

COLORADO CANYONS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA
Proposed Resource Management Plan
and Environmental Impact Statement

CHAPTER 6—PUBLIC COMMENTS

6.1 Public Review and Comment on the Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Following the initial phase of public scoping, the official public comment period on the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area (CCNCA) Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) opened upon publication of the draft document on October 17, 2003. The draft was available for public comment through January 31, 2004.

The BLM distributed a postcard notification and inquiry via first-class mail to approximately 450 contacts on the CCNCA mailing list, announcing the availability of the draft RMP/EIS in various media formats. The CCNCA mailing list includes federal, state, and local elected officials, federally recognized tribes, property owners in and near the CCNCA, individuals, special interest groups, and organizations. Availability of the draft RMP/EIS was also announced by publishing notices in local newspapers and the *Federal Register*, as well as on the project web site (www.co.blm.gov/cocanplan). The Citizen Advisory Council and Working Groups, composed of approximately 120 individuals, were notified by e-mail of the publication of the draft RMP/EIS.

The draft RMP/EIS was provided for public review by bound paper or CD-ROM format upon request, and posted for review or downloading on the project web site. Copies were also available for review at local community libraries.

Along with the monthly Advisory Council meetings in which the public is invited, public open houses were held in January 2004, during the 90-day public comment period.

Table 6-1 summarizes the comments submissions to the BLM. A total of 89 public comments were received by letter, fax and internet response. Most submissions contained more than one comment resulting in a total of 411 comments received on the CCNCA DRMP. Table 6-2 summarizes the major issues addressed in the public comments.

Table 6-3 lists each of the 89 letter submissions we received, along with the sender's name and the number of comments tallied in the document. Each piece of correspondence was given an alphanumeric designator, the

comment letter code seen listed in the left hand column of Table 6-3. Using this format anyone who submitted a comment letter can look up the comment letter code for their comment letter.

Table 6-4 then summarizes each comment contained within each comment letter and gives it a comment response designator. Each comment falls into an overall theme.

CMP	Camping
COLM	Colorado National Monument (National Park Service)
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FCL	Facilities
FMP	Fire Management
FWS	Fish and Wildlife Service
GRZ	Grazing
IE	Interpretation/Education
MR	Mack Ridge
NHT	National Historic Trust
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RA	Rattlesnake Arches
RVR	River Corridor
SO	Sheriff's Office
SRP	Special Recreation Management
SSS	Special Status Species
TGT	Target Shooting
TVL	Travel Management
UI	Urban Interface
VRM	Visual Resource Management

Comments that were very similar were grouped and given a single response labeled by a response designator, seen in the right column of Table 6-4. Each commenter can identify which response applies to his/her individual comment.

In Table 6-5 the Responses to Comments are alphabetized by Response Designator. Example: The first comment was submitted by the Wilderness Society, et. al. and is coded as "OG1". Within Comment Letter OG1 were 18 individual comments (OG1-1 through OG1-18). Each of these comments is matched to a corresponding response. The comment on banning jet-ski travel on the river was mentioned in about 40 comment letters. The response to that comment is designated as RVR-1. So instead of writing that response 40 times, 40 people can, instead, refer to Response RVR-1. The comment letters designated IA1-IA43 are all comment letters resulting in an internet "Action Alert" and the comments were some variation of 9 basic issues – comments designated A1-1 through A1-7 and A2-1 through A2-9.

**Table 6-1
Summary of Comment Submissions**

TOTAL SUBMISSIONS		89
	INTEREST GROUP SUBMISSIONS -CO Plateau Mountain Bike Assoc -International Mountain Bike Assoc -Motorcycle Trail Riding Assoc -Combined Environmental (CEC et al) -Personal Watercraft Industry Assoc -ConservAmerica	6
	AGENCY SUBMISSIONS -National Park Service – Colorado National Monument -US Fish and Wildlife Service -City of Fruita -Mesa County Land Trust -National Trust For Historic Preservation -SO -US Environmental Protection Agency	7
	ACTION ALERT-BASED SUBMISSIONS (all in favor of Alternative 4) -Minimal to no variation 36 -Some variation 10	46
	INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS (Unique) -Alternative 1 1 -Alternative 2 2 -Alternative 3 9 -Alternative 4 8 -Misc 10	30

Table 6-2 Public Comment Issue Summary			
MAJOR ISSUE	SUB-ISSUE		TOTAL
River Management (RVR)			57
	*Ban Jet skis and >5 hp motors	39	
	Miscellaneous	18	
Livestock Grazing (GRZ)			110
(From 41 form letter 'points to make')	*Do not reallocate relinquished/canceled permits	32	
	*Prohibit grazing in tributaries	20	
	* 2 yr. Land Health Assessment	23	
	*Sheep Grazing	35	
Trails (TRL)			38
	*Oppose trails w/o Site-Specific analysis	38	
Travel Management (TVL)			108
	*Close Access w/n 2 mi to Rattlesnake Arches	31	
	Gating in Mack Ridge	10	
	Mountain Bike	19	
	Equestrian	7	
	Other	20	
	All trails	9	
	OHV	12	
Public Education (IE)			2
Urban Interface (UI)			3
Cultural/Paleo Resources (CRM)			4
Natural Resource Protection (NRP)			21
	Wilderness Protection	13	
	Resource improvement	1	
	Wildlife issues	7	
More Info on Maps			3
Target Shooting (TGT)			5
Segregation of uses (TVL)			4
Events/Commercial Use/Permits (SRP)			12
Facility Improvement (FCL)			6
Camping (CMP)			7
Miscellaneous			31
TOTAL COMMENTS			411

*Asterisked comments derived from 46 "form letter" submissions

Table 6-3 Comment Letter Codes			
Comment Letter Code	Name(s)	Commenter(s)	# of Comments
ORGANIZATION COMMENTS (OG)			
OG1	The Wilderness Society Western Colorado Congress American Lands Alliance Aspen Wilderness Workshop Biodiversity Conservation Alliance Californians for Western Wilderness Center for Native Ecosystems Colorado Environmental Coalition Colorado Environmental Coalition Colorado Mountain Club Friends of the Earth NLCS Coalition Sierra Club – Rocky Mountain Chapter Sierra Club – Uncompahgre Chapter Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project Upper Arkansas and South Platte Project New Mexico Wildlife Federation/ConservAmerica -(identical but submitted separately)	Jones, Suzanne Sura, Matt Lazimy, Udi Shoemaker, Sloan Kessler, Jeff Painter, Michael Smith, Jacob Kolbenschlag, Pete Widen, Jeff Smith, Vera Sykes, Kristen Vanasselt, Wendy Cunningham, Kirk Rechel, Eric DeMarco, Margaret Smith, Jean Simpson, Oscar Whitton, Ken	18
OG2	Personal Watercraft Industry Association	Ludwig, Jeff	1
OG3	Motorcycle Trail Riding Association	Renner, Jared	1
OG4	International Mountain Bicycling Association	Sprung, Gary	6
OG5	The Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail Association	Rieves, Clark	5
AGENCY COMMENTS – FEDERAL, STATE and LOCAL (AG)			
AG1	National Park Service – Colorado National Monument	Wilson, Palma	11
AG2	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	Pfister, Allan	3
AG3	United States Environmental Protection Agency	Svoboda, Larry	
AG4	National Trust for Historic Preservation	Smith, Michael	2
AG5	City of Fruita, CO	Adams, Jim	8
AG6	Mesa Land Trust	Aquafresca, Steve	2
INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS – ACTION ALERT-BASED (IA)			
	NAME	LOCATION	

**Table 6-3
Comment Letter Codes**

Comment Letter Code	Name(s)	Commenter(s)	# of Comments
IA1	Weipert, Donn	Colorado Springs, CO	1
IA2	Day, Bill	Hotchkiss, CO	2
IA3	Regelson, Ken		3
IA4	Oberle, Kasey	Aurora, CO	5
IA5	Duncan, Kenneth	Ft. Collins, CO	6
IA6	Huber, Patrick	Davis, CA	6
IA7	DeRuiter, Darla	Gunnison, CO	4
IA8	Shiner, William	Max Meadows, VA	4
IA9	LaPlaca, Nancy	Denver, CO	10
IA10	Hall, John	Grand Junction, CO	6
IA11	Ralston, Donald Clinton Jr.	Grand Junction, CO	7
IA12	Vigil, Patrick	Albuquerque, NM	10
IA13	Wolf, Martin	Colorado Springs, CO	10
IA14	Sirkis, Jon	Boulder, CO	4
IA15	McDowell, Drew	Denver, CO	3
IA16	Vaughn, Stephen	Colorado Springs, CO	8
IA17	Tubbs, Robert Jr.	Dhahran, Saudi Arabia	8
IA18	Mark, Linda	Boulder, CO	9
IA19	Bagley, Charles	Seattle, WA	3
IA20	Bergh, Peter	New Castle, NH	7
IA21	Wagner, Joann	Madison, WI	8
IA22	Stobbe, Linda	Mason, WI	8
IA23	Dunne, Loretta	Woodbury, NJ	5
IA24	Schoch, Susan F.	Idledale, CO	6
IA25	Hoffman, Matt	Portland, OR	6
IA26	Vannier, Lyle	Lincoln, NE	6
IA27	Cuthbertson, Tim	Vernonia, OR	8
IA28	Mabry, Gary	Santa Barbara., CA	8
IA29	Blake, Kathleen	Santa Barbara., CA	8
IA30	Dickson, Rebecca	Boulder, CO	5
IA31	Alderson, George and Frances	Baltimore, MD	10
IA32	Galchutt, Pam and Steve	Monument, CO	6
IA33	Hall, Sarah Jane	Burbank, CA	7
IA34	Frieswyck-Johnson, Michelle	Louisville, CO	7
IA35	Oakes, Bonnie	Bowie, MD	7
IA36	Forneck, Keith	Streamwood, IL	7
IA37	Kramer, Gavin	Lawrenceville, NJ	7
IA38	Faison, Jennifer	Denver, NY	7
IA39	Faes, Eve	Woodstock, IL	7
IA40	Faes, Tabitha	Woodstock, IL	7
IA41	Rappaport, Aaron	Hyattsville, MD	7
IA42	Ortt, Marilyn	Marietta, OH	5
IA43	Cassarini, Greg	Grand Junction, CO	6

**Table 6-3
Comment Letter Codes**

Comment Letter Code	Name(s)	Commenter(s)	# of Comments
INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS (IN)			
IN1	Thevenin, Tine	Lake City, MN	1
IN2	Carr, Arleta	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN3	Carr, Duane	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN4	Kennedy, Patrick	Grand Junction, CO	10
IN5	Potter, John	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN6	Chapel, Steve	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN7	Lucas, Ken	Grand Junction, CO	3
IN8	Renner, Jared	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN9	Sherrill, Eric	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN10	Gardner, Mark	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN11	Keller, Anne	Fruita, CO	1
IN12	Harris, Bill	Montrose, CO	3
IN13	Cranston, Ryan	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN14	Van Dyke, Kristina A.	Fruita, CO	6
IN15	Foote, Kevin	Grand Junction, CO	6
IN16	Killerud, Doug	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN17	Files, Ralph W.	Montrose, CO	1
IN18	Antonelli, Dan	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN19	Butterfield, Linnea	New York, NY	2
IN20	Belles, Mark	Rowlett, TX	2
IN21	Rechel, Eric	Grand Junction, CO	5
IN23	Sealing, Clee	Fruita, CO	1
IN23	Grant, Mike	Palisade, CO	2
IN24	Parker, Robyn	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN25	Dodero, David	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN26	Chausse, Scott	Grand Junction, CO	2
IN27	Chausse, Scott	Grand Junction, CO	1
IN28	Bohn, Donn	Canton, OH	1
IN29	Troth, Anna	Aurora, CO	1
IN30	Hanzel, Karl	Boulder, CO	1
IN31	Nicklaus, Deborah	Denver, CO	1
IN32	Martin, John C.	Grand Junction, CO	7
IN33	McKee, Stephen G.	Moreno Valley, CA	4

Table 6-4 Comment Summaries and Response Designators			
COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
OG1-1	The agency-preferred alternative does not adequately promote conservation – BLM should adopt Alternative 4	RMP	RMP-4
OG1-2	Maps need more detailed information	MP	RMP-5
OG1-3 OG1-4 OG1-5	Management of the Colorado River and adjacent public lands should be addressed in the RMP -Limit or ban motorized use along corridor -Work with CDOW and CO State Parks to meet travel objectives on the river	RVR	RVR-1 RVR-2 RVR-3
OG1-6	Plan should clearly state that trails in RMP are optional proposed (not mandated) and will require further analysis prior to authorization of construction (Mack Ridge & Rabbit Valley)	TRL	TRL-1
OG1-7 OG1-7a OG1-7b OG1-7c OG1-7d	Mack Ridge Trail proposals -Trail A and Mary's Loop road - motorized or not -Trail J – reason for building -Trail K – unnecessary and expensive -Trails G, D, E, and F – require site-specific analysis	TVL	TVL-1
OG1-8	Lion's Loop to overlook – Lions Loop should be closed to motorized vehicles at the turn-off from Hawkeye Rd.	TVL	TVL-1
OG1-9	Rabbit Valley routes -Agree w/ closures N of I-70 and #21 -Justify #16, 17, 20, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 18, especially #9 (elk habitat concern) and #11 (McDonald Ck concern)	TVL	TVL-2
OG1-10 a	River Corridor Travel--designate corridor as non-motorized emphasis	RVR	RVR-1

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	area particularly recommend a ban on jet skis		
b	-BLM will eventually require a river ranger and should work with UT BLM to patrol from Loma to Westwater	RVR	RVR-2
d	-Monitor camping along river corridor; allow quick implementation of management tools for protection		
c	-travel within 100-yr floodplain should be designated non-motorized/mechanized south of the river; designated routes north of river	RVR	RVR-3
OG1-11	Jeep trail to arches should be closed within 2 miles of the arches – build parking lot and restore cherrystem to hiking trail	RA	RA-1
OG1-12	Limit group size within BRCW to 12 - especially within lower 2 miles of Mee and Knowles Cyns.	TVL	TVL-4
OG1-13	Target shooting is incompatible with NCA designation	TGT	TGT-1
OG1-14	RMP should incorporate improved monitoring of livestock management to ensure compliance with land health standards	GRZ	GRZ-1
OG1-15	Retire grazing permits that are voluntarily relinquished or cancelled	GRZ	GRZ-3
OG1-16	Disallow sheep grazing within NCA – at a minimum North of the river	GRZ	GRZ-4
OG1-17	Allow natural fuel management - fire, insects and disease; minimum tool analysis in BRCW	FMP	FMP-1
OG1-18	Perceived failures in RMP:		
a	-Inventories for SSS and habitat		SSS-1
b	-hard look at impacts of the proposed action to SSS		SSS-2
c	-address PCAs and potential impacts to biologic values	SSS	SSS-3
d	-Gunnison Sage Grouse strategy lacking and white tail prairie dog petition for listing issues		FWS-1

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
OG2	The Colorado River is not included within the CCNCA and personal watercraft are not mentioned in the DRMP	RVR	RVR-1
OG3	Do not segregate user groups	TVL	TVL-5
OG4-1	Oppose commercial equestrian tours on Mack Ridge or require mitigation if allowed	SRP	SRP-1
OG4-2*	Do not close trail north of I-70 (RV # 21)	TVL	TVL-3
OG4-3*	Justify plans for RV #22 – should be open for muscle-powered activity	TVL	TVL-3
OG4-4	ID designated shooting area in RV	TGT	TGT-1
OG4-5	ID goals for restroom facilities – should be a priority	FCL	FCL-1
OG5-1	Preserve Mack Ridge as day use only	CMP	CMP-1
OG5-2	Do not encourage equestrian use in Mack Ridge area	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
OG5-3 (OG4-2)	Do not close trail north of I-70 (RV # 21)	TVL	TVL-3
OG5-4 (OG4-3)	Justify plans for RV #22 – should be open for muscle-powered activity	TVL	TVL-3
OG5-5	Would like to see organized bike races allowed in Rabbit Valley	SRP	SRP-1
AG1-1	Show a more concrete reflection in RMP of common goals with COLM	RMP	COLM-1
AG1-2	Minimize visual impact of communication towers – especially those on Black Ridge	VRM	COLM-1
AG1-3	Coordinate with COLM on land health, wildlife and Special Status Species, weed management issues in Black Ridge area	NRP	COLM-1
AG1-4	COLM prefers maximized use of native plants in reclamation and restoration projects – especially those near the COLM/BLM interface	NRP	COLM-1
AG1-5	NPS would support not reallocating allotments 6141, 6142 and 6147 for achieving more seamless growth	GRZ-P	COLM-1
AG1-6	Support closing entire NCA to recreational collecting of all types	CPR	COLM-2
AG1-7	COLM and BLM should identify opportunities for joint education and	IE	COLM-1

