildlife Management Areas (and Wilderness Areas).

**General Comments regarding Table 6 (pg 46) and application of ROS:**

Before ROS is applied, CPW recommends that road systems and associated ROS polygons be mapped more accurately, and that the terrain barriers are considered more precisely. Please consider the following examples where revisions may be appropriate:

- The ridge between Texas Creek and Cottonwood pass provides a natural feature that could be used to define the break between Roded Natural (centered over the new paved road) and Semi-primitive Motorized to the north.
- Various small ROS polygons exist that are odd, fragmented, or are not readily accessible to public access. The example figure map centered over the Cathedral area (Spring and Cebolla Creeks) demonstrates a Roded Natural designation along the bottom of Spring Creek inaccessible to the public, as well as another questionable Roded Natural designation that appears to be primarily based on USFS boundary overlapping a county road for a short 400 m segment.
- **Semi-primitive Motorized:** While examining the ROS designations more closely via ArcMap, CPW discovered that there are some issues with several areas designated as "Semi-primitive Motorized" (development scale = 2). Many of the routes lying within these areas are closed, admin only, or land-locked (inaccessible except from other public land) routes. One example of a closed route includes FS-913 (Irby Gulch). One example admin route includes FS 677.6 (Powerline Admin Route parallel to Monarch Pass). CPW recommends re-evaluating these areas.
- **Roded Natural:** CPW also discovered issues with a number of areas designated as "Roded Natural" (development scale = 2-5). Several of the areas labeled "Roded Natural" do not fit the setting description with regard to "The road system is well defined and can typically accommodate passenger car travel", and "During the winter, the road system is plowed to accommodate passenger car travel. Winter trails are likely groomed...". Examples of routes not fitting to be Roded Natural designation include: a variety of spurs off of FS-724 (Rainbow Lake Rd), FS-728 (Castle Crk - private access

point), FS-737 (Carbon Creek), FS-829 (Red Mountain), FS-954 (Mitzel), FS-860 (Almont Powerline), FS-810 (Triangle Almont), FS-773 (Closed-route Fisher), 6061.B (Etsy), FS-743.4B (Canyon Spur), FS-604.1A (Sheeps Gulch), FS-604 (Cabin Creek Cow Camp), FS-604.A1 (Branch 2 - Closed Route), FS-738.2A (Winter ROS - West Brush), FS-759 (Winter ROS - Italian Creek), FS-374, FS-766 (Halls Gulch), FS-879 (West Mountain), FS-772 (Wiley Gulch), FS-237 (Old Monarch Pass), FS-780 (Long Branch), FS-578.2A (Sargents Mesa - admin and closed routes comprise some of the route density), FS-781.2A (Needle Cr Spur), FS-803 (Myers Gulch), FS-804.1F (Cochetopa Park Spur F), BLM-3323 (Nellie Crk Rd), FS-467 (Bonholder - private access point), FS-464 (Winter ROS - Cannibal Plateau), FS-457 (Winter ROS - Brush Creek).

Most of these routes are only designated as primitive (high-clearance vehicle) roads in travel management planning, or in other cases appeared to involve a road density calculation including closed or admin only routes. If these areas are designated as Roded Natural ROS, it will be difficult to get approval to restore (reroute, realign) or close routes in these areas in the future. In some cases, these Roded Natural ROS designations spatially overlap with Wildlife Management Areas where reroutes or road closures may be desirable.

It appears that many of the Roded Natural designations were based primarily on a currently high road density, in which a system of parallel roads or spurs radiate out from the primary road listed. In the listed examples above, we believe the road density was too high to begin with in terms of necessary law enforcement activities and ecosystem resiliency. One particular example of a very large area labelled Roded Natural, rather than Semi-primitive Motorized is the area between FS-788 (Los Pinos Pass Rd), FS-790 (Big Meadows) and FS-794 (Cochetopa Creek Rd). While some of these are passenger car roads, most of the spurs are high-clearance vehicle or closed segments. With this area currently receiving high intensity logging, it is our understanding that many of these routes will be closed after logging operations are completed. Therefore, the large area of Roded Natural ROS may not fit that characterization into the future, and may fit better in one of the Semi-primitive ROS designations. CPW recommends re-evaluating the ROS designations in this area.

