

Study Group Theme Comments for Turkey and Ute: Pagosa Meeting 3/31

Theme Area #: A

Comment

General: the table and agency discussed the possibility of a Theme 7 increasing opportunity for public/private partnerships for fuels mitigation.

General: There was discussion about private lands and public access impact to range permittees, e.g., gates being left open. A FS representative explained that a Theme 7 acknowledges more presence of people and could mean using cattle guards rather than gates to reduce conflicts.

should be a 3 to decrease intensity of use

7 is fine but don't make state park level facilities

keep the theme as it is its more realistic

Theme Area #: A1

Comment

Consider moving the Theme 7 boundary lower since the upper area does not get as much use and people.

Theme Area #: A2

Comment

General: The table had a lengthy discussion about “where” the Theme 7 boundary line should be, i.e., how far north should the Theme 7 boundary go. Does the presence of “private land” drive a Theme 7 or does the intensity of use and development drive a Theme 7?

Because of private lands and growth trends (i.e., more and more land developed and more people moving in) there was support for Theme 7 and even extending the boundary into the adjacent landscape where there is more private land tracts.

7 is too urban, too much management

Support for theme 7 given the mix of private lands.

close to people heavily used, should be an urban use area

should stay a 5 or 7 because there needs to be some area close to the houses for people to get out and recreate on

This area is good for multiple use and probably is compatible with the proposed Theme 7.

Support Theme 7 because it acknowledges that there is lots of use in the area and the need for wildfire mitigation.

Theme Area #: **B1**

Comment

Suggested for Theme 1 or 3, but the east part of this area has been impacted by logging roads.

less motorized use would be better, theme 3 would be good

lots of hunters good trails, roads there – keep using leave it as a 5 and don't close any roads

leave it a 5 because there are so many roads it decreases conflict

don't change to 3 or existing motor vehicles will start entering the 3 zone to the south

Trail across Middle Mountain is being used by both motorized and non-motorized and will continue to see increased usage by both.

Theme Area #: **B2**

Comment

Good grazing area, good access.

Theme Area #: **C**

Comment

keep it a 3 – it's a rugged area

Theme Area #: **C1**

Comment

Lots of hunting and horseback riding, lots of dead spruce/fir possible forest health needs.

Access from NW corner of this Theme 3 area.

Support for theme 3 to preserve qualities of area. Also like how topography was used to determine boundary—area makes sense.

Theme Area #: D

Comment

There is a very interesting limestone outcrop with fossils in the area around Dudley Creek.

Extend the Theme 4 boundary to the bridge to acknowledge that future recreation needs will likely increase. There was concern about the area not being managed for recreation up to the bridge.

Support Theme 4 and unanimous table support to extend the corridor to the bridge because of the high recreation use in the area/corridor.

Theme Area #: E

Comment

Accessible has been heavily logged

Consider a Theme 4 in a small area around the Devil Mountain campground to reflect the recreation uses.

Suggested that areas be Theme 3

Important elk, deer winter range-winter closures may need to be considered to deal with growing pressure.

Devil Mountain and Mule Mountain: accessible, high ATV and hunting use. There is confusing about travel management, as this area has been in transition from horse hunting to ATV hunting. Off-road travel is currently allowed and should be changed to designated trails only.

FS626 is a very rough road to provide access for recreational users.

Theme Area #: E and C1

Comment

This is a good grazing area and should be allowed to continue that way.

Theme Area #: E1

Comment

keep it a 3 it is a difficult area to access, best kept natural – because of terrain 5 could create more use

Support change to 5 it has lots of good ATV roads and other multi-use areas

it should be used, leave it as is, keep multiple uses including logging, grazing or whatever

Theme Area #: F1

Comment

Steep with limited access via Southern Ute land.

There is access confusion, in this desirable hunting area. Good bald eagle and raptor area.

Theme Area #: **G**

Comment

Very steep, good fishing area.

Theme Area #: **Gen**

Comment

Are there benefits of snowmobile packing trails for easy big game movement? Yes but predators get the same advantage, so it's a wash. Benefits from occasional snowmobile use would only become a problem if snowmobile use became frequent (daily).

The San Juan Conservation District has a grant to study the Stollsteimer watershed.

The presence of a riparian area is a good criteria for a Theme 3 designation because the resource can be better protected if the area's management direction is for less use and less management.

Current snowmobile use currently by lion hunters, but if other snowmobile use starts to develop it might call for seasonal wildlife closures.

Theme Area #: **H**

Comment

DOW has many requests for hunting in this area, but access is limited and easements through adjacent Southern Ute land are unclear. The DOW desires access into Archuleta Canyon, i.e., written into area specific designation.

Theme 2 good and doesn't impact the big game (elk and deer) winter range

2 a good idea, hard to access, I like trees

The two Theme 2 designations are appropriate.

Like to make it a 2, wild area, pristine area, important wildlife.

Support Theme 2 because it is a remote, beautiful area; don't want to see it developed.

Archuleta Mesa makes sense as 2 because of combination of isolation and resulting special qualities.

Theme Area #: K

Comment

Support Theme 2, but restrict drilling to protect the sites.

Consider including the Peterson Mesa archaeological sites with the Chimney Rock Theme 2 area.

Support Theme 2, but allow grazing (terrain may prevent cattle from accessing the area and that's good...but it would be bad if permittees were penalized for cattle getting into a Theme 2 area that did not allow grazing).

Support for making Peterson Mesa a Theme 2 since it relates to Chimney Rock (which is a Theme 2).

Support Theme 2 since it is a remote area

General: Overall the table acknowledged the special-ness of these Arch resources on Peterson Mesa and had lots of discussion about whether Theme 2 was the best way to protect these resources or if there were other ways. For example, do the surrounding private lands (i.e., limited access) protect the sites just as well or better than a Theme 2 designation? Or, would a Theme 2 help access money for

The objective is to protect the resources, but do not want to take away any existing uses in the area, e.g., grazing if that exists.