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	interpretation		
AG1-8	With dog control language, include dogs on trails connecting to Colorado National Monument at those trailheads	TVL	COLM-2
AG1-9	Work with COLM on urban interface issues	UI	COLM-1
AG1-10	Work with COLM on pursuing trailheads near Fruita And near DS Rd. for access to joint trails on Black Ridge	TRL	COLM-2
AG1-11	Add COLM opportunities for cooperative management and complementary visitor activities to planning issues	RMP	COLM-1
AG2-1	Emphasize already impacted regions of the CCNCA (ca. the middle section of the CCCNA) for activities and emphasize conservation in the outlying area where there is currently less impact	NRP	FWS
AG2-2	Be prepared to adopt and implement conservation recommendations being developed for the white-tailed prairie dog	SSS	FWS
AG2-3	Incorporate the Piñon Mesa, Colorado Gunnison Sage-Grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan	SSS	FWS
AG3-1	Include the following five items for adaptive management -an outline for the monitoring plan -monitoring and LACs for water quality & vegetation cover -provide information on funding mechanisms for monitoring; identify an approach that could be done without additional funding -provide an adaptive management decision tree -provide a public participation plan	RMP	EPA
AG3-2	Identify the areas in Mack Ridge and Rabbit Valley not meeting land	LH	EPA

Table 6-4 Comment Summaries and Response Designators			
COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	health standards as a Land Health Revitalization Focus Area		
AG4-1	The DRMP does not adequately discuss direct and indirect impacts associated with the Adaptive Management alternative or provide for protection of cultural resources	CPR	NHT
AG4-2	NHPA Section 110 responsibilities should be conducted independent of funding	CPR	NHT
AG5-1	Alternative # 3 best addresses issues of concern to the City of Fruita.	RMP	UI-1
AG5-2	BLM and Fruita will cooperate in the management of the newly acquired property (Snooks Bottom) as an open space resource	UI	UI-1
AG5-3	Work with the City of Fruita to Identify access corridors, trailhead opportunities and buffer strips as development gets closer to BLM land	UI	UI-1
AG5-4	Fruita supports the BLM working with the city on improvement to the Kingsview entry road	UI	UI-1
AG5-5	Fruita will work with the BLM to sign intergovernmental agreements formalizing relationships	UI	UI-1
AG5-6	Work on new cooperative river management agreements, including opportunities at Colorado River State Park and at Loma boat launch	RVR	UI-1
AG5-7	Continue efforts to acquire Horse Thief Ranch to allow room for river access, parking and a possible trailhead for Mary's Loop trail	RVR	UI-1
AG5-8	Work with Fruita for continuing protection and management of paleontological resources	CRP	UI-1
AG6-1	Choose the alternative that does the most to enhance and protect the health and sustainability of the local ranching community	RMP	UI-2
AG6-2	Collaborate with the Mesa Land Trust on planning for Snooks Bottom area	UI	UI-2

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
AG7-1	Clarify responsibility for Search and Rescue within the CCNCA	RMP	SO-1
A1-1	Adopt the conservation alternative	RMP	RMP-4
A1-2	Eliminate or minimize jet-ski use on Colorado River – work with the State of Colorado to have the Fruita boat launch and the Colorado River corridor closed to jet skis	RVR	RVR-1
A1-3	Grazing allotments not meeting land health criteria in over 75% of the allotment should have thorough assessment	GRZ	GRZ-2
A1-4	Land Health Assessments should be completed every two years	LH	GRZ-2
A1-5	Grazing should be prohibited in Jones Canyon, Devils Canyon and the McDonald Creek cultural area	GRZ	GRZ-5
A1-6 A2-8	Any grazing permit that is relinquished or cancelled should not be reallocated	GRZ	GRZ-3
A1-7 A2-9	Sheep grazing should be prohibited throughout the NCA	GRZ	GRZ-4
A2-1	Oppose construction of 23 miles of trails in Mack Ridge and Rabbit Valley	TRL	TRL-1
A2-2	Any new routes being considered should be analyzed for need and undergo site-specific analysis for potential impacts at exact proposed locations	TRL	TRL-1
A2-3	Lions Loop trail should be gated after parking area to stop motorized traffic access to Colorado River	TRL	TVL-2
A2-4	The Colorado River is an important element of the NCA and should be addressed the RMP	RMP	RVR-1
A2-5	The BLM should ban jet-ski use on the Colorado River and place a 5 horsepower limit on all other motorized craft	RVR	RVR-1
A2-6	The jeep route to the Rattlesnake Arches should be closed to motorized traffic at least two miles before the arches and be reclaimed to a single track hiking trail	RA	RA-1

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
A2-7	Manage livestock grazing in a manner that area into land health compliance	GRZ	GRZ-1
A2-8	See A1-6 Any grazing permit that is relinquished or cancelled should not be reallocated	GRZ	GRZ-3
A2-9	See A1-7 Sheep grazing should be prohibited throughout the NCA	GRZ	GRZ-4
IA1	A1-2	RVR	
IA2	A1-1 A1-2 A1-6	RMP LH GRZ	
IA3	A1-2 A2-6 A2-1	RVR RA TRL	
IA4	A1-2 A2-2 A1-3 A1-5 A1-6 A1-7	RVR TRL GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA5	A2-6 A1-2 A2-2 A1-4 A1-6 A1-7	RA RVR TRL LH GRZ GRZ	
IA6	A1-2 A1-1 A2-6 A1-4 A1-6 A1-7	RVR RMP RA LH GRZ GRZ	
IA7	A1-2 A2-6 A2-2 A1-5	RVR RA TRL GRZ	
IA8	A2-2 A2-5 A1-7 A2-1	RVR RA GRZ TRL	
IA9	A2-1 A2-3 A2-6	TRL TRL RA	

Table 6-4 Comment Summaries and Response Designators			
COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	A1-2 A1-4 A1-5 A1-6 A1-7 A1-1 A2-2	LH GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ RMP TRL	
IA10	A2-7 A1-6 A1-7 A2-1 A2-3 A2-5	GRZ GRZ GRZ TRL TRL RVR	
IA12	A2-1 A2-2 A2-3 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ	
IA12	A2-2 A2-3 A2-6 A1-2 A1-4 A1-3 A1-5 A1-6 A1-7 A1-1	TRL TRL RA RVR LH GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ RMP	
IA13	A2-6 A2-3 A1-2 A2-2 A1-1 A1-3 A1-5 A1-6 A1-7	RA TRL RVR TRL RMP GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA14	A2-5 A2-1 A1-1 A1-6	RVR TRL RMP GRZ	
IA15	A2-6	RA	

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	A2-5 A1-7	RVR GRZ	
IA16	A2-5 A2-2 A2-3 A1-1 A2-6 A2-7 A1-6 A1-7	RVR TRL TRL RMP RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA17	A2-6 Do not ban jet skis on river A2-2 A2-1 A1-1 A1-6 A2-7 A1-7	RA RVR TRL TRL RMP GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA18	A2-4 A2-5 A1-1 A2-2 A2-1 A2-6 A1-5 A1-6 A1-7	RVR RMP TRL TRL RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA19	A2-5 A2-6 A1-6	RVR RA GRZ	
IA20	A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A2-7 A1-6 A1-7	TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA21	A1-1 A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A2-7 A1-6 A1-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
IA22	A1-1 A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A2-7 A1-6 A1-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA23	A2-2 A1-6 A1-7 A2-5 A2-6	TRL GRZ GRZ RVR RA	
IA24	A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A1-6 A1-7 A1-5	TRL TRL RVR GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA25	A2-1 A2-2 A1-2 A2-6 A1-6 A1-7	TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ	
IA26	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA27	A1-1 A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A2-7 A1-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA28	A1-1 A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A2-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ	

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	A1-7	GRZ	
IA29	A1-1 A2-1 A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A2-7 A1-7	RMP TRL TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA30	A2-1 A1-1 A2-5 A1-6 A1-7	TRL RMP RVR GRZ GRZ	
IA31	A1-6 A1-3 A1-4 A1-5 A1-7 A2-6 A1-2 A2-3 A1-1 A2-2	GRZ GRZ LH GRZ GRZ RA RVR TRL RMP TRL	
IA32	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA33	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA34	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA35	A2-2 A2-5	TRL RVR	

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA36	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA37	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA38	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA39	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA40	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7 A1-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA41	A2-2 A2-5 A2-6 A1-6 A1-3 A2-7	TRL RVR RA GRZ GRZ GRZ	

Table 6-4 Comment Summaries and Response Designators			
COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	A1-7	GRZ	
IA42	A2-2 A2-5 A2-7 A1-7 A1-6	TRL RVR GRZ GRZ GRZ	
IA43	A1-2 A1-5 A1-6 A2-5 A2-2 Increased patrolling and heavy fines in Rabbit Valley for off-trail use	RA GRZ GRZ RVR TRL TRL	
IN1	Protect Colorado Canyons	RMP	RMP-1
IN2	Support Alternative 3 support the new trails that will replace more environmentally-damaging trails	RMP	RMP-3
IN3	Support alternative 3 – with conservation of natural resources to the extent possible	RMP	RMP-3
IN4-1	Use gates to minimize motorized use in Mack Ridge	TVL	TVL-2
IN4-2	Restroom facilities are needed at high use parking areas near Mack Ridge trails	FCL	FCL-1
IN4-3	Mack Ridge area should remain a day use area with no camping	CMP	CMP-1
IN4-4	Horses should not be excluded – but the use should not be encouraged with signs or maps	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN4-5	Large (over 50 participants) should be limited to one event per month	SRP	SRP-1
IN4-6	Rabbit Valley could be the venue for competitive bicycle events	SRP	SRP-1
IN4-7	Kokopellis Trail is not highlighted as it passes through Rabbit Valley – not shown on maps	RMP MP	RMP-5
IN4-8	Justify closure (#21) in Rabbit Valley of trail that goes under I-70 and completes Harley Dome Loop (trails #22 and #9)	TRL	TVL-3
IN4-9	Support Alternative #2 – due to addition of proposed shooting area in Rabbit Valley; this would minimize	TGT	RMP-2

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	indiscriminate shooting in the NCA		
IN4-10	Trail # 10 is a concern because it enters the cultural area south of Harley Dome and may be incompatible with biking	CRP	TVL-3
IN-5	Local motorcycle clubs are ready. Willing and able to assist in new trail construction, signing and public education	IE	IE-1
IN-6	Closing the road to the Rattlesnake trailhead is unacceptable	TVL	RA-1
IN7-2	The established off-highway roads north of I-70 should remain open to all vehicles	TVL	TVL-3
IN7-3	Target shooting should be allowed as it currently is with the exception of the areas adjacent to established campgrounds	TGT	TGT-1
IN7-3	At large camping should be permitted without the restriction of portable toilets	FCL	CMP-1
IN8-1	Segregation of user groups is not tolerable	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN8-2	Supports Alternative #2	RMP	RMP-2
IN9-1	All roads that were established routes should remain open and the roadless areas would remain that way	TVL	TVL-3
IN9-2	Supports Alternative # 2	RMP	RMP-2
IN10-1	Expanded trails in Mack Ridge should be allowed and biking should be emphasis	TVL	RMP-3
IN10-2	Supports Alternative #3	RMP	RMP-3
IN11	Supports Alternative #3 – especially item K (frontage road trail)	RMP	RMP-3
IN12-1	Would like to see Mack Ridge remain day-use area	CMP	CMP-1
IN12-2	Development of trailhead facilities in Mack Ridge is important.	FCL	FCL-1
IN12-3	Support Alternative #3 for non-motorized emphasis in Mack Ridge area	RMP	RMP-3
IN13-1	Supports Alternative #3	RMP	RMP-3

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
IN13-2	It is imperative to close Mack Ridge to equestrian use	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN14-1	Supports Alternative #3	RMP	RMP-3
IN14-2	Support gating certain roads in Mack Ridge and restricting use to permit holders	TVL	TVL-2
IN14-3	Supports construction of restrooms at Mack Ridge and Mary's/Lions Loop trailheads	FCL	FCL-1
IN14-4	Supports limiting equestrian events and large (>50) events	SRP	SRP-1
IN14-5	Supports new trail construction in Mack Ridge area	TRL	TRL-1
IN14-6	Justify closure of action #21 – supports Alternative #2 for Rabbit Valley zone	RMP	TVL-3
IN15-1	Supports Alternative #3 for Mack Ridge and Rabbit Valley	RMP	RMP-3
IN15-2	Manage the Mack Ridge area for mountain bike and human foot trails – downplay the equestrian use in the area	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN15-3	No commercial horse touring should be allowed	SRP	SRP-1
IN15-4	Keep timed, competitive mountain bike races out of Mack Ridge area	SRP	SRP-1
IN15-5	In Rabbit Valley – would like actions 21 and 22 remain open to non-motorized singletrack use	TRL	TVL-3
IN15-6	Rabbit Valley could provide place for competitive mountain bike events	SRP	SRP-1
IN16-1	Supports Alternative #3 for limits on non-human powered methods of transport in the Mack Ridge area	RMP	RMP-3 TVL-5
IN16-2	Supports establishing parking lot at Mary's Loop and Mack exit	FCL	FCL-1
IN17	Recommends limiting equestrian use in Mack Ridge area – equestrian outfitters should be barred from the area at the least	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN18-1	Supports Alternative #3 for the Mack Ridge area	RMP	RMP-3
IN18-2	Not in favor of encouraging equestrian use and supports limiting	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
	motorized use in Mack Ridge area		
IN19-1	Consider removing jet skis from the Colorado River	RVR	RVR-1
IN19-2	Uphold the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act	RMP	RMP
IN20-1	Allowing unfettered use with monitoring of the degradation of the area followed by rehabilitation does not fulfill the requirements of the Act (the enabling legislation) and would be illegal	RMP	RMP-4
IN20-2	Alternative #4 successfully brings together the legal mandates of conservation, protection and public enjoyment	RMP	RMP-4
IN21-1	Fully supports Alternative #4	RMP	RMP-4
IN21-2	Its difficult to determine how development of trails and adding facilities and trails can provide a net benefit to the environment	TRL FCL	RMP-4
IN21-3	Agree with the goal in Alternative #4 to re-evaluate livestock management	GRZ	RMP-4 GRZ-1
IN21-4	Why restore/ rehabilitate trails and roads that have no use?	TRL	TVL-6
IN21-5	No trails on Harley Dome	TRL	TVL-3
IN22	Support Alternative #4	RMP	RMP-4
IN23	Support Alternative #4	RMP	RMP-4
IN24	Support Alternative #4 – there are plenty of places in Western Colorado for every sort of recreational enthusiast...	RMP	RMP-4
IN25-1	Support Alternative #4 – new access and new trails not necessary	RMP	RMP-4
IN25-2	Allowing different types of recreational vehicles (jet skis) not needed	RVR	RVR-1
IN26-2	Protect as much of the natural resources in each area as possible – habitat should be first priority in any decision	NRP	RMP
IN26-2	Any off-road use or bicycles should be required to stay on main paths	TVL	RMP
IN27	Supports Alternative #4	RMP	RMP-4

**Table 6-4
Comment Summaries and Response Designators**

COMMENT DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	THEME	RESPONSE DESIGNATOR
IN28-1	Jet ski use will have a negative impact on Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle populations	NRP RVR	RVR-1
IN29	Does not want motorized ski boats on this section of the Colorado River	RVR	RVR-1
IN30	Protect the area from unnecessary and unwelcome motorized travel	TVL	RMP TVL-6
IN31	Protect this area before it is too late	NRP	RMP
IN32-1	Allow both motorized and non-motorized recreationalists to share	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN32-2	Leave camping as open as the land will allow	CMP	CMP-1
IN32-3	Allow motorized use in Mack Ridge – there is no reason to close something just to close it	TVL	TVL-5 TVL-6
IN32-4	Do not refer to this area or any area under BLM management as a “quiet use area” or insist upon the use of a maximum decibel level be defined in the decision	RMP	MR-1
IN32-5	Supports Alternative #2 for Rabbit Valley	RMP	RMP-2
IN32-6	Let the trail inventory grow to meet demand – manage for recreation and its needs	TRL	RMP TVL-5
IN32-7	Experiences and benefits were included for all of the zones except Rabbit Valley	RMP	RMP-6 TVL-6
IN33-1	Supports building the proposed 23 miles of trail in the CCNCA	TRL	RMP-3 TVL-5
IN33-2	All water craft should be allowed on the river to support those who have given up hiking and riding	RVR	RVR-1
IN33-3	Agrees with proposal to keep jeep trail to Rattlesnake arches open	RA	RA-1
IN33-4	Livestock grazing is a legitimate use of the land the decisions on grazing should be allowed by strict adherence to biologists studies and guidelines	GRZ	GRZ-1

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
CMP-1	<p>Several comments were submitted concerning camping in the CCNCA:</p> <p>Leave camping as open as the land will allow</p> <p>Mack Ridge area should remain a day use area with no camping</p> <p>At large camping should be permitted without the restriction of portable toilets</p>	<p>It was determined in the planning process that the Mack Ridge area that is within the CCNCA boundary will remain a day-use area. Increased visitation by non-locals may result in the need to identify an area outside of the CCNCA boundary that could accommodate a campsite. The state land that is located east of Mack Ridge, on both sides of I-70, if acquired by the BLM has been identified as a potential site. Due to an increasing number of Colorado River users illegally camping overnight in the Loma Boat Launch area, a location in the vicinity that could allow boaters to camp for a single night may be considered in the future. Unrestricted camping will continue to become less common in the CCNCA. Widespread resource damage is currently visible in the CCNCA, mainly due to ever-increasing numbers of campsites and fire pits and include fire ash, litter, human waste, and vegetation damage from fuel wood seekers. The CCNCA cannot be protected unless limits on dispersed camping are phased in. Managing human waste was a high priority issue in all of the public forums held in the planning process.</p>
COLM-1	<p>Show a more concrete reflection in RMP of common goals with COLM</p> <p>Coordinate with COLM</p>	<p>The BLM agrees the draft RMP did not adequately acknowledge the extensive collaboration that occurred throughout the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area Resource Management Plan</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	<p>on land health, wildlife and Special Status Species, weed management issues in Black Ridge area</p> <p>COLM and BLM should identify opportunities for joint education and interpretation</p> <p>Work with COLM on urban interface issues</p> <p>Add COLM opportunities for cooperative management and complementary visitor activities to planning issues</p> <p>Minimize visual impact of communication towers – especially those on Black Ridge</p> <p>NPS would support not reallocating allotments 6141, 6142 and 6147 for achieving more seamless growth.</p> <p>COLM prefers maximized use of native plants in reclamation and restoration projects – especially those near the COLM/BLM interface</p>	<p>(RMP) and the Colorado National Monument General Management Plan (GMP) concurrent planning processes. In the draft GMP released by the Colorado National Monument (Jan 2004), Appendix F does an excellent job of summarizing the differences and the commonalities in BLM/NPS land management. The commonalities represent opportunities for future collaborative management between the two agencies that share this unique landscape. Section 2.4.22 has been added to the plan reflecting partnership between the BLM and stakeholders in the planning process. The following language will be inserted:</p> <p><i>‘Concurrent with the development of the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area Resource Management Plan, the National Park Service has been preparing a General Management Plan for the Colorado National Monument. The two areas share a common boundary and the agencies have collaborated throughout their respective planning process to advance an integrated management approach. Specific actions toward this end have been identified in this RMP – allowing leashed dogs on connecting trails, identifying potential locations for trail heads near Fruita and near the DS road / monument for access to joint trails on Black Ridge.</i></p> <p><i>In addition the two agencies have</i></p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p><i>identified the following opportunities that provide potential for future collaboration and foster an ecosystem approach to management:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Vegetation restoration and reclamation projects and integrated weed management issues, to ensure COLM concerns are addressed in projects that may have a direct impact on their own initiatives.</i> • <i>Working together on habitat management in cooperation with US Fish and Wildlife Service and Colorado Division of Wildlife.</i> • <i>Consultation on grazing management decisions, especially in the case of relinquished or canceled allotments bordering the COLM.</i> • <i>The pursuit of providing cooperative information and education in the vicinity of CCNCA and COLM, especially along the length of connecting trails or other areas where complementary visitor recreation management is possible.</i> • <i>BLM support of identifying locations for trail heads near Fruita and near monument for access to joint trails on Black Ridge'</i>
COLM-2	Work with COLM on	The following language has been

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	<p>pursuing trailheads near Fruita And near DS Rd. for access to joint trails on Black Ridge</p> <p>With dog control language, include dogs on trails connecting to Colorado National Monument at those trailheads</p> <p>Support closing entire NCA to recreational collecting of all types</p>	<p>added to the plan in Section 2.4.22: <i>‘Concurrent with the development of the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area Resource Management Plan, the National Park Service has been preparing a General Management Plan for the Colorado National Monument. The two areas share a common boundary and the agencies have collaborated throughout their respective planning process to advance an integrated management approach. Specific actions toward this end have been identified in this RMP – allowing leashed dogs on connecting trails, identifying potential locations for trail heads near Fruita and near the DS road / monument for access to joint trails on Black Ridge.’</i></p> <p>With permission from the NPS, Appendix F has been added to the CCNCA proposed RMP at Appendix 10.</p>
EPA	<p>Include the following five items for adaptive management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) an outline for the monitoring plan; 2) monitoring and LACs for water quality & vegetation cover; 3) provide information on funding mechanisms for monitoring; identify an approach that could be done without additional funding 4) provide an adaptive management decision 	<p>Thank you for these helpful comments.</p> <p>Adaptive Management</p> <p>The BLM understands that successful adaptive management is contingent upon a comprehensive monitoring strategy and the five points you recommend would be valuable components of a successful monitoring plan. Included would be more stringent parameters for areas of greater environmental concern, as in your example of areas where soils have already been identified as highly erosive</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	tree and; 5) provide a public participation plan	<p>The BLM currently has numerous monitoring sites within the CCNCA. These sites will continue to be monitored and are funded through the normal BLM funding channels providing recurring annual (base) budgets to the various resource programs. Any Land Health Restoration projects funded will require monitoring to measure the effectiveness of the treatments or change in management.</p> <p>Land Health Assessment and Status</p> <p>The Colorado Canyons National Conservation area is fortunate to be a step ahead because we completed a Land Health Assessment in the entire NCA in 2001, with the final report completed in 2003. In the vegetation section of Chapter 2 in the RMP (Alternative 3, page 2-29 in the Draft RMP) priority areas for land health restoration are identified and they include: Rabbit Valley, River Corridor and Black Ridge. The Land Health status found in Chapter 3 of the DEIS is only a summary and brief explanation. The detailed analysis of Land Health is found in Appendix 1. This is the official determination of Land Health for the CCNCA and includes numerous break downs of Land Health by various management units.</p>
FCL-1	ID goals for restroom	Management of waste, especially

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	facilities – should be a priority	<p>human waste was an issue that crossed all working groups and management zones. The Mack Ridge working group identified the development of facilities at trailheads as one of the group’s top priorities and is reflected as such in the RMP. Any type of facility development is contingent upon the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the proposed facility meets the objectives of the RMP – resource protection, visitor benefit, health and safety; -site-specific analysis is completed prior to surface-disturbing activity -funds are available for facility construction; -funds and manpower would be available for continuing maintenance. <p>Facilities at Mack Ridge are likely to be developed because of public support for it, the proposed action meets the goals of the RMP, and there is high potential for using partnerships to assist in site development and maintenance.</p>
FMP-1	Allow natural fuel management - fire, insects and disease; minimum tool analysis in Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness	The Grand Junction Field Office Fire Management Plan is being updated in 2004 and will include goals and targets for natural fire management. Minimum tool analysis in the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness will also be included in the Wilderness Management plan included in the RMP.
FWS-1	Emphasize already impacted regions of the CCNCA (ca. the middle	We would like to thank the Service for its input into our RMP planning process and for the comments they

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	<p>section of the CCCNA) for activities and emphasize conservation in the outlying area where there is currently less impact.</p> <p>Be prepared to adopt and implement conservation recommendations being developed for the white-tailed prairie dog</p> <p>Incorporate the Piñon Mesa, Colorado Gunnison Sage-Grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan</p>	<p>have submitted on the Draft Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Service's suggestion to emphasize recreational activity in the already impacted portions of the CCNCA is reflected in the proposed RMP. The Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness is targeted to remain an area for primitive recreation experiences and will not be subject to development unless it is for the sake of resource protection or health and safety reasons. Even in those instances development, e.g. camp sites or toilet facilities, would require minimum tool analysis and would be consistent with the primitive wilderness setting, as would be the case with any proposed action in BRCW. The area north of I-70 is targeted in this RMP to emphasize conservation activity that will promote wildlife and bird watching.</p> <p>In response to recent activity regarding the potential listing of the Gunnison Sage Grouse and the white tailed prairie dog we have enhanced the discussion of conservation strategies in the RMP including insertion of the following language:</p> <p><i>The Colorado State strategy for the white-tailed prairie dog, when it is developed, would include the CCNCA. Restoration of the black-footed ferret to the Cisco Desert may become a national objective and portions of the CCNCA would</i></p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p><i>likely be included. Habitat improvements for special status species would be implemented and may include water developments, food and cover plot plantings, re-introductions, prairie dog den insecticide dusting, backwater development for native fish, and artificial dens (kit foxes, burrowing owls).</i></p> <p><i>Historic and potential habitat for the Gunnison sage-grouse will be managed to attract and support this species. A strategic plan for managing sage grouse will be drafted by the CDOW and the BLM as outlined in the conservation plan prepared by the Pinyon Mesa Gunnison Sage-grouse Working Group (Graham 2000) (Appendix 7). It will cover the public land on Pinyon Mesa, Glade Park and the CCNCA. This plan will also incorporate guidance from the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangeland Conservation Plan, once it is completed. Figure 3-12 shows the habitat where sage grouse habitat protection and enhancements would occur. Water development and forb inter-seeding (to expand the seasons of use by grouse), livestock management, raptor perch tree removal, hazardous fence removal, and decoys are some of the tools that are available to maintain sage grouse habitat.</i></p> <p>We also added language to the description of existing environment to expand on potential Gunnison Sage Grouse habitat in the CCNCA:</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p><i>The Gunnison Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment, Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area (Dec. 1, 2003, Rocky Mountain Ecological Services, Inc., Redstone, Colo.) found that the understory on sagebrush lands averaged 1 to 3 percent in forb cover and 15 percent in grass cover. This accords with winter habitat and not nesting and chick rearing habitat. Whether livestock grazing or native site potential are responsible for the observed understory could not be determined. Only a small percent of the cover was cheatgrass, but prescribed fire, brush beating or chaining were considered high risk management activities for dramatically increasing cheatgrass. Being raptor perch sites, the low cliffs (slick rock) common around the sagebrush parks reduced the area considered optimum for wintering sage grouse. Sagebrush parks in 28 Hole and the Gore Parcel are large enough to attract sage grouse and now support other sagebrush obligate species. A few sage grouse were recorded in 2003 within a mile of the NCA with acceptable linking habitat between.</i></p>
GRZ-1	<p>The comments received on grazing issues were largely based on two different internet alerts that requested commenters make the following points:</p>	<p>The Grand Junction Field Office Monitoring Plan to be developed, the Desired Plant Community description (appendix 8) and the Colorado Standards and Guidelines, now included in the Resource Management Plan are in place to ensure livestock grazing is in</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	The RMP should incorporate improved monitoring of livestock management to ensure compliance with land health standards	compliance with the land health standards and address other resource issues. The regulations provide the means to change, reduce or eliminate grazing if this activity is not consistent with the Colorado Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing or other land use decisions. Also through the permit renewal process management is analyzed through the NEPA process to ensure compliance with land health standards and other resource issues. If additional monitoring is needed it shall be incorporated into the monitoring section of the NCA plan.
GRZ-3	Any grazing permit that is voluntarily relinquished or cancelled should not be reallocated	The regulations provide the means to change, reduce, or eliminate grazing if this activity is not consistent with the Colorado Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing or other land use decisions. Legislation for the creation of the NCA is very specific that grazing leases or permits in the Conservation Area or Wilderness shall be administered in accordance with the same laws provided by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing leases on other land under the jurisdiction of the BLM. If allotments within the NCA are voluntarily relinquished or cancelled authorized grazing use will be analyzed under our normal procedures to ensure compliance with land health standards and

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		impacts to resources and other uses.
GRZ-4	Disallow sheep grazing within NCA – at a minimum North of the river	This issue has been addressed several times in the past ten years including discussion and analysis contained in the Ruby Canyon/Black Ridge Integrated Resource Management Plan specifically the Desert Bighorn Sheep Plan. It was agreed upon with the Colorado Division of Wildlife and other interested parties that the current area restricting domestic sheep use south of the river based on past agreements was satisfactory in protecting the critical portion of the bighorn sheep range. Other portions of the NCA south of the river and north of the river not restricted under agreements would be handled on a case by case basis under the cooperative guidelines set forth in the plan. In the event domestic sheep use was proposed in these unrestricted areas this use would be analyzed through the NEPA process. Restricting domestic sheep use north of the river was not a major issue with the Colorado Division of Wildlife.
GRZ-5	Grazing should be prohibited in Jones Canyon, Devils Canyon and the McDonald Creek cultural area	Currently there is no grazing in Devils Canyon because the area is unallotted. Grazing does not occur in the McDonald Creek cultural area due to inaccessibility to livestock. In the NCA plan it has been proposed to eliminate grazing in a majority of Jones Canyon based on protecting riparian resources along with

<p align="center">Table 6-5 Response to Comments (alphabetical order)</p>		
RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>inaccessibility to livestock. The lower portion of Jones Canyon would remain open to livestock grazing with management consideration to riparian and other resources which are subject to land health standards.</p>
MR-1	<p>Do not refer to this area or any area under BLM management as a “quiet use area” or insist upon the use of a maximum decibel level be defined in the decision</p>	<p>The Mack Ridge zone is targeted to support mountain biking, while allowing equestrian, foot and limited motorized use, it will be primarily a non-motorized zone and is referred to as such in the RMP.</p>
NHT-1		<p>We thank the National Trust for Historic Preservation (National Trust) for comments regarding the Draft RMP/EIS for the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area (CCNCA). Clearly, we share your concern for the cultural resources of western Colorado. We offer the following comments regarding your expressed concerns.</p> <p>First, we believe the DRMP did adequately address direct and indirect impacts associated with Alternative 3. The section you reference on page 4-35 is not to be interpreted at a stand-alone assessment of impacts. It is to be interpreted in the overall context provided on page 4-29, "Common to All Alternatives." In that, we state that,</p> <p align="center">Regardless of which alternative ultimately is selected, management</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>measures are in place that preserve and protect cultural resources for present and future generations (FLPMA Sec. 103[c], 201 [a], 202 [c]; National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] Sec. 106, Sec. 110 [a]; ARPA Sec. 14 [a]). Compliance with management measures for authorized actions requires consultation with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer, federally recognized Native American tribes and other members of the interested public, the identification and evaluation of cultural resources, and adherence to procedures for resolution of adverse effects and mitigation of impacts (DRMP 4-29).</p> <p>The NHPA, Sec. 106 mandates that both direct and indirect impacts of federal undertakings be addressed and we saw no need to reiterate that fact in the plan. Furthermore, our performance of these responsibilities under the <i>Programmatic Agreement Among</i></p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p><i>the Bureau of Land Management, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers Regarding the Manner in Which BLM will Meet its Responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act</i> is reviewed annually by the Colorado SHPO.</p> <p>Thus, the primary issue is <i>not</i> the impact to cultural resources associated with federal undertakings. Rather, the main source of resource degradation is <i>unauthorized, thus unregulated</i>, activities by the general populace. This has been going on for decades and has resulted in the bulk of the vandalism and deterioration of cultural resources in lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office (GJFO) despite our best efforts at patrolling and law enforcement.</p> <p>Second, you find our NHPA Sec. 110 efforts unsatisfactory. Our point is that Sec. 110 work is almost <i>entirely</i> dependent upon funding and the availability of qualified professionals to carry out research. Both are in short supply. The GJFO, like most BLM offices, has one professional archaeologist to manage cultural resources. In the case at hand, the GJFO's area of responsibility covers approximately 2,027,000 acres, 123,000 acres of which comprises the CCNCA. The GJFO contains over 7000 known</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		sites, 349 of are located within the CCNCA. No funding has been provided or earmarked for CCNCA archaeological positions. However, we have, through an assistance agreement with a local company, initiated a project to revisit and re-evaluate 40 of the at-risk sites referenced in the plan. In addition, we seek additional funding to conduct at least 500 acres of Class III inventory per year within the CCNCA.
RMP	General comment favoring the protection of the CCNCA and the Wilderness	The goal of all four of the alternatives is to conserve and protect the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area. The use of adaptive management would allow the BLM to manage with the protection goal in mind by allowing quick implementation of more stringent controls for protection of special values, if monitoring indicates the necessity for such action. The BLM selected this alternative after evaluating input from both the CCNCA Advisory Council, public working groups and internal resource specialists. The management objectives in this alternative will ultimately guide the BLM in managing for a positive balance between multiple use and conservation of the planning area, incorporating beneficial parts of the all of the alternatives.
RMP-1	General support for Alternative 1 – the Continuation of Existing	This “no action” alternative leaves all management of the area in its current management situation as

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	Management Alternative	guided by the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act of 2000, the Ruby Canyon/Black Ridge Wilderness Integrated Management Plan, the Grand Junction Resource Area Resource Management Plan, the Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and National Conservation Areas, and the Colorado State Director's Guidance for the CCNCA. Many aspects of current management will carry over into the new RMP, but this alternative does not offer the increased protection of natural resources allowed in the agency-preferred alternative – Alternative 3, the Adaptive Management Alternative.
RMP-2	General support for Alternative 2 – The Recreation-emphasis Alternative	The emphasis of this alternative is to maximize multiple-use, recreational opportunities while conserving and protecting traditional uses and natural resources to the maximum extent possible. Many of the goals and objectives targeting recreation opportunities are incorporated into this alternative, with increased requirements for monitoring resource status, and visitor satisfaction to determine if management is adequate to protect the characteristics of the area that were key to its designation as a National Conservation Area.
RMP-3	General support for Alternative 3 – the	This alternative's emphasis is on maintaining the current level of

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	Adaptive Management Alternative	enjoyment of the area’s recreational opportunities and unique characteristics while recognizing that increased future use will trigger the need for increased levels of management. Monitoring land health and visitors’ beneficial experience will determine when increased levels of management are required. Adaptive management allows the incorporation of management techniques from the other alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP that assist in meeting goals and objectives for the overall CCNCA management.
RMP-4	General support for Alternative 4 – The Conservation emphasis alternative	The emphasis of this alternative maximizes the conservation of natural resources in the CCNCA while still maintaining traditional uses and recreational opportunities to the greatest extent possible. Many aspects of this alternative are incorporated into the agency-preferred alternative. The goals and objectives for all of the alternatives are for conservation and protection of the CCNCA. The use of adaptive management allows the BLM to manage toward this alternative and incorporate more stringent controls to achieve conservation if monitoring indicates the necessity for such action. The BLM selected this alternative after evaluating input from both the Working Groups and internal resource specialists. The management objectives in this alternative will ultimately guide the BLM in managing for a positive balance between multiple use and

<p align="center">Table 6-5 Response to Comments (alphabetical order)</p>		
RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		conservation of the planning area, incorporating beneficial parts of the other three alternatives
RMP-5	Maps need more detailed information	Maps in the RMP have been improved and include more information, the Natural Resource settings for 10 unique zones identified in the recreation section of the RMP, and the proposed trails in all of the CCNCA are clearly marked as such in the maps at the end of Chapter 2.
RVR-1	<p>Many comments were directed toward management of the 24-mile stretch of the Colorado River that runs through the CCNCA between the Loma Boat Launch and the Utah state line. Included in these comments were:</p> <p>The Colorado River is an important element of the NCA and should be addressed in the RMP</p> <p>The BLM should ban jet-ski use on the Colorado River and place a 5 horsepower limit on all other motorized craft</p>	<p>The enabling legislation, The Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act of 2000 (The Act) states at Sec.(5(l)(5)(A)) that <i>“Neither the Conservation Area nor the Wilderness shall include any part of the Colorado River to the 100-year high water mark.”</i> And at Sec. (5(l)(5)(B)): <i>Nothing in this Act shall affect the authority that the Secretary of the Interior [through the Director of the BLM] may or may not have to manage recreational uses on the Colorado River.... Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary to manage the public lands between the boundary of the Conservation Area and the edge of the Colorado River.</i> This section of the legislation was intended to dispel concerns that special land use designations would have an affect on water rights issues. Management of activity on the river’s edge and beyond, including access and take-out, remains the BLM’s responsibility on</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>any BLM and/or CCNCA property. Language in the proposed CCNCA RMP has been changed to recognize opportunities for the BLM and appropriate agencies to work together on management issues when concerns over resource damage and visitor satisfaction require modification of management so travel objectives on the river corridor are met. The BLM does not otherwise have the authority to unilaterally ban any activity on the river in the CCNCA. Currently, the BLM co-manages the Loma Boat launch with the landowner, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and has worked with CDOW to ban personal watercraft launches from Loma, due to safety and crowding issues at the launch itself. The Loma Boat launch was built by the CDOW for the express purpose of allowing hunters access to the river and that use will not be affected by this planning process.</p>
RVR-2	<p>Several comments requested the RMP address management of the Colorado River and adjacent public lands, specific issues identified: -Require a river ranger and coordinate with Moab Field Office on patrols from Loma to Westwater -Monitor camping along river corridor; allow quick implementation of management tools for</p>	<p>The proposed CCNCA RMP addresses the need for monitoring, including additional on-the-ground patrols of the river corridor and specifies goals to allow timely management modifications to address resource and recreation concerns. A Memorandum of Understanding with the Moab Field Office [UT] details roles and responsibilities for coordinating management in areas of common concern, including the river corridor, motorized trails in Rabbit Valley and management of the 5200</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	protection	Wilderness acres that are located in Utah
RVR-3	-Travel within the 100-year floodplain should be designated non-motorized/non-mechanized	The BLM is adopting the US Fish and Wildlife Service recommendation for no motorized travel within ¼ mile of the Colorado River. The river corridor is not easily accessible to mechanized travel and this has not been an issue of concern but will be monitored in the future to determine if limitations should be officially put in place.
RA-1	There were many, very similar, comments concerning the 4WD road that leads to the Rattlesnake arches trailhead. (e.g.) The jeep route to the Rattlesnake Arches should be closed to motorized traffic at least two miles before the arches and be reclaimed to a single track hiking trail	During the public collaboration on the creation of the Colorado Canyons NCA, it was made very clear to the BLM that that the road to the Rattlesnake Arches Trail head was extremely important historically to the local community. This has not changed and the closure of the road would need to be justified as necessary for resource protection, safety or visitor satisfaction. This is not currently the case but the road will continue to be monitored against these parameters to determine if an administrative management change is necessary.
SO-1	Primary responsibility for search and rescue in remote inaccessible areas or wilderness within Mesa County lies solely with the Sheriff's Office as required in Colorado State Law. The "High Angle Mesa County Search and Rescue Team" is a	The language in the narrative has been changed to reflect that, in inaccessible areas all search and rescue command is assumed by the Sheriff's Office who coordinates with other public safety officials, SAR teams, and local fire districts for wilderness rescue and that SO responsibility applies to Search and Rescue in back country areas - wilderness, river corridor, and

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
(alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	volunteer unit directed by the Sheriff's Office.	inaccessible terrain.
SSS-1	Perceived failures in RMP: -in general, we are concerned the BLM failed to live up to its obligations to protect and conserve special status species throughout the planning area	Thank you for the comments relating to special status species. You mention two species that were not, but should have been addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS, the plants, <i>Chamissonia eastwoodii</i> and <i>Astragalus eastwoodii</i> . These have been added to the final. Regarding the four species of endangered fish, these are found in the Colorado River, which is technically outside the CCNCA planning area. However, a 24-mile stretch of the river runs through the CCNCA and we are concerned about what impacts recreation may have on the special status fish and/or their habitat. Our consultations with the US Fish and Wildlife Service indicate the Service was not concerned over any potential impacts to the four T & E species from any of the proposed activities in the CCNCA RMP.
SSS-2	The BLM failed to inventory SSS and habitat	While there are no data gathering requirements for a land use planning process or National Environmental Policy Act analysis, we did contract to the Colorado Natural Heritage Program to perform a biological inventory for rare species and communities. The inventory report was not completed at the time the Draft RMP was published but a draft report was submitted to the BLM in Apr 2004. Initial information on the report does

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
(alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		not indicate any significant new information was discovered through the inventory. If the final report identifies significant new information, the BLM would be required to develop a supplement to this RMP and EIS.
SSS-3	The BLM failed to take a hard look at impacts of the proposed action to SSS or address PCAs [Potential Conservation Areas] and potential impacts to biologic values	The RMP provides a framework for management of the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and specifies goal and objectives for the area. The impacts to all special status species were generally analyzed in the draft RMP, but the hard look analysis only begins at the RMP implementation stage. Any on-the-ground implementation activity will require site-specific analysis that will provide a more detailed analysis of impacts to SSS and PCAs, especially with the updated information we will have as a result of the 2003-2004 biological inventory for rare species and communities.
	-Gunnison Sage Grouse strategy lacking and white tail prairie dog petition for listing issues	See FWS-1
TGT-1	The several comments we received in favor of and against target shooting were fairly evenly divided. Some commenters felt target shooting is incompatible with the designation as a National Conservation Area; others felt a designated shooting area	The issue of target shooting which is further defined in the RMP as <i>the discharge of any projectile, by means of (including but not limited to) firearms, bows, crossbows and paintball guns. Exceptions include official law enforcement activities, certain military operations, and hunting activities in conformance with laws and regulations.</i> The RMP proposes all projectile

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
	<p>in the CCNCA would preclude indiscriminate shooting in other parts of the CCNCA, others felt target shooting should be allowed anywhere except around established campsites.</p>	<p>shooting be excluded from the CCNCA. The general consensus among collaborators was that the special designation as a National Conservation Area does merit some special consideration. There are other public lands in close proximity to the CCNCA where target shooting is allowed, including a nearby established shooting range. Target shooting already presents a potential safety issue in a popular, high-use area like the CCNCA and with visitation expected to rise dramatically this situation will only become riskier with time.</p>
<p align="center">TRL-1</p>	<p>The RMP should clearly state that trails in Draft RMP are optional proposed (not mandated) and will require further analysis prior to authorization of construction (Mack Ridge & Rabbit Valley)</p>	<p>This is a point well made and text in the RMP has been changed to reflect that any trail proposed for any activity is subject to site specific analysis prior to implementation. Included in this analysis will be the determination that a proposed trail meets the goals and objectives established through extensive collaboration in the planning process.</p>
<p align="center">TVL-1</p>	<p>Mack Ridge Trail proposals -Trail A and Mary's Loop road - motorized or not? -Trail J – reason for building? -Trail K – unnecessary and expensive. -Trails G, D, E, and F – require site-specific analysis.</p>	<p>The map Figure 2-1) has been changed to better reflect the current proposals in Mack Ridge. It is important to note that all trail-related actions are proposed actions and will not be completed unless a site-specific analysis identifies the potential environmental impacts. Language to this affect has been added at Section 2.4.15. Trail K – a multi-use trail parallel to Hawkeye Road (the I-70 frontage road along Mack Ridge) would only be necessary as a result of a critical</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		safety. Motorized traffic in Mack Ridge is emphasized on existing county roads, on the Lions Loop overlook and on existing roads used for administrative purposes – Trail A and Mary’s Loop are not designated for motorized traffic.
TVL-2	Lion’s Loop to overlook – Lions Loop should be closed to motorized vehicles at the turn-off from Hawkeye Rd	<p>The potential location for gates on the throughout Mack Ridge were identified by the Mack Ridge working group to meet the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to minimize motorized traffic on routes that have been little used for motorized activity while maintaining motorized use on county roads, and for administrative uses by BLM staff and permittees -to close unused routes and allow for their rehabilitation -to allow motorized access to a scenic river overlook <p>The proposed gate locations on Lions Loop were specifically identified to eliminate public motorized access to the river which forces a trespass onto private property, but to allow access to the Colorado River overlook that was requested on behalf of handicapped users that would not otherwise have that opportunity in the area.</p>
TVL-3	<p>Rabbit Valley routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Agree w/ closures N of I-70 and #21 -Justify #16, 17, 20, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 18, especially #9 (elk habitat concern) and #11 (McDonald Ck concern) 	<p>Thank you for your support of the travel management actions for the area north of Interstate-70 (I-70)</p> <p>Any trail proposed for any activity is subject to site specific analysis prior to implementation. Included in this analysis will be the determination that a proposed trail meets the</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>goals and objectives established through extensive collaboration in the planning process. Public involvement will be solicited prior to and during the development. Reasoning behind identification of proposed trails:</p> <p>#16 – was designed as an alternate motorized route to the trail system in Utah. If developed, the existing route (#21) would be closed and rehabilitated. Protection of paleontological resources in the area may preclude both actions.</p> <p>Action #17 – would be the completion of a designated hiking trail loop on top of Rabbits Ear Mesa</p> <p>Actions #9 and # 20 represent proposed multiple use trail systems to be developed in Rabbit Valley, but will require site-specific analysis to determine exact locations. Both systems meet the goals and objectives, resulting from extensive public collaboration, for targeting multiple-use activity in the Rabbit Valley area, with increasing motorized emphasis toward the Utah border.</p> <p>Actions #11, #12, and #13 are trail relocation proposals – Trail #11 would replace trail #5 on the map. Once trail #11 is complete, #5, which runs through a sandy wash, will be closed and rehabilitated.</p> <p>When #12 is constructed existing trails # 13 and #15 would be closed and rehabilitated</p> <p>Action #8 – constructing a motorized route to the Colorado</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		River could pose a conflict with the recommendations of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and has been generalized to considering a similar spur if an appropriate location is identified.
TVL-4	Limit group size within Black Ridge Canyon Wilderness to 12 - especially within lower 2 miles of Mee and Knowles Canyons.	The current proposals in the PRMP limit group size in the everywhere in the Wilderness, except the first two miles south of the Colorado River. Because group sizes on the Colorado River are limited to 25, requiring smaller group sizes in the campsites on the south side of the river would not be possible. Groups of more than 12 going into the canyons beyond the campsites has not been an issue to date, but further limitations on group size can be implemented at a later date, if monitoring shows this to be an issue in degrading Wilderness resources or negatively affecting visitor enjoyment.
TVL-5	Several comments were related to multiple-use issues. Specifically comments requesting the BLM not segregate user groups or encourage or Do not encourage equestrian use in Mack Ridge area	Segregation of user groups is one of the top issues facing public land use planning. As the population increases, public land is increasingly responsible for providing habitat for wildlife and habitat for recreation. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act mandates the BLM to manage land use to accommodate multiple-use while protecting natural resources. To the greatest extent possible this plan attempts to fulfill that mandate while minimizing segregation of uses. In the many meetings and

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>other venues where the BLM solicited input from stakeholders in the CCNCA planning process, the majority of the public supports maintaining multiple use in most of the CCNCA, but also recognized some areas where segregation of uses was logical. In the Mack Ridge area the working group recognized the economic importance of mountain biking to the local gateway communities and recommended minimizing other activities that could result in irreversible damage to the single track trail that makes the area a popular destination for mountain bikers from around the country and around the world. Because Mack Ridge is not currently a popular destination for motorized enthusiasts, that use was limited to smaller portions of the area and was eliminated from most of the single-track trail loops. Equestrian use was also limited there, not to the extent of motorized use, but was agreement among user groups was reached to not actively encourage equestrian use in the area. The intent is not to prohibit current popular uses, but to proactively protect opportunities in Mack Ridge for targeted activities. In Rabbit Valley the targeted opportunities, especially approaching the eastern end, are motorized opportunities and trail development will reflect that. Many multiple-use activities are self-limiting, one user group avoids an area because the it is</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		highly popular with another, potentially incompatible user group and this plan tries to maximize that technique, reserving segregation as a tool to implement in the future, if appropriate, when monitoring indicates increased user conflict or resource impact.
TVL-6		The CCNCA RMP follows the example of the <u>Ruby Canyon/Black Ridge Integrated Resource Management Plan</u> , and moves away from traditional and somewhat out-moded, activity-based recreation management toward outcome-based recreation management. The emphasis in this plan is to manage recreation by providing the public opportunities for experiences, from which they can derive certain, targeted benefits. There is a diverse spectrum of experiences open to visitors to the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area (CCNCA). To address this diversity, we have identified ten recreation management zones in the CCNCA based on the unique recreational opportunities that each area can provide. Section 2.4.15 discusses these zones. The settings of these recreation zones vary from being very primitive and isolated, to being easily accessible, heavily visited and highly developed and regulated. The BLM's can then educate visitors on the opportunities and the settings available by zone allowing them a greater chance of achieving the experiences and benefits they

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>desire.</p> <p>One example of would be the Mack Ridge zone for which the targeted activity is mountain biking. ROS defines this zone as “middle country”, which means that heavy use is to be expected and the probability is that there will be a high number of encounters with other trail users. Facilities are developed to enhance the visitor’s experience. Although mountain biking is the niche activity for this zone, hiking, horseback riding and limited motorized use is allowed, but the emphasis will be to manage this zone for mountain biking.</p> <p>This zone concept is not intended to deprive user groups. It is intended to provide the visitor the opportunity to choose the area that includes the activities and setting he/she favors and allows an enhanced level of achieving desired experiences and benefits.</p>
TVL-7	Why restore/ rehabilitate trails and roads that have no use?	<p>In this context the words “restoration” and “rehabilitation” were meant to describe a process of returning a disturbed area (e.g. road or trail) back to its natural state. This plan does not identify any actions that would open a previously closed road or trail.</p>
UI (FRUITA)		<p>The BLM would like to thank the City of Fruita for its valuable input to the BLM throughout the RMP planning process. Section 2.4.22 has been added to</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>the plan reflecting partnership between the BLM and stakeholders in the planning process. The following relates to the City of Fruita:</p> <p>Because of its proximity to the CCNCA, the City of Fruita and the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area have great potential for working together in the future as the CCNCA RMP is implemented. The CCNCA could provide a significant socioeconomic benefit to the community and, through its community planning and development, Fruita is striving to expand its role as the CCNCA Gateway Community. With the continuing goal of consistent management at the urban interface in mind, the City of Fruita and the BLM have identified the following opportunities for future collaboration and partnerships:</p> <p>Cooperative management of the 111 acres of property along the Colorado River and adjacent to the CCNCA purchased by the City of Fruita in 2004. This urban interface area known as Snooks Bottom can be managed as an open space resource and has potential for trail connections into the CCNCA.</p> <p>Work with the City of Fruita, and other appropriate agencies, especially the Colorado National Monument, to identify access corridors, trailhead opportunities and buffer strips as development</p>

Table 6-5
Response to Comments
 (alphabetical order)

RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		<p>gets closer to BLM land.</p> <p>Work with the city and county on improvement and maintenance of access roads, including the Kingsview entry road.</p> <p>Identify opportunities for intergovernmental partnerships and develop agreements formalizing relationships among agencies.</p> <p>Work with Fruita, Colorado State Parks, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, the Colorado Riverfront Commission and other appropriate groups and agencies on new cooperative river management agreements, including opportunities at the Loma Boat launch and Colorado River State Park, and to identify future opportunities for river access, parking and a possible trail heads.</p> <p>Work with Fruita on continuing education, interpretation, protection and management the significant of paleontological resources in the area of the urban interface.</p>
SRP-1		<p>The CCNCA and the Grand Junction Field Office recreation planning staff are in the process of determining policy on use authorization, special recreation permits, group size limitations. The policy will reflect policy and guidance from the BLM Washington DC office. This policy is described in Chapter 2.4.17 The policy</p>

Table 6-5 Response to Comments (alphabetical order)		
RESPONSE DESIGNATOR	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
		conforms to the goals and objectives of the CCNCA RMP and reflects the general wishes of the stakeholders involved in the planning process.

INSERT COMMENTS