

Scott Armentrout, Forest Supervisor
Clay Speas, Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants Program Manager
Carmine Lockwood, Renewable Resources Staff Officer

GMUG Forest Service Supervisors Office
2250 Highway 50
Delta, CO 81416
sarmentrout@fs.fed.us
cspeas@fs.fed.us
clockwood@fs.fed.us

Submitted electronically

November 3, 2014

Re: A conservation community recommendation for the SBEADMR EIS

Dear Mr. Armentrout, Mr. Speas and Mr. Lockwood:

In response to the Forest Service's request, this letter is to inform you that the undersigned groups are working towards drafting features and specific language for a conservation community supported alternative for the SBEADMR EIS. In addition to incorporating ecological protections and NEPA language requiring adequate annual monitoring, we plan to examine the existing features of draft Alternative 3 (Public Health and Safety Focus), to make our recommendations. We intend to submit these recommendations to you and to the PLP SBEADMR working group in early 2015 with the understanding that the Draft EIS will be released in April of 2015.

In order to provide such an alternative, we ask that the Forest Service assist our efforts by providing the following information:

1. A more detailed version of the existing SBEADMR Alternative 3 map including the following:
 - Natural landmarks;
 - Defined USFS WUI boundaries (communities, admin. sites, developed sites);
 - Ski area boundaries;
 - Roads and trails;
 - Electrical and utility lines and sites;
 - Campgrounds and dispersed recreation sites;
 - Forest cover and species including non-seral and seral aspen;
 - Forest Plan management area designations;
 - Past and proposed timber and vegetation treatments;
 - Wildlife habitat designations for sensitive species, including LAU's and severe winter game range; and,

- Inholdings and forest boundaries.
2. The specific USFS WUI features and definitions used to create maps for the draft version of Alternative 3.

We wish to receive GIS shape files and KML files for the above information.

It is challenging to determine the differences between the alternatives as currently proposed. The narrative and maps for each alternative clearly differ, yet total proposed treatment acreage remains in the same range of 70,000 to 120,000 acres for each. The information requested above would assist with determining the differences or intent, which will inform the development of our recommendation.

We are pleased to have learned at the October 9, 2014 PLP stakeholder meeting that there are likely another six months before the Forest Service would release a Draft EIS. Accordingly, we ask that our recommendations be analyzed in detail along side other alternatives and be thoroughly considered in the decision making process. We recognize that it would be ideal to present a diverse stakeholder supported alternative. While we plan to move forward with developing acceptable conservation features for an alternative, we are willing to participate in the broader stakeholder process and pledge to present our recommendations to the recently initiated PLP stakeholder group.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions. We look forward to receiving the requested information so our participation in the SBEADMR may remain robust.

Sincerely,

Hilary Cooper
Sheep Mountain Alliance
Hilary@sheepmountainalliance.org

Alli Melton
High Country Conservation Advocates
alli@hccaonline.org

Sloan Shoemaker
Wilderness Workshop
sloan@wildernessworkshop.org

Jimbo Buickerood
San Juan Citizens Alliance
jimbo@sanjuancitizens.org

Rocky Smith
Forest Management Analyst

2rockwsmith@gmail.com

Luke Schafer
Conservation Colorado
luke@conservationco.org

Rein van West
Western Colorado Congress
rein@wccongress.org

Kevin Mueller
Wild Earth Guardians
kmueller@wildearthguardians.org