

## **APPENDIX A - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**



## **INTRODUCTION**

This report summarizes the outcomes and processes making up the preliminary scoping phase of the joint San Juan Forest Plan and BLM Resource Management Plan revision. San Juan Public Lands Center staff and community participants engaged in dozens of professionally facilitated, well-attended planning events, meetings, study groups, and workshops. San Juan Public Lands Center (SJPLC) has far exceeded requirements and typical expectations for a scoping process. In an effort well beyond compliance, SJPLC engaged citizens, community organizations, and government agencies using professional support and innovative media and forums that focused community input directly onto the land. The focus on features, uses, and conditions of the land resulted in remarkably civil and thoughtful conversations and comments that are pertinent to the task at hand: revising the plans that guide decision-making about managing the land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service and BLM.

### **THE NEED FOR THE PLAN REVISION**

The Forest and Renewable Resource Planning Act of 1974 (RPA), as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, requires preparation of Forest Plans and revision of these plans at least every 15 years (Sec. 6, 16 U.S.C. 1600). Since the San Juan National Forest Plan was last revised in 1983 and amendments are not considered revisions, the revision of this plan is now overdue. USFS published a Notice of Intent to revise the San Juan Forest Plan in the Federal Register on Sept. 23, 1999. The revision was deferred pursuant to 1998 Appropriations Act that prohibited spending on Forest Plans, and funding shortfalls in 1999 and 2000.

Section 202(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 as amended (43 USC 1701 et seq.) requires the Secretary of Interior with public involvement to develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land use plans which guide the use of the public lands.

There are a number of new issues, higher levels of controversy around existing issues, and new, unforeseen public land uses and concerns that have arisen over the years which were not included in the previous Forest and Resource Management Plans. Issues that need to be addressed in these plans include but are not limited to:

- Off-highway vehicle use and transportation planning – revision of current decisions to reflect changes in national policy for both agencies.
- The need to address Healthy Public Lands initiative and hazardous fuel management,
- New and changing recreational uses of public lands such as mountain bike use, ski area development, and increasing recreational demands.
- Availability of lands for mineral development and terms under which lands are available for leasing. Determine if existing lease restrictions are necessary and if they are adequate.
- Habitat requirements and protective measures for species identified as Forest Service management indicator species (MIS), federally listed species, and agency sensitive species.
- Increasing interest in the interplay between public lands management and regional water resources.

### **PURPOSE OF THE PLAN REVISION**

The purpose of the plan revision is to establish guidance, objectives, policies, and management actions for lands and resources under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Public Lands Center. The plans will be comprehensive in nature and will resolve or address major revision topics and

issues within the planning area which will be identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts.

Plan decisions will:

1. Establish multiple-use goals and objectives.
2. Establish management and management area directions applying to future activities.
3. Establish monitoring and evaluation requirements.
4. Determine suitability and potential capability of lands for resource production.
5. Determine mineral leasing and leasing stipulations.
6. Where applicable, recommend designations of special areas such as Wilderness, and Wild and Scenic Rivers to Congress.
7. Designate Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Research Natural Areas, Habitat Management Areas, Special Botanical Areas, and Special Interest Areas as appropriate.
8. Explain or identify the current management situation, desired future conditions, cultural resource management goals, goals for continued management of energy resources, standards and guidelines for forest and rangeland health, and goals for multiple-resource management, within the planning area.
9. Appropriate methods and management actions necessary to achieve objectives will be determined. A schedule and cost estimate for implementing planned actions for achieving those goals will be developed. These actions will be guided by the various laws and regulations pertinent to the public lands of Southwest Colorado.
10. The documents will address and integrate, to the degree possible, current Forest Service and BLM activity plans related to management of the lands in the planning area including, but not limited to, fire management plans, livestock grazing allotment management plans, wildlife habitat management plans, timber management plans, cultural resource management plans, the wild horse herd management plan, and recreation management plans. All decisions made and subsequent implementation decisions will be subject to valid existing rights with decisions documented through separate Records of Decision for the forest and BLM lands.
11. Decisions will specify application to forest lands only, BLM lands only or application to both jurisdictions. This includes, but is not limited to, valid existing rights associated with oil and gas leases, mineral leases, mining claims, and lands and realty actions.

In addition to the purposes described above, the plans will also fulfill the needs and obligations set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), and USFS/BLM Land Use Plan policies.

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA**

### ***Physical description***

The planning area lies in the Colorado Plateau and Southern Rocky Mountains physiographic provinces. Elevations within the area range from about 4,900 feet to over 14,000 feet above sea level. The Colorado Plateau portion is characterized by sedimentary surface deposits dominated by deep canyons, and lower-elevation mesas with predominant rock deposits of sandstone and shale. The Southern Rocky Mountains portion is characterized by mountains that are partially volcanic in origin and have been shaped by glaciation. Ecological zones represented in the planning area include canyon-desert, lower montane-plateau, upper montane, sub-alpine and alpine zones.

### ***Jurisdictional description***

The outer boundaries of the planning area encompass approximately 700,000 acres of federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and 1,867,800 acres within the San Juan National Forest. The planning area includes lands in Archuleta, Conejos, Dolores, Hinsdale, La Plata, Mineral, Montezuma, Montrose, Rio Grande, San Juan, and San Miguel counties. The west border of the planning area is the Utah/Colorado state line. The southern border of the planning area is the New Mexico/Colorado state line. The eastern border is the Continental Divide. The northern bounds are the administrative boundaries with the Rio Grande, Gunnison, Grand Mesa and Uncompahgre national forests and the BLM Gunnison and Uncompahgre Field Offices.

### ***Integrated management of San Juan Public Lands***

The San Juan Field Office and San Juan National Forest are pioneering a concept known as Service First. Service First is a partnership strategy to provide better customer service and be more cost-effective in the delivery of those services to users of the public lands in Southwest Colorado. The local units have the opportunity to streamline multiple processes and regulations, combine management of adjacent BLM and National Forest public lands, and offer one-stop shopping and a single point of contact for all customers — commercial users, partners and visitors. The project has merged the San Juan National Forest, the BLM San Juan Field Office, the Anasazi Heritage Center, and the newly created Canyons of the Ancients National Monument under the management of the San Juan Public Lands Center in Durango with field office/ranger districts in Pagosa Springs, Durango, Bayfield and Dolores, Colo.

Congress, in the Interior Appropriations, signed by the President on November 14, 1997, authorized the BLM and Forest Service to delegate duties, responsibilities and authorities, thereby allowing employees of either agency the authority to act in full force and effect for the other agency. Public lands within the San Juan National Forest and lands under BLM jurisdiction are still managed under different laws and regulations, but resource management by the two agencies is very similar and joint management allows for more effective management across jurisdictional boundaries. The San Juan Public Lands Center (SJPLC) is responsible for the management and stewardship of more than 3.6 million acres of public lands in Southwest Colorado.

## **SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PROCESS**

### **SCOPING OVERVIEW**

San Juan Public Lands conducted a broad, thorough, and innovative community-based public input process that far exceeds the typical efforts of a federal-lands scoping process and easily meets the basic requirements. The scoping process included the following 10 components:

### **STUDY GROUP MEETINGS**

The core of the community input process consisted of 21 study group meetings over a period of eight months with more than 450 registered attendees (many of which attended several meetings) and dozens of 'drop-ins' that attended meetings or portions of meetings but chose not to register for the meetings. Some meetings in the Columbine and Dolores districts attracted over 100 participants.

**Table A.1 - Scoping Overview**

Scoping Component	Duration	Forum	Community Input Summary Sources
Study Groups	Jan. 2005 - ongoing	21 facilitated open public meetings	66 comment summary sheets and 33 maps on forest planning website: <a href="http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan">http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan</a>
On-Site Town Meetings	Summer 2005	3 facilitated open public meetings	Input integrated into study group comment summaries <a href="http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan">http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan</a>
Recreation Interviews	Jan. - May 2004	83 interviews with recreation groups, outfitters, conservationists	Report: <i>Interviews Conducted for Recreation Planning</i> <a href="http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan">http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan</a>
Written Comments	1999-ongoing	Written comments submitted to SJPLC	Written comments available at SJPLC
Web Comments	Jan. 2005 - ongoing	Available during study group meetings on forest planning website	Digital database available at SJPLC
Governmental Water Roundtable	May 2005 - ongoing	10 monthly meetings so far with more scheduled	Meeting summaries and resources on forest planning website: <a href="http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan">http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan</a>
Aspen Workshop	Dec. 2004	1 focused workshop	Meetings summaries available at SJPLC
Community Wildfire Protection Planning	2001 - ongoing	Separate process but input and fire plans considered in plan revision	Documents available at Southwest Colorado Information Clearinghouse: <a href="http://www.southwestcoloradofires.org">http://www.southwestcoloradofires.org</a>
Northern San Juan Basin DEIS	Summer, Fall 2004	Separate process but input considered in plan revision	Contact SJPLC for DEIS documentation
Roadless Area Taskforce Public Meeting	Dec. 2005	1 facilitated meeting in La Plata County	Meeting documentation available at <a href="http://www.keystone.org/htm">http://www.keystone.org/htm</a>

All study group meetings were well attended by SJPLC staff representing the full spectrum of land-management disciplines, and creating a broad knowledge base for meeting discussions. SJPLC staff introduced each landscape and provided an active role in facilitating and informing all meeting exercises and discussions. Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services developed the study group concept and provided meeting scheduling and logistics and partnered with RPI Consulting, Marcia Porter-Norton and other local planning professionals for facilitation and comment processing of the study group meetings.

Each study group meeting was open to all participants who were willing to make it to the venue and was heavily advertised. Each week prior to a scheduled meeting, SJPLC staff sent public notices to dozens of media and information clearinghouse organizations including the Durango Herald, Denver Post, DCAT TV, KDUR, City Span TV, KSUT, HubWest, Cortez Journal, Telluride Daily Planet, KVFC, Southern Ute Tribe, Free Press, Mancos Times, Rico Bugle, Pagosa Sun, Pine River Times, High Country News, Durango Telegraph, and many

other key information dissemination contacts. Meetings were also posted on the official forest planning website hosted by Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services.

**Table A.2 - Study Group Meetings**

District & Meeting Location	Meeting Date	Geographic Focus
Columbine District FLC Ballroom, Durango, CO	1/25/2006	Missionary Ridge, Lakes
	2/22/2005	Hermosa Creek, La Plata Canyon, Wild Oats
	3/30/2005	Durango, Mayhan
	4/21/2005	Beaver Meadows and HDs
	5/24/2005	Weminuche, Silverton, Animas Valley
	6/29/2005	San Juan Public Lands Vision & Niche Statement
	8/04/2005	Vision & Niche Statement and Wrap-up
Dolores District KoKo's, Cortez, CO	1/20/2005	Upper Dolores, Mesas
	2/17/2005	Boggy Draw, Big Glade
	3/17/2005	Haycamp Mesa, Mancos-Cherry Creek
	4/14/2005	Dove Creek, McPhee, and Cortez
	5/18/2005	Slick Rock, Dry Creek, Disappointment
	6/29/2005	San Juan Public Lands Vision & Niche Statement
	8/04/2005	Vision & Niche Statement and Wrap-up
Pagosa District Jr. High, Pagosa, CO	1/27/2005	Williams Reservoir
	2/24/2005	Turkey Springs, Ute
	3/31/2005	Mosca, Piedra
	4/28/2005	Wolf Creek, Pagosa
	5/25/2005	Square Top, South San Juan
	6/30/2005	San Juan Public Lands Vision & Niche Statement
	8/02/2005	Vision & Niche Statement and Wrap-up
On-Site Meetings	6/07/2005	Norwood On-Site Meeting: Norwood Area
	6/28/2005	Silverton On-Site Meeting: Silverton, Weminuche
	8/31/2005	Rico On-Site Meeting: Rico Area

The 2005 San Juan Forest and BLM plan revision study group meeting schedule outlines the extent of opportunities on each district for community input. Meetings were held according to 35 specific geographic areas or *landscapes* making up the planning area. See San Juan Landscapes for a geographic overview of the planning area.

### ***Individual written geographically specific comments***

Each participant attending the study group meeting had the opportunity to register four written place-specific comments about each landscape covered in each meeting. The comments were organized into four categories:

- Primary Use
- Outstanding Features
- Concerns
- Opportunities

Participants recorded each of the written comments on individual comment sheets while they placed corresponding icon stickers representing various comment categories (motorized uses, pet impacts, wildlife habitat, mineral and gas development, etc..) onto full-sized maps to specify the location specific to the comment. Well over 3,000 place-specific comments were collected in this manner.

### ***Facilitated discussion groups***

At the beginning of each study group meeting, participants viewed a slide show presenting the aggregate results of the individual, place-specific comments about the landscapes from the previous meeting in 3-D format. Taking this into consideration, study group participants were randomly assigned to tables with 5-10 participants, one or two professional facilitators, and a SJPL staff member to discuss the draft management themes for each landscape. Facilitators challenged participants to learn the differences between the management themes and propose changes to the draft themes supplied by SJPLC staff or offer reasoning for supporting the draft themes. Theme definitions were provided at the meetings and on the planning website along with a presentation at the beginning of most meetings. Each comment was recorded by the facilitators during the meeting.

### ***Processing and use of study group input***

Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services and RPI Consulting entered all of the input received during study group meetings into a master database and presented it in map database format, enabling SJPLC staff and interested public to view the comments in their geographic context. Processed comments and accompanying maps were posted on the official planning website so that they were accessible to anyone visiting the website. These summaries are still available at <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan/default.asp>

Processed public input was distributed to ID team meetings where it was carefully considered in the initial stages of planning and continues to serve an important role in the drafting of alternative management themes.

### **ON-SITE TOWN MEETINGS**

Since the geographic extent of San Juan Public Lands encompasses many different transportation corridors, some communities such as Norwood, Rico, and Silverton are isolated from the core of the planning area along U.S. 160, where the majority of the meetings took place. In order to encourage geographically diverse participation and to reach these communities, SJPL took the study group meetings on the road. These meetings were conducted similarly to the regular study group meetings in Cortez, Durango, and Pagosa Springs and were heavily advertised, and relatively well-attended, with 50+ participants in Silverton, for example.

## **RECREATION INTERVIEWS**

Recognizing the importance of recreation for public lands planning and to lifestyles in the Southwest, SJPL initiated a recreation group interview process, conducted by Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services partnering with RPI Consulting LLC. A total of 83 interviews were conducted with leaders of organized recreation groups, commercial outfitters, stewardship groups, outdoor equipment retailers, and other organized groups with an interest in recreation on public lands. Interviews were conducted in nearly even numbers for the three districts comprising San Juan Public Lands.

RPI Consulting built a geographic database of the interviews to capture place-specific comments and produced a qualitative summary of the interview findings for use in the planning process. These interviews, conducted during the winter of 2004, were an important component of the information and public input foundation upon which the ensuing recreation components of the scoping process were built. The summary report is available on the planning website at <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan/reports.asp>

## **WRITTEN COMMENTS**

More than 2 dozen written comments have been submitted to San Juan Public Lands during the initial scoping period beginning in 1999. This may be a relatively low number of written comments for a full plan revision, but not surprising because San Juan Public Lands dedicated extra time and resources to conduct a meaningful scoping process built upon the diverse set forums for authentic community participation that are profiled in this report.

Nonetheless, written comments are an important form of community input and generally offer well-written, concise statements about specific issues. The written comments represent a broad array of interests ranging from potentially adverse impacts of Wild and Scenic River designations on private land values to a call for protection of three specific fresh-water springs in the HD Mountains. Many of the written comments are summaries of concerns voiced during informal meetings with SJPL staff members at the Public Lands Center. The written comments were read carefully and integrated into the *Issues Summary* contained later in this report.

## **GOVERNMENTAL WATER ROUNDTABLE**

Water resource concerns cut across jurisdictional boundaries and so should planning efforts surrounding water. Recognizing the jurisdictional complexity of water resource management, SJPL invited local governments, tribal representatives, water conservation districts, and state agencies to be part of the Governmental Water Roundtable. A total of 10 Water Roundtable meetings have been held to date. The purpose of this effort is to:

- Develop mutual understanding of key local issues related to water
- Develop ideas for the land management plan
- Guide land management agencies to make water resource portions of land management plans more accessible and easily identifiable.
- Identify issues beyond the scope of the land management plan and discuss forums that would be appropriate for working on those issues.
- Evaluate proposed and existing Wild and Scenic River designations for area rivers.

## **ASPEN WORKSHOP**

In order to draw insights from a number of local and regional authorities on various aspects of aspen ecology, function, and management, San Juan National Forest convened a focused workshop. Topics included:

- Aspen ecology and interdependency with wildlife history and implications of aspen management
- Role of aspen in the regional economy
- Aspen aesthetics and environmental values

Broad sponsorship for this focused resource workshop included San Juan National Forest, Montezuma County Federal Lands Program, Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services, Mountain Studies Institute, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Rocky Mountain Experiment Station, San Juan Citizens Alliance, Colorado Wild, and Colorado State Forest Service.

### **OTHER RELEVANT PLANNING EFFORTS**

The San Juan Forest and Resource Management Plan revision draws from an enormous depth of information and community input. Several important planning efforts have been under way during scoping, and the SJPLC is applying knowledge gained from these related planning efforts to the Plan revision.

#### ***Community Wildfire Protection Planning***

In order to achieve the most effective outcomes for wildfire protection and forest health, Fort Lewis College Office of Community Services has been coordinating an interjurisdictional, forest-wide Community Wildfire Protection Planning process. Participants in this process include the San Juan Public Lands Center, the Colorado State Forest Service as well as fire protection districts, municipalities and five Southwest Colorado counties that include San Juan National Forest and BLM lands.

Community Wildfire Protection Planning involves several parallel elements including updating Wildfire Protection Plans in order to:

1. Coordinate wildfire hazard mitigation on public and private lands
2. Identify wildfire hazard areas on public and private lands
3. Identify urban interface areas
4. Enhance wildfire mitigation capacity of fire protection districts
5. Meet standards of the National Fire Plan, Healthy Forests Restoration Act, and other relevant legislation
6. Establish coordinated Community Risk Assessment Mapping

#### ***Northern San Juan Basin Coal-Bed Methane Draft Environmental Impact Statement***

The draft Environmental impact statement for the Northern San Juan Basin Coal-Bed Methane Project analyzes the impacts of additional Fruitland coal-bed methane wells on USFS, BLM, state, and private land in the northern San Juan gas field of Southwest Colorado. The field can potentially produce 2.5 trillion cubic feet of methane over the next 30 years, with an estimated \$7.5 billion in gross revenues. The EIS is a joint effort of the USFS and BLM.

The proposal calls for development of about 300 new wells, an estimated additional 125 miles of access roads and pipelines, and approximately 10 additional compressors. Issues included in this analysis include property values, noise, visual impacts, tax revenues, water depletions, gas seepage into domestic water wells, and impacts on vegetation, wildlife, roadless values,

archeological resources, and air quality. A Record of Decision was issued on April 4, 2006 for the Northern San Juan Basin Coal-Bed Methane Project.

### **Roadless Areas Review Task Force**

The Roadless Areas Review Task Force is a bipartisan 13-member group, created under Colorado Senate Bill 05-243. This group will help determine the future of roadless areas in Colorado, including what uses, if any, will be allowed in the applicable forest areas. Based upon public comment, the task force will make recommendations to the governor regarding how inventoried roadless areas should be managed. Gov. Bill Owens submitted a petition to the United States Forest Service on behalf of the State of Colorado. With the election of Gov. Bill Ritter, Colorado submitted a revised petition and request to the Department of Agriculture.

On Dec. 9, 2005, the roadless area review task force held a public comment meeting in La Plata County. SJPLC staff attended this meeting and have taken into account the local comments regarding roadless area components of the plan revision.

### **Biodiversity Model Project**

The BLM established this project with The Nature Conservancy in Colorado (TNC or the conservancy) under a National Assistance Agreement. The project established a conservation assessment of the planning area based primarily on information and analyses from The Nature Conservancy and the Colorado Natural Heritage Program. The report highlights the relative value of biological resources within the planning area from a regional context perspective (<http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/CO%20-%20San%20Juan%20Project>).

### **SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS**

Several existing and proposed special designations under consideration in the Plan:

- Special Recreation Management Areas (BLM): Silverton, Durango
- Wilderness Study Areas (BLM): McKenna, Weber, Menefee, Dolores River
- Wilderness Areas (FS): Lizard Head, Weminuche, & South San Juan
- Piedra Area (FS): Established by the 1993 Colorado Wilderness Act
- Wild and Scenic Rivers (BLM & FS): Upper Pine, Piedra, and Lower Dolores.
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (BLM): Tracts outside of Canyons of the Ancients National Monument that were not included in the monument, Big Gypsum Valley, Grassy Hills, Silvies pocket.
- National Register Archeological Districts (FS): Chimney Rock, Spring Creek, Anasazi, Lost Canyon, and Falls Creek.
- Spring Creek Wild Horse Herd (BLM)
- Research Natural Areas (FS): Narraguinnep and Williams
- Special Botanical Area (FS): O'Neal Hill
- National Level Utility Corridors: TransCo Pipeline Route. West Wide Energy Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Currently being developed under the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

### **COOPERATING AGENCIES**

To integrate a regional land management perspective into the plan, San Juan Public Lands invited 30 local governments and state and federal agencies to become cooperating agencies for the Plan revision process. Cooperating-agency status provides the opportunity for San Juan Public Lands managers and other government leaders to work together to achieve desired land

management outcomes. It also offers the opportunity for interested agencies to take on additional roles and responsibilities beyond basic participation opportunities such as attending public meetings, and reviewing and commenting on Plan documents.

**Table A.3- Cooperating Agency Invitees**

<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State of Colorado</u>	<u>Federal</u>
Bayfield	Mineral	Governor	USFWS
Ignacio	Archuleta	DNR	Bureau of Reclamation
Pagosa Springs	Hinsdale	DOW	Mesa Verde
Durango	La Plata	DOT	USDA - APHIS - Wildlife Services
Cortez	Montezuma	SHPO	
Dolores	Dolores		
Mancos	San Juan		
Rico	San Miguel		
Silverton	Conejos		
Telluride	Rio Grande		
Dove Creek			

In addition to being specifically invited to be cooperators, these governments and agencies were encouraged to attend study group meetings with public notices sent to key government or agency contacts for each meeting. Two of these governments chose to be cooperators in the plan development: Town of Rico and Montezuma County.

**CONSULTATION WITH TRIBES**

The two tribes with adjacency to San Juan Public Lands were invited to be cooperators: Southern Ute Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe.

The 25 tribes affiliated with San Juan Public Lands were informed about the Plan revision efforts and were offered a visit from SJPL staff to gather input and provide further information about the Plan revision.

**Table A.4- Affiliated Tribes**

The Navajo Nation	Pueblo of Sandía
The Zuni Tribe	Pueblo of Cochiti
The Southern Ute Indian Tribe	Pueblo of Santa Ana
Pueblo of Acoma	Pueblo of Tesuque
Pueblo of Laguna	Pueblo of Nambe
Pueblo of San Juan	The Hopi Tribe
Pueblo of San Ildefonso	Pueblo of Zia
Pueblo of Santa Clara	Pueblo of Jemez
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	Pueblo of San Felipe
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	Pueblo of Pojoaque
Pueblo of Isleta	The Jicarilla Apache Nation
Pueblo of Taos	The Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe
Pueblo of Picuris	

All of the above Tribes were sent letters notifying them that we were starting the Plan/EIS revision on January 20, 2005. The Jicarilla Apache were the only Tribe that requested a meeting at that time. Officials from the San Juan Public Lands meet with the Jicarilla Tribe on March 10, 2005. The San Juan Public Lands Heritage Team Lead met with the Hopi Tribe on August 23, 2007. The San Juan Public Lands Forest Supervisor/Center Manager met with the Pueblo of Jemez, Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Nambe, Pueblo of Santa Ana, Pueblo of Santa Clara, and the Navajo Nation on Oct. 5, 2007. On Oct. 16, 2007 the San Juan Public Lands Forest Supervisor/Center Manager met with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe.

### **Notice of intent**

On Dec. 14, 2004, San Juan Public Lands staff filed in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in conjunction with the joint revision of the land and resource management plan for the BLM San Juan/San Miguel Resource Management Plan and San Juan Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and San located in Archuleta, Conejos, Dolores, Hinsdale, La Plata, Mineral, Montezuma, Rio Grande, and San Juan counties, Colorado.

## **SUMMARY OF ISSUES ARTICULATED BY COMMUNITY DURING SCOPING**

### **METHODOLOGY**

Careful recording of input was provided for all meetings, interviews, workshops, and other components of the scoping process. For the geographically specific input gathered during the study group meetings, database specialists built databases to track and query community input. In other cases, such as in water roundtable meetings, professional facilitators or SJPLC staff produced meeting summaries.

The individual sources of community input are listed in Table A-1, *Scoping Overview*. These sources provide raw narrative summaries of community input. To best inform the forthcoming planning efforts, RPI Consulting focused the thousands of comments making up the community input into a categorized set of concisely stated issues. This refinement created a planning-issues framework that lends itself to the planning process during which issues of all types are being addressed. This format also allows planning-team members to easily identify the issues that are most relevant to their respective disciplines.

### **STUDY GROUPS**

For the large community-input databases containing input from study group meetings and recreation interviews, analysts identified issues by conducting key-word and key-phrase content analysis. Analysts first identified broad topics by browsing the database, such as fire-urban interface, grazing, and motorized recreation. Related comments were then queried, sorted, and grouped until the underlying core issues were identified. For example, the following comments were aggregated into the issue "*Hunting Impacts: Wet Weather Damage from ATVs and Other Motorized Vehicles*"

"The ruts left over from hunting season get deeper every year."

"We need seasonal closures of some areas to avoid all the damage hunters cause with their trucks and ATVs during the wet fall around here."

"Hunters do more damage driving in the mud for a couple months than the rest of us combined."

"My #1 concern is with vegetation damage and erosion caused by hunters that won't get out of their vehicles and walk."

"Hunters rut-out the access road to my grazing allotment every fall."

## **OTHER MEETINGS**

Meeting summaries are more concise and planning-team facilitators often summarize meeting conversations in terms of issues. Therefore, each meeting summary related to the plan revision scoping process was examined thoroughly and issues were extracted directly from the summaries. Once the issues articulated in each meeting summary were identified, analysts checked for redundancy in the issues list built from the study groups. Redundancy in the issues list was eliminated where it was possible to do so.

## **WRITTEN COMMENTS**

Written comments were read thoroughly and issues were identified within each comment. Once the list of issues articulated in the written comments was built, analysts checked for redundancy and listed issues that had not already been articulated during other components of scoping.

## **DRAFT PLANNING CRITERIA**

### ***General draft planning criteria***

1. The plans will be completed in compliance with the following laws: Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) pertaining to BLM lands; Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 476 et seq.) as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NCMA) (90 Stat. 2949 et seq.; 16 U.S.C. 1601-1614), pertaining to National Forest Lands; the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate regulations under the principles of the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 that set out the process for the development and revision of land and resource management plans (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)).
2. The plans will establish the guidance for managing the lands and resources under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Public Lands Center.
3. The planning process includes an environmental impact statement that will comply with National Environmental Policy Act standards.
4. Focus the planning process and collaborative participation on the elements of the plan that merit change. Assume that the current plan is adequate and appropriate unless demonstrated otherwise.
5. Organize collaborative efforts so that the participants can see their influence on the plans within a reasonable timeframe.
6. Provide a strategy for reaching desired conditions and meeting objectives that includes a framework relevant to resource managers in planning site-specific activities. This strategy contains only appropriate programmatic direction needed to achieve the desired conditions and objectives of the plan.
7. Recognize the specific niche that federal lands provide both to the nation and to the surrounding community. A successful plan is responsive to both national needs and community needs.

### ***Cooperative relations and public participation***

1. Decisions in the plan will strive to be compatible with the existing plans and policies of adjacent local, state and federal agencies. However, conformance with federal laws and regulations that direct resource management on the public lands takes precedence.
2. The plan will recognize the State of Colorado's responsibility to manage wildlife. The San Juan Public Lands Center will consult with the Colorado Division of Wildlife before establishing no-hunting zones or periods for the purposes of protecting public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.
3. The plan will be understandable to the public that participated in its creation. The plan must be organized and use language that is accessible to the general public, so they can understand how their public lands are being managed.
4. The SJPLC will involve the public in the planning process to determine the best mix of resource use and protection consistent with the multiple-use and other criteria established in the FLPMA and other applicable laws, regulations and policies.

#### ***Energy and mineral draft planning criteria***

1. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA) inventory results will be integrated into land use planning and energy use authorizations.
2. Environmental protection and energy production are both desirable and necessary objectives of sound land management practices and are considered as compatible priorities;
3. The BLM must ensure the appropriate amount of accessibility to the energy resources necessary for the nation's security while recognizing that special and unique non-energy resources can be preserved;
4. Relative resources values will be weighed, creating consistency with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act;
5. For all stipulations developed in new land use plans and to further improve consistency and understanding of lease stipulations, state and field offices will use the Uniform Format for Oil and Gas Lease Stipulations prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Lease stipulations will be reviewed for consistency with neighboring field offices and states, and where there are discrepancies, efforts will be undertaken to try to get consistency.
6. A Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario will be developed to predict management activities and actions, including development, that are likely to occur in the planning area over the life of the plan.

#### ***Fire management and land use planning draft criteria***

1. Create landscape-level fire management goals and objectives, including desired wildland fire conditions.
2. Describe desired wildland fire conditions using Fire Regime Condition Class or other approved method of description.
3. Identify the suite of management strategies/actions (including public and firefighter safety, appropriate management response, hazardous-fuels treatments, prevention and mitigation methods) that can be used to meet desired future conditions and underlying land use allocations.
4. Differentiate between and describe areas that are suitable for wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate due to social, economic, political, or resource conditions (i.e., wildland-urban interface).
5. Describe the maximum burned acres and treatment acres projected for the life of the plan for the following: wildland fire, fire use, prescribed fire treatments, non-fire fuels treatments and post-fire rehabilitation actions.
6. List criteria that will be used for establishing fire management priorities. Public and firefighter safety is always the number one priority during fire management activities.

7. Identify restrictions on fire management practices needed to protect natural or cultural resource values (including both wildfire suppression and fuels management).
8. Best management practices may be developed in conjunction with land use planning efforts. Some or all of these practices may be identified as land use plan decisions.
9. The plan will provide guidance to fully maintain, or contribute toward the restoration of, the structure and composition of old-growth stands according to the pre-fire-suppression old-growth conditions characteristic of the forest type.

### **Public land health**

1. The plan will incorporate the Colorado Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines. It will lay out a strategy for ensuring that proper grazing practices are followed within the jurisdiction of the San Juan Public Lands Center. Grazing will be managed to maintain or improve the health of the public lands by incorporating conditions to enhance resource conditions into permitted operations.
2. Consider science appropriately in the planning process with acknowledgement of risk and uncertainty.
3. Analyze problems at the appropriate scale. Decisions are generally made at the management level but with knowledge and understanding of the multi-scale context of those decisions.
4. Monitor conditions and trends on a continuous basis at the appropriate scale, with published evaluations at regular intervals. Evaluations examine the adequacy of the current plan direction and may lead to adjustments of implementation or changes in the plan direction.
5. Create an adaptive framework that incorporates regular monitoring and evaluation to adjust forest management consistent with the direction of the existing plan; or when that is not possible, with a focused plan amendment process.
6. Have realistic desired conditions and achievable objectives consistent with likely budgets and the design criteria.

### **Wilderness and special area management criteria**

#### ***BLM Wilderness Study Areas in land use planning***

1. Provide for the long-term protection and preservation of the area's wilderness character under a principle of non-degradation. The area's natural condition, opportunities for solitude, opportunities for primitive and unconfined types of recreation, and any ecological, geological or other features of scientific, educational, scenic or historical value present will be managed so that they will remain unimpaired.
2. Manage the area for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that will leave the area unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. The wilderness resources will be dominant in all management decisions where a choice must be made between preservation of the wilderness character and visitor use.
3. Manage the area using the minimum tool, equipment, or structure necessary to successfully, safely, and economically accomplish the objectives. The chosen tool, equipment, or structure should be the one that least degrades wilderness values temporarily or permanently. Management will seek to preserve spontaneity of use and as much freedom from regulation as possible.
4. Manage non-conforming but acceptable uses permitted by the Wilderness Act and subsequent laws in a manner that will prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the area's wilderness character. Non-conforming uses are the exception rather than the rule; therefore, emphasis is placed on wilderness character.

### *Lands with wilderness characteristics*

Lands with wilderness characteristics may be managed to protect and/or preserve some or all of those characteristics. This may include protecting certain lands in their natural condition and/or providing opportunities for solitude, or primitive and unconfined types of recreation.

### *Special area management*

FLPMA (Section 202(c)(3)) requires that, "In the development and revision of land use plans, the Secretary (BLM) shall give priority to the designation and protection of areas of critical environmental concern." In designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, special management attention is focused on protecting and preventing irreparable damage to important cultural, historic, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. To qualify for consideration of the ACEC designation, such values must have substantial significance and worth, with qualities of more than local significance and special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern. Where ACEC values and wilderness characteristics coincide, the special management associated with an ACEC, if designated, may also protect wilderness characteristics.

### **Right-of-way and utility corridor criteria**

1. Utility corridors: The Energy Policy Act of 2005 will be incorporated in all alternatives with specifications for centerline, corridor width, allowable facilities and appropriate approval conditions.
2. Identify existing and potential ROW development sites such as energy development areas (e.g., wind energy sites) and communication sites.
3. Describe likely development of potential corridors and other ROW sites as a basis for impact assessment and development of stipulations or conditions of use.
4. Highlight limitations on other uses in the potential corridors or at potential ROW development sites which would be necessary to maintain the ROW and corridor values.
5. Describe corridor and ROW development area selection criteria, including goals and objectives for the areas identified (to help establish reclamation standards, manage other multiple uses, establish sideboards for approval process for future compatible uses, etc.).
6. Evaluate impacts on the distribution or production of energy supplies if plan decisions limit the authorization of energy-related facilities.
7. Establish reasonable alternatives to a proposed action having adverse energy effects and the anticipated effects of such alternatives on the production/distribution of energy.
8. Plan should consider a general goal statement for ROW corridor decision which emphasizes that SJPLC will encourage use of the designated ROW corridors and ROW use areas to the extent possible, but, depending on site-specific needs, actual locations may vary. Such variances should be considered consistent with the management plan, provided such locations and uses are consistent with the selection criteria and goals and objectives for ROW corridors and ROW use areas.

## **INFORMATION PROVIDED DURING SCOPING AND INFORMATION GAPS**

### **STUDY GROUP INFORMATION RESOURCES**

Several resources were available for study group participants both in meeting packets and online:

### **GOVERNMENTAL WATER ROUNDTABLE INFORMATION RESOURCES**

A wide variety of information has been provided to the ongoing Governmental Water Roundtable component of the scoping process, all of which is available online at <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestPlan/roundtable.asp>

***Narrative resources***

San Juan National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan  
Desired Outcomes for the San Juan Public Lands Center Plan Revision Process  
MOU: Framework for Federal/State Cooperation on Water Management  
Colorado River Cutthroat Conservation Management Plan and Strategy  
Species Conservation List  
San Juan Basin Recovery Implementation Program, Outline July 6  
Range-Wide Conservation Agreement for Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker and Flannelmouth Sucker  
Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Colorado River Cutthroat Trout  
CDOW Draft Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS)  
Letter from Under Secretary Rey to Senator Allard  
July 6 revision of Desired Outcomes  
USFS Acronyms  
Carbon Lakes Ditch Project  
Wilderness Act of 1964  
Wilderness Act of 1975  
Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980  
Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993  
BLM-DNR MOU  
Brunot Agreement with Ute Nation - 1874  
Proposed Criteria to Trigger USFS Stream By-Pass Analysis, submitted for discussion by Steve Harris, Nov. 2, 2005.

***Slide-show presentations***

Multiple Water Uses on National Forests and BLM Lands  
Federal Strategies to Protect Streamflows  
Water MOU: USFS/CDOW/DRR Cooperation  
Planning for Aquatic Species and Aquatic Ecosystems  
Forest Planning Rule  
Special Uses on Public Lands  
Roadless Area Inventory and Wilderness Evaluation (Thurman Wilson)  
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Roy Smith)  
Selection of Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers/Streams (Kay Zillich)  
Range Water Uses  
Ditch Bill (Dave Gerhardt)  
Wild and Scenic Rivers Analysis Intro  
Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Analysis (Roy Smith)

### **Aspen workshop presentations**

Aspen Ecology in the Southwest, Dr. Bill Romme, Colorado State University, Department of Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship

History and Implications of Aspen Management in Southwest Colorado, Dave Dallison, San Juan National Forest

Overview of Aspen Research, Dr. Wayne Shepperd, Rocky Mountain Experiment Station

Role of Aspen in Our Economy, Norm Birtcher, Western Excelsior and Dewayne Findley, Aspen Wall Wood

Interdependency between Aspen and Wildlife, Patt Dorsey, Colorado Division of Wildlife

Aspen Aesthetics and Environmental Values in SWCO, Mark Pearson, San Juan Citizens Alliance

### **Data gaps**

The *Terrestrial and Aquatic Assessments for the San Juan National Forest* lists extensively the information needs identified during recent analysis and during the scoping process. Terrestrial information needs focus almost exclusively on inventorying and assessing recreation and travel trends, facilities, and impacts. The Aquatic Assessment calls for much of the same information regarding the extent and trends of human activities and transportation networks, with a special emphasis on water resource development. The *San Juan Planning for Biodiversity Model Project-Phase I* report identified significant ecological and species to be considered in the plan revision with a focus on BLM-managed lands.

While the information gaps will need to be filled incrementally, the current information gaps do not limit the ability of SJPLC to conduct planning-level analysis.

