

Appendix W

Analysis of Plans and Land Use Policies of Adjacent Governments and Tribes

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

Chapter 2. Counties 2

 2.1 Archuleta County 2

 2.2 Conejos County 3

 2.3 Dolores County 3

 2.4 Hinsdale County 4

 2.5 La Plata County 5

 2.6 Mineral County 6

 2.7 Montezuma County 6

 2.8 Montrose County 10

 2.9 Rio Grande County 10

 2.10 San Juan County 11

 2.11 San Miguel County 12

Chapter 3. Municipalities 13

 3.1 City Of Cortez 13

 3.2 Town Of Dolores 13

 3.3 Town Of Dove Creek 13

 3.4 City Of Durango 14

 3.5 Town Of Pagosa Springs 14

 3.6 Town Of Rico 14

 3.7 Town Of Silverton 15

Chapter 4. Tribes 16

 4.1 Southern Ute Indian Tribe 16

 4.2 Ute Mountain Ute Tribe 16

Chapter 5. Sources 18

 5.1 Counties 18

 5.2 Municipalities 20

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service 1982 Planning Regulations require a review of planning and land use policies of other agencies, governments, and tribes to compare the goals and objectives of their plans and policies with the direction in the revised Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 219.7(c)). Bureau of Land Management Planning Regulations also require that the proposed plan be as consistent as possible with plans, policies, or programs of other agencies, tribes, and local governments (43 CFR 1610.3-1(d)). Comprehensive plans, subarea plans, land use codes, and other applicable planning and land use policies were obtained for relevant counties, municipalities, and tribes with jurisdiction within or adjacent to the San Juan National Forest (SJNF) and Tres Rios Field Office (TRFO). Each plan or code was reviewed for policies relevant to public land management, natural resource management, and intergovernmental coordination.

All plans and policies were retrieved electronically. For this review, it was assumed that the plans available on each local government's official website were the most up-to-date versions (as of July 2013). If plans could not be located electronically, inquiry was made to the respective entity to retrieve the relevant document. The scope of review was limited to comprehensive plans, subarea plans, and land use codes because it was assumed that these documents fully represented the planning and land use policies for local governments. Assuming that based on location, some subarea plans would not be relevant to the LRMP, subarea plans were only reviewed if the subarea included public lands or discussed public land management.

A brief summary and analysis of each plan is presented below, which includes a consideration of the plans' objectives and an assessment of the plans' interrelated impacts. If any conflicts were identified between the LRMP and the county, municipal, or tribal plan or policy, a consideration of alternatives for their resolution is discussed.

CHAPTER 2. COUNTIES

2.1 Archuleta County

Archuleta County Community Plan: 2001

The major focus of the Archuleta County Community Plan is growth management and the community's interest in preserving open space. Archuleta County's rapid growth is also discussed in the LRMP, as well as the pressure existing on transportation systems in the county due to that growth (see LRMP Section 3.4).

Wildlife corridor and habitat protection is supported by Archuleta County and the LRMP (2.3.66, LRMP). Archuleta County's plan establishes a Critical Wildlife Overlay District (with the habitat areas identified by Colorado Parks and Wildlife [CPW]) that designates additional site development standards in critical wildlife habitat areas in order to avoid or minimize disruption of wildlife habitat.

Protected open spaces are valued highly by Archuleta County. Preservation of agricultural viability in the county is important, as well as preserving the county's heritage.

The county has policies that support land trades of unusable agricultural land for adjacent public lands that could be utilized agriculturally with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The LRMP also supports acquiring or disposing of land for certain purposes.

No policies in the Archuleta County Community Plan appear to be in conflict with the LRMP.

Archuleta County Regional Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan: 2007

This plan's recommendations focus on private land. It is valuable to note, however, the importance of trail connectivity between residential areas that abut National Forest System (NFS) land. Two trail recommendations, the Pagosa Springs Regional Loop and the Piedra Road Corridor, involve connections to NFS land. The LRMP does not provide trail-specific recommendations or plans, though Section 2.13 "Access and Travel Management" sets forth desired conditions and objectives to guide future travel management planning decisions that are site-specific. No policies in this plan appear to conflict with the LRMP.

Archuleta County Community Development Action Plan: 2012

Projects described in the Archuleta County Community Development Action Plan are consistent with the LRMP. Specific road decisions are not included in the LRMP, but the Archuleta County Community Development Action Plan involves more site- and road-specific objectives.

Archuleta County's desired conditions are very similar to the LRMP's objectives for Chimney Rock National Monument (see LRMP Section 3.17)

Archuleta County and LRMP policies related to ponderosa pine and pinyon-juniper forest sustainability are also compatible. The LRMP specifically states:

- 3.4.1** Management activities maintain or enhance the ecological sustainability and integrity of the area. The demands of residents and users are balanced with the protection of watersheds, wildlife habitat, vegetation, soil productivity, and undisturbed natural areas.
- 2.2.7** Old growth ponderosa pine, old growth pinyon-juniper and old growth warm-dry mixed conifer forests are more abundant, occupy more acreage, and are well distributed on SJNF and TRFO lands.
- 2.10.1** Terrestrial ecosystems have age- or size-class diversity and compositional diversity that make them resistant to insect and disease outbreaks.

- 2.10.3** Epidemic outbreaks are rare after management actions have been completed.
- 2.10.6** Within the next 10 years, reduce the risk of mortality due to bark beetles by increasing the mature-open development stage of ponderosa pine forests by 20,000 to 40,000 acres by using timber harvest and prescribed fire in the mature-closed development stage of ponderosa pine forests on SJNF lands.
- 2.2.52** Within 15 years, increase the percent of ponderosa pine forests in the young development stage from 0% to 3% on SJNF and TRFO lands by using mechanical treatments (e.g., timber harvest) or fire (prescribed or natural ignitions).

Other Plans and Policies

The Archuleta County Land Use Regulations were reviewed but no specific policies related to NFS or public land management issues were found. The Archuleta County Town-to-Lakes Trail Master Plan (2011) was also reviewed, but because this plan is focused on a small area in Pagosa Springs, it did not have policies relevant to public land management.

2.2 Conejos County

Because no TRFO land and only a very small portion of the SJNF (approximately 6,000 acres or less than 1% of total county land) extends into Conejos County, it was not reviewed as part of this analysis.

2.3 Dolores County

Dolores County Master Plan: 1996

This plan states that low-density development and rural lifestyle are highly valued and that the county does not want tourism or outdoor recreation to overwhelm the county's character. Agriculture is extremely important and the importance of protection of their water sources, particularly the Dolores Project, is referenced multiple times.

Dolores County wishes to preserve the following uses on public lands: timber, grazing, minerals and energy development, and recreational, cultural, and visual resources. Active participation in federal land management and decision-making processes is also mentioned as important to the county. Maintaining access to public lands for fishing and hunting, wildlife habitat, and scenic characteristics is very important to Dolores County.

The LRMP's desired conditions for the Dolores County geographic area appear to be consistent with the policies in the Dolores County Master Plan. These desired conditions involve working lands, scenic vistas, Dolores River system health (see 3.2.2 below), protection of cultural and historic resources, shared and access for motorized and mechanical recreation opportunity, as well as foot and horseback opportunities. No policies appear to be inconsistent with the LRMP.

- 3.2.2** The Dolores River system remains a primary water source in order to meet domestic and agricultural needs while, at the same time, contributing a wide array of recreational, ecological, and aesthetic services. Collaborative efforts support watershed health, instream water quality, scenic assets, healthy native and sport fish populations, rafting and flat water boating opportunities, and flow and spill management below McPhee Dam in support of ecological, recreational, reservoir management, and water rights imperatives.

Dolores County Community Development Action Plan: 2012

Dolores County has many community development objectives. Relevant policies include promoting tourism and trail systems, and maintaining ongoing relationships with public lands offices. This action plan is more of an economic development strategy and has less direct relevance to the LRMP as a county planning document. No projects, outcomes, or expected actions appear to conflict with the LRMP.

Dolores County Development and Land Use Regulations: 2012

Dolores County has incorporated public lands policy into its Development and Land Use Regulations. The policy stated in these regulations attempts to retain all historic uses on public land, as well as all historic motorized and non-motorized recreational use travel routes. Particular emphasis is placed on maintaining hunting use and other historic recreational uses. Policy in the regulations also states that all historic trails, paths, or roads must remain open.

Additionally, Dolores County has set up a process in its Development and Land Use Regulations for when a federal or state action is determined to significantly impact use or access on public lands. The intent of this section is to allow for as much participation as possible in those actions and involves impact determinations, research, coordination meetings, and a public hearing.

The Public Lands Policy and Plan section of the Dolores County Development and Land Use Regulations may be in conflict with the LRMP. The USFS and BLM engage in active management, meaning that changes in management of public lands, including those in Dolores County, would occur when and where deemed necessary for the health of the land, to manage conflicting uses, or for a variety of other reasons that further the mission of the USFS or BLM. While the LRMP provides strategic guidance for public land management and does not determine site-specific, route-by-route determinations, historic uses and routes are not assured in perpetuity.

LRMP policies relating to future travel management planning are most relevant to this issue and do provide an alternative for the resolution of this policy conflict through Alternative A, which continues current management. However, travel management planning and other project-level actions would likely alter access and uses from what was allowed historically regardless of the alternative selected. This has already occurred with the approval of the Boggy Glade Travel Management Plan in 2012. LRMP components and direction with a direct bearing on this issue are provided below.

“Access and opportunity to experience areas through both motorized and non-motorized travel is a key component of recreation, as well as a primary management emphasis for the SJNF and TRFO. Efforts would focus on the designation of effective motorized and non-motorized travel routes over the long-term, consistent with desired conditions” (LRMP Section 2.13).

- 2.13.10** Travel management plans are complete for all SJNF and TRFO lands within 5 years of adopting this LRMP. Travel management planning remains a continuous process designed to improve the transportation system on SJNF and TRFO lands.
- 2.13.11** Motorized and non-motorized users, as well as local, state, tribal, and other federal agencies, are actively engaged in travel management planning, route designation and implementation, and route monitoring on SJNF and TRFO lands.
- 2.13.19** Develop travel management plans in accordance with the designation criteria in 36 CFR 212, Subpart B, for NFS lands and 43 CFR 8342.1 for BLM lands. Routes that are not included in the designated motorized transportation system will be evaluated for their resource impact potential. Those with high potential for resource impacts will be prioritized for decommissioning as part of the implementation plan for each individual travel management plan decision. Each implementation plan will identify those routes prioritized for decommissioning, the method(s) that may be used, and a schedule for completion.

2.4 Hinsdale County

Lake City and Hinsdale County Community Plan: 2006

The Lake City and Hinsdale County Community Plan has many policies relevant to public land management. All of the policies appear to be consistent with the LRMP. The plan advocates for Lake City's and Hinsdale County's participation in decisions regarding the public lands. The county and town

are well informed regarding cooperation with public land management and emphasize their desire to participate in decision-making to support their community interests.

The management of public lands for multiple use is highlighted as very important to the town and county's economic vitality, so they strongly support multiple use management. The separation of motorized and non-motorized uses, while still allowing for both types, is important to the county and town. Finally, Hinsdale County supports public land exchanges under similar circumstances as what is supported by the LRMP.

Other Plans and Policies

The Hinsdale County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (2010) was also reviewed; the USFS participated in creation of this plan. There are not many specific policies, but general direction in the plan does not conflict with the LRMP. Hinsdale County Zoning and Development Regulations (2011) were also reviewed; there were no specific policies related to public land management.

2.5 La Plata County

La Plata County Comprehensive Plan: 2001

Only a few policies in the La Plata County Comprehensive Plan are applicable to public land management. The relevant policies appear to be consistent with the LRMP. La Plata County recognizes the importance of multiple use recreational opportunities on public lands and has also developed district land use plans to aid federal land management agencies in understanding what their preferred land uses are near public lands.

La Plata County Trails Plan: 2000

The La Plata County Trails Plan places exceptional emphasis on public land access. The USFS and BLM are listed as likely partners on many of the nearly 100 trail need and opportunities identified in the plan. Multiple use access (hunting, fishing, recreation, equestrian, motorized travel) is highlighted. USFS and BLM representatives were actively involved in the preparation of the La Plata County Trails Plan, which is intended to complement the land management plans of the agencies. No policies appear inconsistent with the LRMP. More detailed analysis and comparison of trail development would occur in a travel management plan setting.

La Plata County Land Use Code

The La Plata County Land Use Code includes some policies related to public lands, and all the relevant policies appear consistent with the LRMP. The code recognizes the importance of maintaining access to public lands and encourages the completion of needs analyses for potential public access. Preservation of visual resources is also mentioned as important. The county welcomes the opportunity to comment on development taking place on federal lands.

Other Plans and Policies

The North County District Land Use Plan (2004) has policy goals common to those of the LRMP. Scenic integrity of the area is very important. No policies appear to be in conflict with the LRMP. For the Junction Creek District Land Use Plan (1997), the protection of natural environment and wildlife corridors is a common policy, as well as scenic view retention, adequate parking, public land access, and managing uses sensitive to natural environment. None of these policies appear to conflict with the LRMP.

Access to public lands is an important issue in the Vallecito District Land Use Plan (2005), as well as retaining multiple uses on public lands. Maintenance of natural environmental qualities is also important. Converting public lands to private ownership is discouraged. No policies conflict directly with the LRMP other than discouraging public land conversion, which is supported in the LRMP if done for the purpose of consolidating land ownership (see LRMP Section 2.18)

The West Durango District Land Use Plan (1997) was reviewed; no specific policies are related to public land management. The La Plata County Regional Transit and Future Land Use Plan (2009) was also reviewed; no specific policies are related to public land management, and no policies reviewed were inconsistent with the LRMP.

2.6 Mineral County

Mineral County Comprehensive Plan

The BLM and USFS were unable to locate the Mineral County Comprehensive Plan. An inquiry was made with Mineral County, who confirmed the existence of a county comprehensive plan completed in the 1970's, but the county was also unable to locate or produce it (Cahill 2013).

The principal issue that intersects between the SJNF and Mineral County is the proposed expansion of Wolf Creek ski area, which is strongly supported by the Mineral County Board of County Commissioners. This was the primary topic of discussion when SJNF officials met with the Mineral County Board of County Commissioners on June 3, 2012, to update the Commissioners on the status of the LRMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). As discussed during this meeting, the LRMP makes no decision with regard to the Wolf Creek ski area proposed expansion, but does include management direction that could accommodate a potential expansion were it to be approved under a separate analysis.

Other Plans and Policies

The Mineral County Zoning Regulations were reviewed; there were no references to public land management policies.

2.7 Montezuma County

Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan: 1997

The Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan recognizes the importance of federal lands to the economy, tradition, and future of the county.

Maintaining agricultural viability is of critical importance to the county and the role of continued grazing on federal land is an integral component of maintaining agricultural viability. Also, if open space and grazing are still economically viable, the future subdivision of agricultural lands may be avoided.

The comprehensive plan includes a policy that supports the continuation and coexistence of multiple uses on federal lands. Another policy is to keep all the industries related to the multiple use of federal lands viable and seek compatibility between them. The highest priority is placed on the continued use of historic uses of federal land, as natural resource economies are vital to the preservation of Montezuma County. The historical and traditional uses of federal lands that Montezuma County depends on are livestock grazing, timber harvesting, mining, energy development, water resource development, recreation, hunting, and the preservation of scenic, historic, and biological resources. Other policies call for the strengthening of linkages between healthy landscapes and natural resource industries.

Montezuma County also recognizes the contribution of wildlife and open space to the local economy as an attraction for visitors and hunters.

Joint planning and intergovernmental relationships are also of great importance to Montezuma County. The county advocates facilitating meaningful community-based involvement in federal land policy, planning, and decision making. Policies in its comprehensive plan state that the county should strengthen meaningful relationships between land managers and land users, and seek active community participation in the management of federal lands. The plan states that the county has an obligation to coordinate with other local governments and advocate for local interest at higher levels of government,

seeking active participation in local, state, and federal government relationships. Further, the county wishes to support efforts that minimize resources tied up in non-productive conflict and utilize all resources in collaborative efforts that support the plan's policies.

Another policy in the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan states that the county should monitor, comment upon, and where appropriate seek administrative and regulatory relief if regulations negatively impact economic viability of the community and the goals of the plan. The plan mentions that the main issues related to this are those which may restrict private property use are the Endangered Species Act, predator control and reintroduction, and wetlands protection.

The initiation of the LRMP revision process is mentioned in the comprehensive plan, which states that the revision would support the county's policies if it provides for balanced ecological and community health and productivity. There is a concern and atmosphere of uncertainty discussed about current and future prospects for federal land uses in Montezuma County and the subsequent impact on the local economy.

Finally, a 2004 amendment to the plan is included, which emphasizes the importance of the water quality of the Dolores River.

The LRMP does not appear to conflict with the policies of the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Continued use of federal land for grazing is supported in the LRMP. Desired conditions for livestock and rangeland management include:

- 2.7.1** Rangeland provides forage for qualified local livestock operations and helps ranches remain sustainable and intact.
- 2.7.2** Rangelands and permitted livestock grazing use contribute to the maintenance of large open spaces on private lands.
- 2.7.3** Permitted livestock grazing fee collections contribute to the local county fund base for roads, schools, and range improvements.
- 2.7.4** Rangelands provide healthy and sustainable habitat for wildlife populations that, in turn, support recreational hunting, fishing, and/or viewing (thereby contributing to the local and regional economy).
- 2.7.5** Rangelands provide diverse, healthy, and sustainable plant communities and conserve soil quality.

Objectives for livestock and rangeland management also support cooperation:

- 2.7.9** Annually administer at least 25% of active grazing allotments to standard on a priority basis ensuring that all active grazing allotments during the life of the LRMP receive appropriate administration. Work with grazing permittees and peers to resolve livestock grazing management issues. Take appropriate administrative action as needed to improve livestock grazing management.
- 2.7.10** Within 15 years, working with partners and cooperators, reconstruct 25% of priority structural range improvements in order to maintain infrastructure integrity.

LRMP area direction for the TRFO also has similar policies to those espoused in the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan related to intergovernmental cooperation, the effect of Endangered Species Act protection, and the recognition of sustaining local economies through natural resource industries.

