

**APPENDIX B —
NOTICE OF INTENT**

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department has submitted the proposal for the collection of information, as described below, to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The Notice lists the following information: (1) The title of the information collection proposal; (2) the office of the agency to collect the information; (3) the OMB approval number, if applicable; (4) the description of the need for the information and its proposed use; (5) the agency form number, if applicable, (6) what members of the public will be affected by the proposal; (7) how

frequently information submissions will be required; (8) an estimate of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information submission including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response; (9) whether the proposal is new, an extension, reinstatement, or revision of an information collection requirement; and (10) the name and telephone number of an agency official familiar with the proposal and of the OMB Desk Officer for the Department.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Application for Commitment to Guarantee Mortgage-Backed Securities.

OMB Approval Number: 2503-0001.

Form Numbers: HUD-11704.

Description of the Need for the Information and its Proposed Use: The HUD Form 11704 is used by Ginnie Mae Mortgage-Backed Securities (MBS) issuers to apply for commitment authority to guarantee mortgage-backed securities.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

	Number of respondents	Total annual responses	×	Hours per response	=	Burden hours
Reporting burden	297	1,188		0.25		297

Total Estimated Burden Hours: 297.
Status: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 35, as amended.

Dated: August 16, 2002.

Wayne Eddins,

*Departmental Reports Management Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02-21491 Filed 8-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-72-M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4730-N-34]

Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 23, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mark Johnston, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room 7262, 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708-1234; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708-2565, (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1-800-927-7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the December 12, 1988 court order in *National Coalition of the*

Homeless v. Veterans Administration, No. 88-2503-OG (D.D.C.), HUD publishes a Notice, on a weekly basis, identifying unutilized, underutilized, excess and surplus Federal buildings and real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. Today's Notice is for the purpose of announcing that no additional properties have been determined suitable or unsuitable this week.

Dated: August 15, 2002.

Mark R. Johnston,

Deputy Director, Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs.

[FR Doc. 02-21231 Filed 8-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-29-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge, Golden, CO

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: This notice advises that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) intends to gather information necessary to prepare a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its implementing regulations.

A CCP will be prepared for the future Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) located in Jefferson County,

Colorado. The purpose of the CCP is to describe the future conditions of the Rocky Flats NWR and provide long-term guidance and management direction to achieve the refuge's purpose and restore its ecological integrity.

In the EIS, the Service will describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives and the anticipated impacts of each. This information will be used in the draft CCP for the Rocky Flats NWR. The Service is furnishing this Notice in compliance with Service CCP policy to advise other agencies and the public of its intentions and to obtain suggestions and information on the scope of issues to be considered in the planning process.

DATES: Public scoping meetings will be held in surrounding communities in September 2002. Written scoping comments must be received by October 31, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments and inquiries should be directed to Rocky Flats NWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan, Attn: Laurie Shannon, Planning Team Leader, Rocky Mountain Arsenal NWR, Building 111, Commerce City, Colorado 80022. Comments also may be mailed electronically to rockyflats@fws.gov. The Draft and Final CCP, Draft and Final EIS, Record of Decision, and final rule will be available for viewing and downloading at <http://rockyflats.fws.gov/>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurie Shannon, Planning Team Leader (see address above) at (303) 289-0980, or Fax (303) 289-0579.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Service has initiated Comprehensive Conservation Planning for the future Rocky Flats NWR in Jefferson County, Colorado. Each national wildlife refuge

has specific purposes for which it was established and for which legislation was enacted. Those purposes are used to develop and prioritize management goals and objectives within the National Wildlife Refuge System mission and to guide those public uses proposed for the Refuge. The planning process is a way for the Service and the public to evaluate management goals and objectives for the best possible conservation of this important wildlife habitat, while providing for wildlife-dependent recreation opportunities that are compatible with each Refuge's establishing purposes and the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge Act of 2001 mandates that the refuge will be managed for the purposes of: (1) Restoring and preserving native ecosystems; (2) providing habitat for, and population management of, native plants and migratory and resident wildlife; (3) conserving threatened and endangered and candidate species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; and 4) providing opportunities for compatible scientific research.

The Federal Government acquired 2,519 acres of the 6,300-acre Rocky Flats site in 1951 for use as a nuclear weapons production facility. The remaining acreage was acquired in 1974–1976. In 1992, the mission of the Rocky Flats site changed to site cleanup and closure in a manner that is safe, environmentally and socially responsible, physically secure, and cost-effective. The majority of the site has generally remained undisturbed since its acquisition, and provides habitat for many wildlife species, including a resident, federal-listed threatened species. Within the site is a rare xeric tallgrass prairie plant community. Establishing the site as a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System will promote the preservation and enhancement of its natural resources for present and future generations.

By Federal law, all lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System are to be managed in accordance with an approved CCP. A CCP describes the desired future conditions of the refuge and provides long-range guidance and management direction to accomplish the purposes of the refuge, contribute to the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and meet other relevant mandates. The planning process will consider many elements including habitat and wildlife management, wildlife-dependent recreation opportunities, environmental education, and other wildlife-dependent uses. Public input into this process is essential. The Service is requesting

input for issues, concerns, ideas, and suggestions for the future management of Rocky Flats NWR. Anyone interested in providing input is invited to respond to the following three questions:

(1) What makes the Rocky Flats NWR special or unique to you?

(2) What problems or issues do you want to see addressed in the CCP?

(3) What are your recommendations for future management of Rocky Flats NWR?

The above questions were designed to stimulate thinking about Rocky Flats and its future management. The Service invites any relevant comments or ideas and does not require that participants provide any specific information. Comments received by the planning team will be used as part of the planning process.

An opportunity will be given to the public to provide input at public meeting to scope issues and concerns. These public scoping meetings will be held in nearby communities in September 2002. The meetings will take place in facilities meeting accessibility requirements outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act. Citizens with disabilities that may require accommodation to participate in or to understand the meeting, should contact Laurie Shannon, Refuge Planner, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service at (303) 289–0980 at least one week in advance so arrangements for accommodations can be made. Comments also may be submitted anytime during the planning process by writing to the above addresses.

The environmental review of this project will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), NEPA Regulations (40 CFR 1500–1508), and other appropriate Federal laws and regulations, and Service policies and procedures for compliance with those regulations. All comments received from individuals on Service EISs become part of the official public record. Requests for such comments will be handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, NEPA (40 CFR 1506.6(f)), and other Departmental and Service policy and procedures. When requested, the Service generally will provide comment letters with the names and addresses of the individuals who wrote the comments. However, the telephone number of the commenting individual will not be provided in response to such requests to the extent permissible by law. Additionally, public comment letters are not required to contain the commenter's name, address, or any other identifying information.

Dated: July 31, 2002.

John A. Blankenship,

Acting Regional Director, Region 6, Denver, Colorado.

[FR Doc. 02–21505 Filed 8–22–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Geological Survey

Technology Transfer Act of 1986

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey.

ACTION: Notice of proposed Cooperative Research & Development Agreement (CRADA) negotiations.

SUMMARY: The United States Geological Survey (USGS) is contemplating entering into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) with the American Geological Institute to develop and distribute USGS GIS database information in a variety of educational mediums.

INQUIRIES: If any other parties are interested in similar activities with the USGS, please contact Beth Duff, Business Development Office, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 500, Reston, Virginia, 20192, phone: (703) 648–4621.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is submitted to meet the USGS policy requirements stipulated in Survey Manual Chapter 500.20.

Dated: August 8, 2002.

Robert A. Lidwin,

Acting Associate Director for Geography.

[FR Doc. 02–21516 Filed 8–22–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–Y7–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Geological Survey

Technology Transfer Act of 1986

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey.

ACTION: Notice of proposed Cooperative Research & Development Agreement (CRADA) negotiations.

SUMMARY: The United States Geological Survey (USGS) is contemplating entering into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) with Pixxures, Inc. to develop spatial data Internet deployment technologies which allow Internet publication of aerial imagery.

INQUIRIES: If any other parties are interested in similar activities with the USGS, please contact Beth Duff, Business Development Office, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 500, Reston, Virginia 20192, phone: (703) 648–4621.

**APPENDIX D —
SUMMARY LIST OF COMMENTS**

Appendix D. Summary List of Comments

This list contains a summary of the explicit comments that were gathered during the various scoping activities, including public scoping meetings, public agency consultation, focus group meetings, and written comments. A total of 1,881 individual comments were collected during the scoping process. This list is a summary of explicit comments and does not include multiple occurrences of the same substantive comment.

Vegetation Management

General

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prairie grasses that have never been plowed • Upland shrub community • Unique biotic communities and wildlife populations • Good example of intact ecosystem • Opportunity to merge vegetation and management near metro area 	<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate research opportunities • Existing plans for adjacent managed lands • Restoration of native ecosystems • Habitat fragmentation by roads and utility corridors • Appropriate sites for soil disturbing activities and prescribed fire (re: contamination) • Methods, intensity and purpose of grazing (if any) 	<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active management including fire, stream restoration, weed control and road closures • Maintain and restore natural habitats and ecosystem • Consider a full range of vegetation conditions • Create vegetated patches in a creative way • Introduce Ute Ladies'-Tresses Orchid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of tallgrass prairie • Regional grassland conservation goals • Protection of wetlands in if water is insufficient • Vegetation – wildlife connection • Grazing – soil disturbance issues • Historical grazing practices • Restoration of industrial area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage vegetation carefully • Understand past land uses to inform management • Create a mixed grazing program • View grazing as a management tool • Grazing - use herding techniques instead of fencing (including fire) • Bison wouldn't graze site in the spring

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve natural prairie ecosystem • Emphasize monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management • Study prescribed burning and grazing as management tools • Manage to protect plants and plant communities ranked by CNHP as imperiled or critically imperiled • Restore disturbed areas • Coordinate with Boulder’s grassland conservation plan • Continue ecological monitoring • Vegetation Management Planning process should be thorough and addresses the public’s concerns • Preserve processes that will sustain native vegetation • Consider potential effects of prairie dogs on vegetation • Study grasslands in surrounding areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grazing by domestic animals is inappropriate • Create habitat patches • Consider a range of vegetation conditions • Set measurable objectives for management tools • Use the best science available for vision, goals and measurable outcomes • Use trails for fire breaks • Short grasses are resistant and resilient • Industrial area will need attention –restoration • Focus on management goals • Do not limit management tool box – grazing, fire, herbicides, etc. • Retain man-made wetlands to provide watershed protection • Scientific resource – treat it carefully • Goal should be habitat management
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fire

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of fire, including weed control and regeneration 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire management • Fire will generate significant public interest • Level of contamination that is acceptable to burn • Risk/fear of airborne contamination • Objectives of prescribed burning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception of risk • Risk of wildfires • Effects of fire on invertebrates • Alternatives to burning • Air monitoring

Recommendations

- No burning
- Fire is important for grassland management
- Do not rule out controlled burns
- Some localized burning in uncontaminated areas is ok
- Study fire history and how it has shaped current resources
- Fire is a bad idea
- Err on the side of caution
- Do not oppose prescribed burns for weed management
- Use controlled fire to remove wildfire fuel, which can choke vegetation
- Natural fire cycle is about 7-10 years
- Accidental or natural fires will occur
- Use prescribed fire to minimize uncontrolled wildfires
- Allow communities to review and comment on Vegetation Management Plan and Standard Operating Procedures for prescribed burns
- Unique time to promote fire as a management tool, due to summer fires
- Trails and roads can serve as firebreaks
- Educate surrounding communities prior to prescribed fires
- Develop partnerships for research on burning
- Can't do research and burns simultaneously
- Propose burn and non-burn areas
- Manage for low-smoke fires
- Manage controlled burns well to retain credibility
- Grazing may have more particle emissions than burning
- Can result in spread of weeds if managed poorly
- Burn wetlands to promote orchids
- Fire can be used to move wildlife
- Consider impacts from burning due to contamination
- Independent study of fire and contamination

Weed Control

Qualities

- Unique site for its resilience and resistance to weeds

Issues

- Non-native species management
- Integration with adjacent open space
- Identification of weed species
- Grazing for vegetation management
- Herbicide spraying
- Wildlife species reintroduction (grouse) may hamper weed control efforts
- Spread of weeds due to ground disturbance
- Use of insect biological weed controls
- Weeds in mining areas
- Weed dispersal due to horses

Recommendations

- Aggressively manage weeds
- Prevent and manage invasive species
- Study effects of weeds/non-native plants on native plant community
- Use natural methods to control weeds
- Use full range of pest management tools
- No biological weed control
- Continue current noxious weed control program
- Include grazing and burning
- Continue use of manual weed management and goat herds
- Minimal use of herbicides
- Develop an integrated weed management plan
- Use minimum-security inmates for weed control w/ protective equipment and informed consent
- Use early season grazing to control warm season weeds
- Use spring grazing to control cheat grass
- Require horse manure catchers
- Keep trails out of weed-free areas
- Grazing and fire are both useful tools but can also cause damage

Wildlife Management

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contiguous with more than 50,000 acres of open lands • Habitat in Rock Creek area • Shortgrass/tallgrass habitat • Preble's meadow jumping mouse • Songbirds • Wetlands and riparian areas • Unusually rich diversity of butterfly species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife impacts on sensitive vegetation • Healthy mule deer population size • Protection and enhancement of raptor habitat • Impact of mouse on trail development • Impact of hunting on species reintroduction • Preble's mouse/habitat requirements post-closure • Preble's mouse management • Preble's habitat in ditches • Impacts to Preble's from changes in ground and surface water flows • FWS will be held to a very high standard regarding Preble's impacts • Elk migration onto site • West Nile Virus – ponds and wetlands • Adjacent housing impacts • Impacts of adjacent Wind Technology Center on migratory birds • West Nile Virus and mosquito control
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife resources that need protection • Restoration and protection of threatened and endangered species • Species reintroduction – sharp-tail grouse, bison, badgers, pronghorn, wolves • Reintroduction of federally listed species • Impacts of public use on wildlife • Historic wildlife use • Migration of threatened and endangered species onto private land • Impacts of wildlife (coyotes, deer) on adjacent landowners • Chronic wasting disease • Migration corridors – where? - fencing, preventing road kill • Relocation of prairie dogs from developing areas • Prairie dog carrying capacity • Prairie dogs and contamination • Waterfowl use and management in ponds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate any hunting with surrounding wildlife managers • Riparian areas should be protected for all species • Use trails to manage wildlife • Create habitat before introducing species • Retain and enhance raptor habitat • Trails can disturb raptors feeding on prairie dogs • Trails may increase predation on Preble's mouse • Do not allow wildlife underpasses to become trail linkages
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address restoration, protection, and enhancement of habitat • Identify significant problems which may affect wildlife • Allow wildlife to be as natural as possible • Develop wildlife and habitat database • No wildlife use • Educate public on hunting as a management tool • Allow safe place for prairie dogs • No prairie dogs 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow scientific research on the effects of contamination on wildlife • Wildlife fences to prevent road kill • Tunnels under surrounding roads for wildlife passage • Integrate wildlife corridors with trail planning • Preserve raptor nests during nesting periods • Should not be used as a dumping ground for unwanted prairie dogs or other animals • Do not introduce burrowing species (prairie dogs) to the site • Work with Open Space staff to maximize integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design appropriate underpasses for different species • Try to connect Preble’s habitat across drainages; off-site • Wildlife are sometimes less disturbed by cars • Reintroduce a sustainable sharptail grouse population • Prioritize among wildlife uses • Inviolate wildlife sanctuary • Coordinate with Northwest Parkway planning • Adaptation of wildlife is natural
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Public Use
General

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to large metropolitan area • Beautiful view of mountains and Standley Lake • Natural beauty • Could serve as recreational cornerstone of region • Visual benefits on and off site • Opportunity for solitude 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary purpose is wildlife conservation 	
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve large urban population • Provide quality wildlife-dependent recreation • Create sense of ownership and support • Prioritize scientific needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t lose sight of refuge mission • Consider family recreation needs • Remember compatibility issues • Refuge experience is a starting point

Trails

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nexus of several regional trail systems • Excellent trail opportunities – views, terrain and wildlife • Regional attraction - interconnected trails, 3.5 million visitors to Boulder open space • Trails are the most popular activity in Colorado (70% of rec. uses) 	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to define regional trail vision <p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore how public and wildlife can coexist • Off trail recreation can increase vulnerability to weed dispersal, wildlife displacement, and habitat fragmentation • Criteria for trail design • Integration/connection with surrounding trail systems • High demand for bicycle and horse trails in surrounding parks/open spaces • Constraints from residual contamination • Soil disturbance constraints • Erosion and water quality • Impact of Preble's mouse protections on trail construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spread of weeds due to trails • Direct and indirect wildlife impacts • Connections with adjacent Arvada parcel • Trail funding options • Seasonal trail closures for wildlife • Trail connections across/under highways • Trail along transportation corridor (Indiana) • Using existing two-track roads for trails • