

## Study Group Theme Comments for Haycamp and Mancos-Cherry Creek Meeting 4/14/'05

**Theme Area #:** A1

**Draft Theme Designation:** 5

### Comment

Making this a 5 and allowing commercial logging and would damage the wildlife and recreational value of this

I don't like the incremental shifting of land uses – e.g. a 3 area gets managed like a 5 then it gets degraded and then gets regarded as a 5 – it should have been managed and kept as a 3 to begin with

Keep it a 3 and rehabilitate it to better condition so that it is higher quality habitat etc.. Don't make it a 5

This makes sense as a Theme 5 area. It has a long history of logging, grazing and multiple recreation use.

**Theme Area #:** A2

**Draft Theme Designation:** 5

### Comment

Turn this all into a 3, keep it recreation oriented and preserve it

Trails and recreation here are attractive because of lots of shade and water – keep it that way, keep it a 3

It is currently an active recreation area right now and we should manage it like that

Proposed designation is OK - no disagreements

Keep it a 5 so it can be clear-cut for forest health. We need to cut down the aspens. Clear cuts in certain areas really make nice recreation areas later.

Keep Chicken Creek Non motorized

The Chicken Creek cross-country ski trail should be open to motorized uses in the summer because of its easy accessibility.

The road to Transfer Campground should be better maintained. I work at the Mancos Visitor Center in the summer and can't even recommend to people with motor homes that they go up there because the road is so bad.

**Theme Area #:** **A3**

**Draft Theme Designation:** **5**

**Comment**

Because the area is so close to New Mexico, out-of-state users tend to flood it. They seem to have less regard for the rules and the landscape than people from Colorado, even though it's all federal land.

Keep area restricted as this is Mancos' watershed -- Should be a 3

Make it a #3

Makes sense as a Theme 5 area. It has a long history of logging, grazing and multiple recreation use.

Ok as is

Theme 5 makes sense since there are roads and trailheads.

**Theme Area #:** **A4**

**Draft Theme Designation: 5**

**Comment**

The Theme 5 designation is good here. Multiple use and active management are appropriate because of the easy access and frequent use.

Support Theme 5 since this is an accessible lower elevation area where it is good to manage and use the resources.

**Theme Area #:** **A5**

**Draft Theme Designation: 5**

**Comment**

Makes sense as a Theme 5 area. Needs forest health treatments.

**Theme Area #:** **A6**

**Draft Theme Designation: 5**

**Comment**

Suggest trading these BLM tracks with something more desirable like the State Trust lands near fairgrounds (in the Cortez landscape).

**Theme Area #:** **B**

**Draft Theme Designation: 3**

**Comment**

Would like to see area managed if needed, e.g. in the event of a tree infestation.

Make it a 1, it's a wild area already, it's a wilderness as it is

Manage as a '2' to protect cultural resources in Lost Canyon

Mange for a 2 as there are some special arch. Sites at the south end -- make Special Interest Area

Lost Canyon makes sense as a 3. Undeveloped and natural.

Seems like a good 3 area since it is not as accessible and is a good wildlife corridor.

**Theme Area #:** C1

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

East Mancos River bottom should be in Theme 2, as a riparian watershed protection area.

**Theme Area #:** C1 and C2

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

The FS inventory roadless area should be managed as a '1' to be consistent with the adjacent area to the east.

**Theme Area #:** C1, C2, C3

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

Agree w Theme 3 designation because it is steep, no roads and it's good to keep some areas undisturbed and relatively unmanaged for wildlife.

**Theme Area #:** C1, C2, C3, C4

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

Watershed protection is important in all of this upper Mancos high country watershed. Watershed protection should include reduced fuel loading to reduce risks for large scale fire.

For all canyon "3" areas use management to treat/improve resource when needed, e.g., tree infestations, prescribed burning.

**Theme Area #:** C2

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

I don't want restrictions here -- roads still go up in there -- can't go off the roads anyway

**Theme Area #:** C3

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

No segregation of uses in this area. Would like improved trail signage. Support trail expansions and loops. If it is going to be a 5, then expand some trails.

Leave it as a 5 because old aspen needs regeneration and grazing needs to continue.

Ok as is b/c no access anyway

Like it as a 3 because of excellent recreation opportunities and access – lots of peaks and alpine terrain.