- 3.1.6** Abundance and viability of Gunnison sage-grouse, and its habitat, are achieved through a range-wide perspective on species management that provides a healthy sagebrush steppe ecosystem so that the sage-grouse, and other sagebrush obligate species in the system, benefit. An atmosphere exists of cooperation, participation, and commitment among wildlife managers, landowners, private and public land managers, other stakeholders, and the interested public in the development and implementation of conservation actions that recognize the importance of

sustainable local economies as being essential to successful conservation. Gunnison sage-grouse protection and restoration is enhanced through these cooperative efforts while, at the same time, oil and gas development, mining, recreation, and grazing continue.

LRMP area direction for the Dolores Ranger District area, specifically the desired conditions, appears consistent with the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan policies:

- 3.2.1** Public lands continue to function as “working lands.” Collaborative forest health and rangeland management practices reduce wildfire hazards, contribute to the viability of private ranch lands, and sustain ecosystem services (including watershed health and wildlife habitat). The local economy benefits from, and contributes to, sustainable resource management, as well as the preservation of open space.
- 3.2.2** The Dolores River system remains a primary water source in order to meet domestic and agricultural needs while, at the same time, contributing a wide array of recreational, ecological, and aesthetic services. Collaborative efforts support watershed health, instream water quality, scenic assets, healthy native and sport fish populations, rafting and flat water boating opportunities, and flow and spill management below McPhee Dam in support of ecological, recreational, reservoir management, and water rights imperatives.

Because of the comprehensive plan’s strong emphasis on unencumbered and continued grazing, one area of potential conflict with the comprehensive plan is provisions in the LRMP that discuss canceling grazing privileges and placing certain limitations on grazing:

- 2.7.15** Land managers should phase out grazing systems that allow for livestock use in an individual unit during the entire vegetative growth period (season-long), except where such management has been determined to be able to achieve or maintain desired conditions.
- 2.7.16** If grazing privileges are relinquished or cancelled on SJNF or TRFO lands where fragile soils, low forage production, low livestock water availability, and/or conflicts with other resources make livestock grazing undesirable, the privileges should not be re-allocated.
- 2.7.17** Prior to allocating grazing privileges for a new grazing permittee on unallocated grazing allotments, the needs of existing rangeland management, as well as ecological diversity and species viability, should be considered.
- 2.7.18** Grazing systems should be designed in a manner to provide periodic rest to forage species during the critical growing season in order to promote species diversity, reproduction, and productivity.
- 2.7.22** Grazing management activities should be modified in, or livestock excluded from, riparian areas that are “nonfunctional” or “functional-at risk” with a downward trend (as rated by the Proper Functioning Condition protocol), where livestock have been determined to be a key causative agent.
- 2.7.25** The BLM should consider closing custodial allotments when term grazing permits expire where public lands cannot be properly managed due to the subdividing of surrounding base property, or due to insufficient or livestock water availability, access, management flexibility, and/or lack of capable rangeland.

Canceling grazing privileges and modifying livestock grazing practices as allowed through allotment management plans is authorized through agency regulation and can occur regardless of the provisions proposed in this LRMP. Thus, these guidelines do not directly conflict with the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. However, in recognition of the importance of this issue for the county, the SJNF and TRFO would coordinate closely with Montezuma County when these guidelines are being considered for implementation on any allotment within the county.

Montezuma County also emphasizes the importance of intergovernmental relations, and the comprehensive plan states that the county has an obligation to advocate for local interests at higher levels of government. Various activities such as cooperator agreements, regular briefings, Resource Advisory Councils, and ongoing engagement between BLM and USFS offices and their respective counties allow public lands and their local communities to be better served by the involvement of local government in BLM and USFS decision-making.

In creating the LRMP, a major effort was undertaken to gather and use public knowledge regarding values, knowledge, and uses of SJNF and TRFO lands. Initial public participation focused on visioning and identifying management challenges. Additional information was gathered during the comment periods for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in 2007 and Supplement to the EIS in 2011. A summary of public participation activities is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4.

Montezuma County Resolution 08-2010

A resolution is a general statement of policy or position of a city or county, whereas an ordinance is a local law. This resolution is a general statement of Montezuma County's position and thus is important to include in the adjacency analysis. The resolution calls for coordination between federal and state agencies with the Montezuma County Board of Commissioners, following all applicable laws, and that private property and the economic stability of the county be addressed and provided for in plans, policies, and actions. In the past, the SJNF and TRFO have had discussions and exchanged written communication with Montezuma County regarding coordination that revealed some differences between the county and agencies in what is expected or required through "coordination." Because of these different expectations, this presents an area of potential conflict. However, Resolution 08-2010 refers to coordination as required and mandated by federal law. The requirements of the USFS and BLM that could be interpreted as "coordination" requirements are discussed below.

Based on applicable laws and regulations, the USFS and BLM are required to seek comment from state or local agencies on a Draft EIS when the agencies are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards (40 CFR 1503.1(a)(2)(i)). The USFS and BLM must cooperate with state and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and state and local requirements (40 CFR 1506.2). When the USFS or BLM and the state or county each is preparing an EIS, the USFS or BLM may designate the state or county as a joint lead agency (40 CFR 1501.5(b) and 1508.5). The USFS or BLM also may give cooperating agency status to a state or local agency, whose role would be to assist the USFS or BLM in preparing an EIS (40 CFR 1501.6 and 1508.5). In addition, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) contains a provision (43 U.S.C. 1712(c)(9)) that applies to the BLM in its development and revision of land use plans that requires that the BLM coordinate land use inventory, planning, and management activities for the public lands with the planning and management programs of state and local governments where those lands are located and make their land management plans consistent with state and local plans to the extent consistent with federal law and the purposes of FLPMA.

The SJNF and TRFO have and would continue to coordinate, per the laws and regulations cited above, with Montezuma County through the development and implementation of the LRMP. The requirement for coordination and the other topics addressed in Resolution 08-2010 are consistent with the LRMP.

Other Plans and Policies

The Montezuma County Land Use Code (2010) was also reviewed; it includes no specific regulations related to public land management.

2.8 Montrose County

Montrose County Master Plan: 2010

Since only a small portion of the TRFO extends into the western portion of Montrose County, focus for this analysis was primarily placed on the West End Planning Area policies of the Montrose County Master Plan. Montrose County discussed the importance of balancing natural resource utilization and conservation. Mitigating the impacts of oil, gas, and other mining development is important to the county, as well as preserving water quality and wildlife corridors. Agricultural land preservation is also of value. Tourism is a major economic driver in Montrose County and recreational opportunities are very important. Maintaining access to public lands is also vital and the plan calls for collaboration and participation with land management agencies.

Water quality, particularly salinity, is also discussed. Salinity is also addressed in the LRMP:

2.13.28 Road Density Guideline for Water Quality and Watershed Health on TRFO Lands: In order to protect water quality, watershed function, major surface source water protection areas for municipalities, and to ensure compliance with the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, use the best available information for determining the appropriate level of road density when analyzing and approving management actions that affect motorized routes.

3.1.7 Salinity and sediment contributions of the Dolores River tributaries (including Disappointment, Big Gypsum, Little Gypsum, and Dry Creeks) are reduced through an integrated activity approach that achieves reduced erosion and improves land health.

In sum, all relevant policies in the West End Planning Area focus of the Montrose County Master Plan appear to be consistent with those stated in the LRMP.

Other plans and policies

The Montrose County Zoning Regulations were also reviewed; they include no relevant public land management regulations.

2.9 Rio Grande County

Rio Grande County Joint Master Plan: 2004

Because only a small portion of the SJNF exists within Rio Grande County, not many of the policies were relevant to the LRMP. The Rio Grande National Forest accounts for nearly half of the county's land, and the Continental Divide separates the Rio Grande National Forest and SJNF. Land management policies in this plan generally regarded the Rio Grande National Forest. However, general policies of natural resource conservation and policies supporting tourism and outdoor recreation are applicable and consistent with the LRMP.

Rio Grande Land Development Code: 2011

This code contains scarce policy related to public land management. The Agricultural Forestry Zoning District aims to conserve forest resources, protect the natural environment, and preserve uninhabited areas. Only a small portion of the SJNF extends into Rio Grande County, the majority of which is within a designated wilderness area. The policies appear in line with the LRMP.

2.10 San Juan County

Town of Silverton and San Juan County Master Plan: 2010

Tourism is very important to Silverton and San Juan County. Tourism markets are envisioned to be continually expanded, with emphasis on year-round attractions. The town and county want a variety of recreation options to be enhanced and expanded with balanced motorized and non-motorized opportunities available.

The importance of backcountry road access is emphasized. All-terrain vehicle transportation directly into town is supported. San Juan County and Silverton discourage new development to take away existing public access across private property. Access to mining claims is also mentioned, and travel to those claims over BLM or NFS land is encouraged. Mineral development is still available on mining claims.

Water quality protection is also very important to San Juan County and Silverton.

Backcountry county land is envisioned by Silverton and San Juan County to be primarily natural with small pockets of recreation and evidence of mining history. The BLM works with the town and county to implement recreation vision and goals in the plan. Heritage tourism is supported and promoted.

The LRMP has consistent policies stated in its direction for the Silverton area (Section 3.24):

“As the result of the configuration of mineral patents and private lands, San Juan County has a fragmented land ownership pattern of public lands isolated by private lands sometimes called ‘splinters’ or ‘slivers.’ These splinters or slivers can range in size from less than an acre up to 40 acres and oftentimes make accessibility to public lands difficult.”

- 3.24.1** Interpretation of the historic landscapes and features of the Silverton [Special Recreation Management Area] is made available through a range of effective and appropriate venues. Information is designed to enhance the touring experience and encourage the greatest extent of appreciation and protection of these precious assets.
- 3.24.11** Although private land access is provided, as required, opportunities for protection of key resources are sought through the county development process, easement options, and acquisition.
- 3.24.17** Lands would remain open to mineral entry except where limited and specific needs for withdrawal or segregation. When possible, new mining projects would consider reclamation and remediation of historic mining operations to the extent economically, technologically, and legally possible.

The LRMP has no specific reference to the Kendall Mountain Recreation Area, mentioned in the Town of Silverton and San Juan County Master Plan as a potential site for transfer of ownership, but does state:

“In keeping with the BLM mission of “serving communities,” lands in San Juan County near Silverton may be made available for recreation and public purposes or sold either competitively or directly for expansion of residential, commercial, recreation, or infrastructure uses.”

- 3.24.13** Where public lands 1) are isolated by surrounding private parcels with limited or no public access, 2) have minimal cultural/natural resource or recreation values to protect, and 3) are not needed for any federal project or resource management activity, the BLM may consider exchanges, sales or other disposal in order to improve the overall management of the public lands. Each proposal will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, including environmental analysis under NEPA.

San Juan County Zoning and Land Use Regulations: 2012

These overlay districts appear to be consistent and supportive of LRMP policies for the area.

2.11 San Miguel County

San Miguel County Comprehensive Development Plan: 2008

The San Miguel County Comprehensive Development Plan, divided into planning areas, has only certain applicable portions to consider related to the LRMP. Only the TRFO is located within San Miguel County; the SJNF does not extend into the county. This BLM land is expansive but is only located in the western half of San Miguel County. For this reason, only policies relevant to the “West End,” the entire county, and the “Remainder of County” were analyzed.

The San Miguel plan includes policies supporting multiple use of the public lands. Policies are also included to promote recreation and preserve resources while ensuring access. Mining on federal lands is supported with county cooperation and assurance of adequate housing for mining employees. A sustainable logging industry is encouraged throughout the county while protecting environmentally sensitive areas and ecosystems. Expansion of outdoor recreation facilities such as picnic and camping areas is supported in the remainder of the county.

No policies in the San Miguel County Comprehensive Development Plan appear to conflict with the LRMP.

San Miguel County Land Use Code: 2010

The San Miguel County Land Use Code goes into significant detail regarding public land policies. The county has specific policies for property adjacent to public land that do not appear to conflict with the LRMP. Access to public lands is a primary focus as the county seeks to preserve access and identify additional access points to secure. Non-motorized, low-impact use of public land is favored in San Miguel County. Policies in the land use code also seek to protect wildlife habitat, water resources, and wetlands in a manner consistent with LRMP policies. No policies conflict with the LRMP.

Other Plans and Policies

The San Miguel County Open Lands Plan mostly establishes the mission of the San Miguel County Open Space Commission and sets up a strategic framework for open space acquisition. It does not set up particular policies related to public land management. The Wright’s Mesa Master Plan (2008) was reviewed, but this subarea is located east of BLM land in San Miguel County; public land access was mentioned but is relevant to the Uncompahgre National Forest, not the land managed by the LRMP. The Telluride Regional Area Master Plan (2006) was reviewed, but this subarea is located significantly east of BLM land in San Miguel County; the area is much more relevant to Uncompahgre National Forest planning than the LRMP. The San Miguel County Trails Plan was reviewed; no policies were listed and the map only focused on the eastern half of San Miguel County. Therefore, this plan was not applicable to this LRMP.

CHAPTER 3. MUNICIPALITIES

3.1 City Of Cortez

City of Cortez Comprehensive Plan: 2008

All of the relevant policies in the City of Cortez Comprehensive Plan appear to be consistent with LRMP policies. Cortez emphasizes the importance of “critical lands” throughout its comprehensive plan. Maintaining water supply and quality is important, as well as soil health and productivity. Cortez recognizes the importance of recreational opportunities to its economy and focuses on collaboration with other agencies to support recreation in the area. Invasive species and noxious weed management, particularly tamarisk management, is discussed in Cortez’s plan and the city’s policies for its management are consistent with the LRMP.

Other Plans and Policies

The City of Cortez Land Use Code (2007) was also reviewed; no specific policies are related to public land management.

3.2 Town Of Dolores

Town of Dolores Comprehensive Plan: 1997

The Town of Dolores Comprehensive Plan designates future land use and anticipates growth in the town. There are not many policies related to public land management. The town wishes to maintain its important natural and visual features, preserve wildlife habitat, and preserve and protect open space. Another objective states that the town wishes to connect town sidewalk to a trails system and public lands. No policies were found to conflict with the LRMP.

Town of Dolores Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities Plan: 2005

The Town of Dolores Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities Plan includes site-specific park planning for the town and a few more general policies related to public land management. The Dolores River, McPhee Reservoir, and public land proximity is highlighted as important to the town.

Specifically, the LRMP states:

- 3.2.6** The McPhee Reservoir area is one of the Four Corners’ “recreation gems.” A viable marina facility is re-established that offers, at a minimum, basic services for those enjoying water sports and fishing. A strong connection exists between the reservoir and the town of Dolores.

Other Plans and Policies

The Town of Dolores Land Use Code (2008) was also reviewed; no specific policies are related to public land management.

3.3 Town Of Dove Creek

The Dolores County planning regulations regarding Dove Creek were reviewed; see review of Dolores County plans and policies above.

3.4 City Of Durango

City of Durango Comprehensive Plan

The City of Durango Comprehensive Plan places emphasis on the protection of the Animas River, the value of open space, and the collaboration of many agencies to achieve the city's goals. Open space, under the jurisdiction of many different entities, is seen as a value for human use, recreation, wildlife habitat and migration, and scenic value. Durango recognizes the value of natural resources and its sustainable management to the city's economic vitality. No policies appear to conflict with the LRMP.

City of Durango Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation Master Plan: 2010

Overall, the City of Durango Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation Plan is consistent with the LRMP. This plan is much more site specific within the city's comprehensive planning boundary than the LRMP, designating future trail opportunities and improvements. Policies related to public land managed by the BLM or USFS are in line with policies detailed in the LRMP.

Other Plans and Policies

The City of Durango Animas River Management Plan (2013) was reviewed; however, because this was a very site-specific plan, federal lands were not discussed and LRMP-relevant policies were not mentioned. Therefore, no inconsistencies were found. The City of Durango Land Use Code was also reviewed; no specific policies or regulations relating to public land management are included. Other policies reviewed were consistent with the LRMP.

3.5 Town Of Pagosa Springs

Town of Pagosa Springs Comprehensive Plan: 2006

The Town of Pagosa Springs Comprehensive Plan lists broad policies for the protection of the natural environment, including maintaining water and air quality, wildlife habitat, and all other components of the town's valued natural setting. Economic vitality of the town is recognized to be tied to natural resource management, though the town hopes to diversify its economy, particularly seasonally. Outdoor recreation opportunities are also very important to the town. No policies appear to be in conflict with the LRMP.

Town of Pagosa Springs Land Use Code

The Land Use Code regulations regarding sensitive area protection are consistent with the LRMP. Other regulations reviewed were not relevant to the LRMP.

3.6 Town Of Rico

Rico Regional Master Plan: 2004

Because Rico is surrounded by NFS land, many of its Regional Master Plan policies are relevant to the LRMP. Protection of soil and water resources and remediation from past contamination are major concerns discussed in the plan. Recreation is a vital part of Rico's economic health. Big-game hunting provides an economic boost for the town. Easy access to these recreational opportunities and trail access are important to the town.

A future USFS interpretive site, visitor's center, and parking lot are mentioned in the Rico Regional Master Plan. Informal and unmanaged camping is discussed as an issue for the town to coordinate a solution with the USFS. Future land use for NFS lands include passive recreation, limited motorized recreation, firewood extraction, removal of fuel woods to reduce forest fire risks, and limited small-scale logging of small-diameter forest products.

It is important to note that in the Rico Master Plan, a significant focus is placed on the “Rico Renaissance” land holdings, an extensive collection of land under the same ownership that is intermixed with NFS land. Policies are discussed for a future “extensive land exchange program” between Rico Renaissance and the USFS. The LRMP does not specifically mention this possibility, though one policy for the Rico special area is to improve and consolidate land ownership patterns. No policies appear to be inconsistent:

- 3.27.3** Land ownership patterns are improved and consolidated between the town, private landowners, and the SJNF in order to enhance community development objectives and to reduce resource impacts (including to the viewshed on the surrounding public lands).
- 3.27.4** Trails accessing SJNF-administered lands from within town boundaries emphasize non-motorized recreation modes in order to emphasize the community’s quiet-use character.
- 3.27.6** Undeveloped areas and [Colorado Roadless Areas] on SJNF-administered lands near and/or around Rico provide quality elk and other large game habitat and wildlife corridors. These areas also provide quality hunting and wildlife viewing, as well as pristine backcountry non-motorized recreational experiences.

Town of Rico Three Mile Plan for Annexation: 2010

This plan discusses general characteristics of areas that may be suitable for future annexation under the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965. Because this plan is mostly a study of land characteristics and assessment of annexation probability, its relevance to the LRMP is limited. The policies do not conflict with the LRMP.

Town of Rico Mineral Extraction Policy: 2009

The Town of Rico Mineral Extraction Policy establishes broad policy goals related to mining in the Rico area. The LRMP sets forth restricted management of leasable and saleable minerals in the Rico area. Locatable minerals are an allowed use in the Rico area, though they may be subject to restrictions to protect resources. None of the policies appear to conflict with the LRMP.

Town of Rico Land Use Code: 2011

The Town of Rico Land Use Code establishes particular development requirements for areas of state interest, including avalanche hazard areas, floodplain areas, geologic hazard areas, steep slopes, wetland areas, wildfire hazard areas, and wildlife habitat. The policies guiding these regulations are consistent with the LRMP.

3.7 Town Of Silverton

See “Town of Silverton and San Juan County Master Plan: 2010” under the review of San Juan County plans and policies, above.

The Town of Silverton Zoning Code was reviewed and no policies were relevant to public land management.

CHAPTER 4. TRIBES

4.1 Southern Ute Indian Tribe

The 2005 Southern Ute Indian Tribe Comprehensive Master Plan was reviewed; no policies appear to be in conflict with the LRMP. The Brunot Agreement, analyzed below, bears heavily on the management relationship between the SJNF/TRFO and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe.

4.2 Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

The Ute Mountain Ute Tribe is in the process of developing an Integrated Resource Management Plan; however, the plan has not been finalized and a draft version is unavailable for review. No other plans or policies were made available for review. The Brunot Agreement, which outlines rights associated with lands now managed by the SJNF and TRFO, is discussed below.

The Brunot Agreement

The Brunot Agreement, ratified by Congress in 1874, withdrew over 5,000 square miles in the mountains of southwest Colorado from the 1868 Ute Reservation. The agreement, entered into between the United States (as represented by Felix Brunot) and the Ute Indians in Colorado, was passed into law (18 Stat., 36) by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress on April 29, 1974 (after Congress decided in 1871 that the United States would no longer make treaties with Native American tribes, yet continued to interact with Native American tribes in much the same manner through executive orders and agreements enacted as statutes). Under the “reserved rights doctrine,” hunting rights on reservation lands relinquished by the Utes were retained; that is, the tribes retained such rights as part of their status as prior and continuing sovereigns. Article II of the Brunot Agreement specified that “the United States shall permit the Ute Indians to hunt upon said lands so long as the game lasts and the Indians are at peace with the white people.” The Ute Mountain Ute Tribe’s hunting rights were acknowledged when the tribe sued the State of Colorado for their historical hunting rights in 1978. The rights were granted to the tribe under a consent decree that gave enrolled members of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe the right to hunt deer and elk in the Brunot area for subsistence, religious, or ceremonial purposes. The consent decree specified that tribal members may hunt deer and elk without a state license year-round, providing that they obtain a tribal hunting permit. In 2013, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe renegotiated this agreement with the State of Colorado to include the tribe’s fishing rights and the right to hunt a certain number of black bears, moose, mountain goats, bighorn sheep, and mountain lions, in addition to the existing take of elk and mule deer within the Brunot area. Other game animals may be hunted without a license and without bag limits, but only during hunting seasons established by CPW. In 2008, the Southern Ute signed an agreement with the State of Colorado that reinstated their hunting and fishing rights within the Brunot area. The SJNF and TRFO will continue to ensure that the hunting and fishing rights of the 1873 Brunot Agreement are upheld on public lands under their management jurisdictions. In exercising their Brunot hunting rights, the Ute Mountain Ute and Southern Ute tribal members are required to adhere to federal policy and regulations designed to protect natural and cultural resources.

The SJNF and TRFO will continue to allow tribal members to collect botanical and other special forest products from public lands within the constraint of ecological sustainability. The SJNF and TRFO will also coordinate and collaborate with tribal governments to increase awareness and knowledge of culturally significant plants, and will consider potential impacts on culturally significant plants in project design and implementation. Prescribed burn plans, noxious weed control, and other management projects should address and consider traditional uses and traditional management of culturally significant plants.

Important cultural areas and traditional cultural properties will be protected for current and future tribal use. The SJNF and TRFO will continue to consult with tribes and pueblos, and knowledgeable individuals to identify important cultural areas and traditional cultural properties. If requested by the tribes, the SJNF and TRFO will keep information on such localities and uses confidential.

The SJNF and TRFO will maintain and strengthen the existing relationship of government-to-government consultation between the USFS and BLM and the 26 Native American tribes and pueblos that claim cultural affiliation with lands under each agency's jurisdiction. The SJNF and TRFO will develop consultation protocols and other formal agreements between the USFS and BLM and Native American tribes with direct communication between USFS and BLM line officers and tribal officials. The SJNF and TRFO will provide opportunities for tribal participation and partnerships in educational, interpretive, social, and economic programs and will continue to work with the tribes and pueblos to educate the public on appropriate and respectful etiquette when visiting culturally sensitive sites.

CHAPTER 5. SOURCES

5.1 Counties

Archuleta County

Archuleta County Community Plan

<http://www.archuletacounty.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/203>

Archuleta County Regional Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan

<http://www.archuletacounty.org/DocumentView.aspx?DID=213>

Archuleta County Town-to-Lakes Trail Master Plan

<http://www.archuletacounty.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/216>

Archuleta County Community Development Action Plan

<http://www.archuletacounty.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/350>

Archuleta County Land Use Regulations

<http://www.archuletacounty.org/index.aspx?nid=247>

Dolores County

Dolores County Master Plan

http://www.dolorescounty.org/documents/dolores_county_master_plan.html

Dolores County Community Development Action Plan

http://www.scan.org/uploads/dolores_2012.pdf

Dolores County Land Use Regulations

http://www.dolorescounty.org/documents/dolores_county_land_use_regulations.html

Hinsdale County

Lake City and Hinsdale County Community Plan

http://hinsdalecountycolorado.us/files/LakeCity-Hinsdale-Community_Plan-120906-ADOPTED.pdf

Hinsdale County Community Wildfire Protection Plan

http://hinsdalecountycolorado.us/files/HCCWPP_CWPP_Final_8_26_10_Revised_06282011.pdf

Hinsdale County Zoning and Development Regulations

http://hinsdalecountycolorado.us/files/land_use_document_august_4_2010_revised_08202010_web_Revised_06222011.pdf

La Plata County

La Plata County Comprehensive Plan

http://www.co.laplata.co.us/departments_elected_officials/planning/comprehensive_plan

La Plata County Regional Transit and Future Land Use Plan

http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/documents/La_Plata_Plan_FINAL.pdf

La Plata County Trails Plan

<http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/documents/2000trailsfinalplan.pdf>

North County District Land Use Plan

<http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/codesplansmaps/documents/ncounty.pdf>

Junction Creek District Land Use Plan

<http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/codesplansmaps/documents/junc-crk.pdf>

Vallecito District Land Use Plan

<http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/codesplansmaps/documents/vallecito.pdf>

West Durango District Land Use Plan

<http://co.laplata.co.us/sites/default/files/departments/planning/codesplansmaps/documents/westdgo.pdf>

La Plata County Land Use Code

<http://library.municode.com/HTML/13098/level1/CO.html>

Mineral County

Mineral County Zoning Regulations

<http://www.mineralcountycolorado.com/commissioners.html>

Phone communication with Les Cahill, Mineral County Administrator. June 19, 2013.

Montezuma County

Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan

<http://www.co.montezuma.co.us/documents/planning/Comp%20plan.pdf>

Montezuma County Land Use Code

http://www.co.montezuma.co.us/documents/planning/LandUseCode_Sept2010.pdf

Resolution requiring coordination with and from federal agencies

http://www.co.montezuma.co.us/documents/administration/Resolutions/BOCC_Resolution2010-08.pdf

Montrose County

Montrose County Master Plan

<http://www.co.montrose.co.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=1031>

Montrose County Zoning Regulations

<http://www.co.montrose.co.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/614>

Rio Grande County

Rio Grande County Joint Master Plan

<http://www.riograndecounty.org/images/stories/docs/landuse/Riograndecountymasterplan.pdf>

Rio Grande Land Development Code

http://www.riograndecounty.org/images/stories/docs/landuse/revised_rgdc_flood_2011.pdf

San Juan County

Town of Silverton and San Juan County Master Plan

<http://www.sanjuancountycolorado.us/uploads/2/7/4/4/2744655/cmp.pdf>

San Juan County Zoning and Land Use Regulations

http://www.sanjuancountycolorado.us/uploads/2/7/4/4/2744655/county_code_4.2013.pdf

San Miguel County

San Miguel County Comprehensive Development Plan

<http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/documents/SMCMP.COUNTY.PART1.2008.pdf>

Wright's Mesa Master Plan

<http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/documents/SMCMP.WRIGHTSMESA.FEB08.pdf>

Telluride Regional Area Master Plan

http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/documents/SMCMP_TellurideRegionalArea_Part3_2009-8.pdf

San Miguel County Open Lands Plan

http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/documents/SMCMP.OPENLANDS.PART4_2008.pdf

San Miguel County Trails Plan

<http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/documents/SMCMP.TRAILS.PART5.2008.pdf>

San Miguel County Land Use Code

<http://www.sanmiguelcounty.org/departments/planning/index.html?tab=1#tabsDepts>

5.2 Municipalities

City of Cortez

City of Cortez Comprehensive Plan

<http://www.cityofcortez.com/sites/default/files/Comp%20Plan%208-5-08.pdf>

City of Cortez Land Use Code

http://www.cityofcortez.com/sites/default/files/file/public_works/Cortez_LandUseCode.pdf

Town of Dolores

Town of Dolores Comprehensive Plan

<http://gigshowcase.com/EndUserFiles/38912.pdf>

Town of Dolores Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities Plan 2005

<http://gigshowcase.com/EndUserFiles/38913.pdf>

Town of Dolores Land Use Code

<http://gigshowcase.com/EndUserFiles/23634.pdf>

City of Durango

City of Durango 2007 Comprehensive Plan

<ftp://ftp.ci.durango.co.us/Planning/Comprehensive%20Plan/Comp%20Plan%20Final%20Plan%2003.30.07.pdf>

City of Durango Parks, Open Space, Trails, and Recreation Master Plan

<http://www.durangogov.org/index.aspx?nid=554>

City of Durango Animas River Management Plan

<http://www.durangogov.org/index.aspx?NID=567>

Durango Land Use and Development Code

http://library.municode.com/HTML/11771/level2/PTIICOOR_CH27LAUSDECO.html

Town of Pagosa Springs

Town of Pagosa Springs Comprehensive Plan

http://www.pagosasprings.co.gov/index.asp?Type=B_LIST&SEC=%7BF5A5939F-4139-403B-8833-560300FD8166%7D

Town of Pagosa Springs Land Use Code

<http://www.pagosasprings.co.gov/vertical/Sites/%7B175F1D4C-10BE-47AA-AF3E-C1BCDE2446A6%7D/uploads/%7B91717D4F-EF80-425F-AFEC-903F48121248%7D.PDF>

Town of Rico

Rico Regional Master Plan

http://www.ricocolorado.org/gov/documents/Rico_Regional_Master_Plan_FINAL_8-18-2004.pdf

Town of Rico Three Mile Annexation Plan

http://www.ricocolorado.org/gov/documents/Town_of_Rico_3_Mile_Annexation_Plan_Final.pdf

Rico Mineral Extraction Policy

http://www.ricocolorado.org/gov/documents/Rico_Mineral_Extraction_Policy_2011-09.pdf

Town of Rico Land Use Code

http://www.ricocolorado.org/gov/RLUC_Amended_6-15-11.pdf

Town of Silverton

Town of Silverton and San Juan County Master Plan

<http://www.sanjuancountycolorado.us/uploads/2/7/4/4/2744655/cmp.pdf>

Town of Silverton Zoning Code

<http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheadname1=Content-Disposition&blobheadname2=Content-Type&blobheadvalue1=inline%3B+filename%3D%22Town+of+Silverton+Municipal+Code.pdf%22&blobheadvalue2=application%2Fpdf&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1251852383582&ssbinary=true>

Tribes

Brunot Agreement

<http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/forestplan/roundtable/brunotAgreement.pdf>

This page intentionally left blank.