- **Roded Natural adjacent to Wildlife Management Areas:** Based on our current knowledge of indirect impacts and displacement of wildlife near roads and trails, CPW is concerned that a Roded Natural designation adjacent to or bisecting a Wildlife Management Area could greatly reduce wildlife use of a Wildlife Management Area. If additional trails or routes are built near the boundary of a Roded Natural polygon adjacent to a Wildlife Management Area, displacement of wildlife in the Wildlife Management Area will occur. Therefore, we suggest that the ROS within ½ mile of designated Wildlife Management Areas and Wilderness, but not to within 100 m of the current linear road features, receive a Semi-primitive (development scale <2) designation or lower. This would effectively shrink the Roded Natural polygon designation around FS-743 (Lost Canyon Rd), FS-880 (Dark Gulch), Cnty Rd 209

(Cottonwood Pass), FS-584 (Sanford Crk), FS-632 (Red Buck), and Kebler Pass (along Raggeds Wilderness boundary).

#### **Timber and other Forest Products (pg 49):**

**Recommended Additional Guideline:** To prevent displacement of wildlife from large long-term forest management projects (i.e., the currently proposed Taylor Park veg project), work (logging, thinning, salvaging, etc) will be scheduled to move through the larger geographic area focusing on a smaller contiguous concentrated tracks of land each year. A certain percentage of larger landscape will be treated each season proportional to the duration of the project (i.e., 10 year project would equate to 5-15% of the land being disturbed each year). Ensuring that work activities are predictable both spatially and temporally will help mitigate some of the wildlife displacement. Annually, timber management work will only be scheduled where those activities will not adversely impact wildlife; particularly avoiding from December 1st through April 30th.

#### **Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers (pg 51):**

CPW will provide additional comments when the eligibility study is completed.

### **Chapter 3: Management Area Direction**

#### **Wilderness and Areas where Natural Processes Dominate (MA 1)**

**FW-STND-WLDN-256 (pg 54):** Please include an exemption for drone use for wildlife survey purposes with an approved Minimum Requirement Decision Process (MRDP) document.

**Recommended Additional Guideline:** Wildlife surveys in designated wilderness may use techniques such as placement of non-permanent GPS or radio-telemetry collar transmitters deployed via helicopter capture, provided that a MRDP is completed in consultation with GMUG staff.

#### **Special Areas and Designations (MA 2)**

##### **Special Interest Areas (pg 54):**

CPW recommends clarifying what constitutes a Special Interest Area. The wording for desired condition (Page 54 - FW-DC-SIA-261: "Special interest areas preserve the characteristics for which the areas are established") is open-ended without a better understanding of what this designation means and the scope of activities covered under the designation.

**FW-DC-SIA-261 (pg 54):** CPW recommends revising this desired condition to more accurately reflect the specific range of purposes for which a special interest area may be designated.

#### **Natural Areas with Focused Management**

##### **Wildlife Management Area (pg 56)**

### **General Comment regarding Mapping of Wildlife Management Areas:**

Thank you for incorporating the Wildlife Management Area concept into the Preliminary Draft Plan. Please consider the following revisions and additions to the polygons provided on your web page:

- CPW recommends that the USFS lands mapped as CO Roadless Area bordering the north side of the continental divide on south slopes of the Lake Fork Drainage be considered zoned as Wildlife Management Area due to its importance as summer production habitat for deer and elk, and as habitat for a Tier 1 bighorn sheep herd (S33). This area serves as a bighorn sheep migration corridor between the south and northern portions of the Tier 1 bighorn sheep herd (S33). It also serves as one of the first known occupied lynx and denning habitats. CPW recommends managing this area to limit access to existing routes and increase monitoring and enforcement so that no unauthorized trails are constructed. See Wager Creek West from Table 1 - CPW Wildlife Emphasis Areas and USFS Wilderness Evaluation, submitted with CPW Wilderness Evaluation Report comments on October 1, 2018.
- CPW recommends that the USFS land mapped as General Forest and CO Roadless Area south of the West Elk Wilderness be considered a Wildlife Management Area. Given the extensive habitat/fuel treatments planned for this area in the near future by USFS and other partners, it has tremendous potential for providing high quality big game (elk, bighorn sheep, mule deer) in the future. The land currently designated as "General Forest" areas has the potential to be fragmented if future road and trail densities increase. Under the designation as a Wildlife Management Area the current road system could be redesigned to ensure adequate security habitat for elk and improve the distribution.
- CPW recommends that an area mapped as General Forest (north of Highway 50, just west of Sargents) and Colorado Roadless Area (south of Highway 50, just Southwest of Sargents), and extending west to the south side of Tomichi Dome be considered as a Wildlife Management Area. This area is important to ungulates throughout the year, is a critical migration corridor for elk, and consists of Critical Habitat for Gunnison sage-grouse. CPW supports the 2010 USFS Decision Record for reduced motorized use in this area and that the travel and recommends that recreational use in this area be kept at the current standard as both hunter and recreation access is sufficient based on existing routes. See Dawson Gulch Montane from Table 1 - CPW Wildlife Emphasis Areas and USFS Wilderness Evaluation, submitted with CPW Wilderness Evaluation Report comments on October 1, 2018.
- CPW recommends that all General Forest areas on FlatTop Mountain be changed to Wildlife Management Area due to its importance for Gunnison sage-grouse and wintering big game. See Flat Top West and Flat Tip East Corridor from Table 1 Table 1 - CPW

Wildlife Emphasis Areas and USFS Wilderness Evaluation, submitted with CPW Wilderness Evaluation Report comments on October 1, 2018.

- CPW recommends that Kannah Creek Basin remain primitive and non-motorized, preferably non-mechanized. The area provides a unique roadless area in the otherwise heavily roaded Grand Mesa. For this reason, it provides critical security for terrestrial wildlife and also provides high quality habitat for aquatic species. In order to maintain existing road and trail densities and the unique characteristics of this area on the Grand Mesa, CPW recommends that the Kannah Creek drainage below the rim of the Grand Mesa be managed as a Wildlife Management Area for foot and horseback travel only. See Kannah Creek Drainage from Table 1 - CPW Wildlife Emphasis Areas and USFS Wilderness Evaluation, submitted with CPW Wilderness Evaluation Report comments on October 1, 2018.

**FW-STND-WLDF-270:** Due to substantial distance effects and displacement of some species from roads and trails, CPW recommends incorporating into the route density calculation a buffer to account for the displacement of wildlife from roads and trails adjacent to designated Wildlife Management Areas. This will help achieve FW-DC-WLDF-269 and ensure that the functional route density within designated Wildlife Management Areas is maintained at the desired level.

**Recommended Additional Guideline:** A system for monitoring route user volume/usage in Wildlife Management Areas will be implemented within two years following the release of the Final Forest Plan. This monitoring system or would be part of a larger visitor volume/usage monitoring system GMUG wide.

#### **Recreation Emphasis Management Areas (MA 4)**

##### **Mountain Resorts (pg 56):**

##### **General Comments on Mapped Mountain Resort Areas :**

- An area designated General Forest on the southeast slopes of Mt Crested Butte is already under plans for expansion (Teo Park and Teo Drainage), but is not currently mapped as Mountain Resort Area. CPW recommends re-evaluating the mapping for this area.
- The NW, NE, and SE quadrants of Snodgrass Mtn are mapped as a Mountain Resort Area, and appear to correspond to another Crested Butte Mountain Resort Expansion. This area is important for ungulate birthing and is an important migration corridor for elk. Elk using this area are already cut off from utilizing a migration corridor that once ran between the slate river and Mt. Crested Butte. In order to maintain elk use of this area, CPW recommends re-evaluating whether it is more appropriate to designate it a special interest area like the neighboring areas to the north and east. Alternatively, the area could be considered as a General Forest management area.



## **High-use Recreation Management Areas (pg 58):**

### **General Comments on High-use Recreation Management Areas:**

- CPW recommends that the General Forest areas with Suitable Timber Production directly south of Table Mountain bordering the Rio Grande NF be changed to an Area to be Analyzed as Wilderness/CO Roadless. Designating a High Use Recreation Area in this area will have significant impacts on wildlife due to particularly high quality elk calving habitat on middle section of Table Mountain. On the east and west ends of the mountain primitive roads currently exist, impacting elk distribution and making the south side and middle portion of the mountain more important. CPW strongly recommends reconsideration of the proposed High Use Recreation Area in this location.
- The area at the base of beaver creek is currently not heavily used, but mapped as a High-use Recreation Management Area. The ROS is currently semi-primitive motorized with only one looping trail (single-tracked motorized). It is an important access point for hunters that utilize it at a low to moderate density. This area is part of the larger upper Gunnison to Crested Butte ungulate migration corridor, linking elk and deer winter ranges to summer ranges. CPW recommends maintaining, but not expanding, the existing trail network and access in this area.

**FW-GDL-REC-286:** CPW recommends adding a bullet to “Restrict use to designated trails and reclaim user-created trails to prevent resource damage.”

**Recommended Additional Objective:** Annually inventory routes and trails in High-use Recreation Management Areas to monitor the proliferation of user-created trails and prioritize trail maintenance and reclamation activities.

## **Chapter 4. Monitoring**

**General Comment on Monitoring:** The Forest Plan will rely heavily on Law Enforcement presence and compliance monitoring to achieve the stated Objectives, Standards and Guidelines. Colorado’s human population is expected to grow throughout the life of this plan, resulting in an increased demand for GMUG resources and opportunities. CPW strongly encourages the GMUG to explore ways to increase its Law Enforcement staff to ensure that the new Plan is implemented as intended, and foster the monitoring efforts outlined in this section.

### **20. Table 8 Monitoring questions and indicators (Page 63 - 75).**

**Page 63 - Row 1 Indicator(s):** Spatio-temporally explicit user volume data for each particular management area/zone of the GMUG can be used for host of Standards and Guidelines for other plan components. This include basic user satisfaction, recreation impacts on ecosystems (i.e., wildlife), and other stakeholder groups (i.e., ranchers, timber harvesters). CPW recommends adjusting NVUM sampled sites to be able to quantify visitor usage by each management area/zone.

**Page 63 - Row 2 Indicator(s):** Please add (5) “built but unauthorized/user-created /social/ illegal routes”

**Page 64 - Row 1 Indicator(s):** Similar to documenting user volume, CPW recommends adding an indicator for the number and/or density of dispersed camp sites for each management area and time period across the GMUG.

**Page 65 - Row 2 Indicator(s):** CPW recommends adding an indicator for annual fishing days, hunting licenses, and outfitter days, and total annual economic contribution of hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching. It is important to note that big game meat harvested for each CPW Game Management Unit on the forest is a commodity that has intrinsic value (like timber) and also provides significant secondary economic benefits. This highlights that healthy big game populations and hunting provide more than just a recreational opportunity.

**Page 66 - Row 3 Adaptive Management Actions:** CPW recommends that adaptive management actions include reducing stocking rates, deferring grazing to a later opening date, adjusting allotment closing dates, temporarily closing active allotments, and adjusting allotment boundaries if necessary to address conflicts with wildlife.

**Page 71 - Row 1 Indicator(s):** CPW recommends that range condition and trend have objectively quantified (measured) metrics to assess changes. For instance: % bare-ground measurements, grass stubble height, shrub browsing intensity metrics. CPW recommends range conditions be objectively monitored and assessed annually during the active grazing season to effectively manage stocking rates and prevent overutilization.

**Page 74 - Row 2 Indicator(s):** Elk, mule deer, and bighorn sheep mapped areas provided by CPW (Species Area Maps: SAM) are not recommended to be an indicator, as they only represent the occupancy of animals, and do not provide a representation of vitality such as the way an abundance or density estimate would. The SAM polygons are not drawn at a scale fitting to the Associated Plan components in relation to providing big game security areas. CPW recommends using CPW’s 3 or 5 year average abundance estimate in comparison to CPW’s Herd Management Plan objectives (<https://cpw.state.co.us/hmp>).

**Page 74 - Row 2 Adaptive Management Actions:** Establish inter-agency collaborations to monitor ungulate movement and distribution data via radio-telemetry to assess spatial distribution in relation to big game security areas. Manage road closures and/or trail density and seasons of use to improve big game distribution and use of security areas. Monitor forage conditions annually and reduce livestock numbers as needed to provide sufficient forage, nesting, and hiding cover for wildlife.

**Page 75 - Row 1 Indicator(s):** Similar to the comment for pg 74- row 2 (big game) the occupancy of Gunnison sage-grouse across the landscape (via mapped polygons) is not as important as the abundance or density of sage-grouse. CPW recommends using the count of grouse on leks as better indicator. Contact CPW for annual lek count data.

## State and Local Direction (pg 162)

CPW suggests adding the following agreements to State and Local Direction:

- Conservation agreement for Colorado River cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii pleuriticus*) in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. (June 2006)
- Conservation strategy for Colorado River cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii pleuriticus*) in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming (June 2006)
- Range-wide conservation agreement and strategy for roundtail chub *Gila robusta*, bluehead sucker *Catostomus discobolus*, and flannelmouth sucker *Catostomus latipinnis* (September 2006)
- Conservation plan and agreement for the management and recovery of the Southern Rocky Mountain population of the boreal toad (*Bufo boreas boreas*) (February 2001)
- Policies and guidelines for fish and wildlife management in National Forest and Bureau of Land Management Wilderness (as amended June, 2006)

## Conclusion

CPW appreciates the opportunity to review the Preliminary Draft Revised Land Management Plan (PDRLMP) for the GMUG. We continue to be encouraged by our positive working relationship with GMUG staff, and we look forward to continued collaboration as a cooperating agency.

The PDRLMP is a substantial document. We hope that our comments on the PDRLMP are helpful in the context of our previously stated concerns and recommendations on the subject matter assessments completed by GMUG staff. CPW recommends an in-person joint review of our comments so that both GMUG and CPW staff better understand the content of our comments and how they will be integrated into the PDRLMP.

If you have any questions or would like clarification on any comment in this letter please contact Southwest Energy Liaison, Jon Holst at 970-375-671.

Sincerely,



Heath Kehm, Acting SW Region Manager

xc: JT Romatzke, NW Region Manager, J Wenum, Area 16 Wildlife Manager, Renzo Delpiccolo, Area 18 Wildlife Manager, Kirk Oldham, Area 7 Wildlife Manager, Scott Wait, SW Region Senior Terrestrial Biologist, Brad Petch, NW Region Senior Terrestrial Biologist, John Alves, SW Region Senior Aquatic Biologist, Lori Martin, NW Region Senior Aquatic Biologist, Taylor Elm, NW Region Energy Liaison



## COLORADO

Colorado Water  
Conservation Board

Department of Natural Resources  
1313 Sherman Street, Room 718  
Denver, CO 80203

May 22, 2019

Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and  
Gunnison National Forests  
Attn: Plan Revision Team  
2250 South Main Street  
Delta, CO 81416

Dear Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison Forests Planning Staff:

The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) appreciates the opportunity to participate and provide comments during the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests Plan revision process. Our agencies have a long-standing partnership and we appreciate the reference to the 2015 Memorandum of Understanding between the Forest Service (FS), the State of Colorado Department of Natural Resources, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board in the draft Forest Plan (Appendix E, Relevant Federal Statutes, Regulations, Policies, and Agreements). This cooperation during the forest planning process is paramount to better integrating federal and state laws and activities concerning protection and management of instream flows on National Forest System lands.

### Pathfinder Project

In a May 9, 2004 letter addressed to the CWCB, the Forest Supervisor praised the work of the 2004 Pathfinder Project Steering Committee and committed GMUG National Forest staff and Ranger Districts to the concepts of cooperation and coordination outlined in the 2004 Pathfinder Report (Attachment 1). The letter stated that the Pathfinder Project process and strategies for instream flow management would be incorporated into the Forest Plan revision.

We appreciate the inclusion of the Pathfinder cooperation strategy as a management approach in the draft Forest Plan, which states, “[w]hen considering authorizations for water developments and uses, apply the Pathfinder approach (or other similar protocol) to coordinate with stakeholders and provide for balanced management of environmental flows.” (Appendix C, Management Approaches and Possible Actions, Watersheds and Water Resources, page 149). However, the draft Forest Plan also states, “[t]he listed proposed and probable management practices are not intended to be all-inclusive, *nor are they intended to be decisions or commitments, but simply projections of what actions may take place in the future.*” [emphasis added] (Appendix C, Management Approaches and Possible Actions, page 141). We encourage the FS to include a stronger commitment to this management action in the final Forest Plan that references the strategic tools and actions that can provide for instream flows or protect existing instream flow regimes. The Pathfinder Project specifically addresses the following:

- The CWCB’s Instream Flow Program may provide adequate protection on National Forest Service lands;
- Issues concerning the conditioning of special-use permits by the Forest Service with “bypass” flow requirements to provide for instream flows; and
- Adherence to state water law and recognition of privately held water rights and the State’s ability to adjudicate water for instream flow purposes.


The CWCB encourages the FS to include and implement the Pathfinder Project management strategies and results, rather than only reference the Pathfinder approach to coordinate with stakeholders. The tools identified by the Pathfinder Project entail 27 possible actions or strategies to achieve instream flow protection without unilateral action and bypass flow requirements on special use permits.

### Acquisition of Water Rights

The draft Forest Plan includes the acquisition of water rights for new Federal uses as a management approach (Appendix C, Management Approaches and Possible Actions, page 148). Prior to exploring an acquisition of water rights to protect flow-related values, we recommend the Forest Plan reference the CWCB’s Instream Flow Program and recognize it as a management strategy to protect flow-related values in lieu of pursuing federal reserved water rights, as set forth in the Pathfinder Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact CWCB Stream and Lake Protection Section Chief Linda Bassi at 303-866-3441, ext. 3204.

Sincerely,



Lauren Ris  
CWCB Deputy Director

Attachment

**RECEIVED****MAY 09 2004**

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Grand Mesa,  
Uncompahgre, Gunnison  
National Forests  
Colorado Water Conservation Board

2250 Highway 50  
Delta, CO 81416  
Voice: 970-874-6600  
TDD: 970-874-6660

File Code: 3000-3

Date: April 30, 2004

Dan Merriman  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
1313 Sherman St. Room 721  
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Dan,

I have received the Pathfinder Project Steering Committee Report. Completion of this report addressing strategies for Instream Flow management on National Forest System lands is an excellent template for the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests to consider as part of its Forest Plan revision.

I wish to personally thank you for the time and effort you have put into this collaborative process. I recognize a great deal of understanding, cooperation, and compromise was required by the Steering Committee to develop this report.

As a Committee member, in a group possessing and representing divergent opinions and beliefs, you are to be commended for your ability to work towards this common goal. The product of this work represents a fresh look at how the Forest Service can work cooperatively with a wide array of the stakeholders having diverse interests in how water resources are managed on the GMUG National Forests.

As the Forest Supervisor, I am committing the GMUG National Forest staff and Ranger Districts to the concepts of cooperation and coordination outlined in your Report. It is our intent to incorporate the Pathfinder Project process and strategies for instream flow management into our Forest Plan revision. The results of your efforts will provide proposals for the Plan revision that I believe will be the foundation to future Forest Service decisions regarding instream flow protection. The Forest Plan revision process will ensure continued public and stakeholder input on water resource management issues.

It is my firm belief that your Report, which embodies the collective wisdom of the Steering Committee, represents a fair balance of public perspectives on how water resources on our National Forest System lands should be managed in the future. It is my hope this effort will have more far-reaching influence and will serve as a template for other National Forests.





Your participation, effort, dedication, and contributions to the Pathfinder Project have been greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert L. Storch". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

ROBERT L. STORCH  
Forest Supervisor

cc: Lisa Carlson, Maro Zagoras