'3' seems appropriate given the current low-impact usage. (x 4)

**Theme Area #:** **C4**

**Draft Theme Designation:** **3**

**Comment**

Should evaluate for wilderness (theme 1) because of all the high peaks

Maintain snowmobiling in the sharktooth area and around the low peaks

**Theme Area #:** **C5**

**Draft Theme Designation:** **3**

**Comment**

The Theme 1 and Theme 3 designations are both appropriate for those areas because of their ruggedness and lack of access.

It's good that camping is still allowed for the public in these areas.

Good due to limited access

**Theme Area #:** D

**Draft Theme Designation:** 1

**Comment**

Don't do anything that would interfere with access for the stagecoach trip through Weber Canyon.

**Theme Area #:** D1

**Draft Theme Designation:** 1

**Comment**

Manage for #1, as is

Make it a 2 instead

Keep this area closed to oil and gas leasing because of its wilderness characteristics.

Should buy up the isolated parcels from the state land trust so that there is access

Like this as wilderness, make it a theme 1

**Theme Area #:** D2

**Draft Theme Designation:** 1

**Comment**

Concern about Theme 1 because of dead pinyon-juniper wildfire hazard, but recognition that it will burn in any case which will allow it to convert to grass enhancing diversity.

Agree with Theme 1 because this is a prime wilderness area—no roads, steep, not a lot going on or that can go on and it's beautiful. If a Theme 1 still want to be able to use prescribed burning in this "1" area to protect private lands and the resource.

**Theme Area #:** D3

**Draft Theme Designation:** 1

**Comment**

Keep it as it is.

**Theme Area #:** E

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

Should be a 2 due to special interest area (Ponderosa Pines)

Manage as a '2' for protection/preservation of old growth Ponderosa Pine

Sprucewater Canyon should be in Theme 2 as a watershed protection area.

Disagree -- do not restrict -- old growth can remain and no one will really bother it

**Theme Area #:** F

**Draft Theme Designation:** 5

**Comment**

Support Theme—this area has mountain biking, grazing and the oak cutting has improved elk forage.

This area is used a lot so the 5 is good

Expand parking lot at Boggy Draw to accommodate increasing population.

**Theme Area #:** F1

**Draft Theme Designation:** 5

**Comment**

Should stay a 3 so we can keep the really nice biking trails – timber harvesting if it was a 5 would create conflicts

Easier to manage if it the whole area is a continuous 5 – make it a 5

5 is good, more timber and fire management would be good. Harvesting this area would keep fire out of the hwy145 corridor

Restrict cross-country travel to maintain forest health

**Theme Area #:** G

**Draft Theme Designation:** 4

**Comment**

The Theme 4 designation is appropriate here – it is heavily used and really can't be anything else.

Private land causes access problems. It would be good to create some access points to minimize trespassing.

Keep designation

**Theme Area #:** Gen

**Draft Theme Designation:**

**Comment**

Private land development is impacting water drainage

FS and BLM should actively engage user groups to assist in maintaining /improving public lands so that multiple use can continue to exist. (x 6)

Improve maintenance of Morrison Tr. from Bear Cr. to Chicken Cr.; the center is overgrown.

Current roadless areas don't necessarily have to be managed as a '1.' (x 3)

In general, more stewardship and volunteer efforts are a better solution to problems of abuse by motorized vehicles than just closing or gating roads. Also, people will drive around gates when they see that an area is dry.

Fire could be used more often as a management tool – it's better than harvesting

As a longtime forest visitor, I have noticed there are not as many chipmunks and Abert's squirrels as there used to be. I would like to see their populations rebound.

Seems like a poor process to be managing so many small blocks. Trade these small BLM parcels for other more useful, connected lands. Or sell them and use the money for more useful, important resource needs, e.g., fuels reduction projects.

In general, it's good to have separate trails for motorized and non-motorized uses.

Keep existing roads open – check with County regarding requirements of RS 2477 (x 3)

ATV's should be allowed on all existing roads – this is important for seniors and those who can't walk.

In '2' (special management areas), need direction on how to handle road issues.

**Theme Area #:**   H  

**Draft Theme Designation:** 3

**Comment**

Theme 3 seems to make sense since there are towers in the area.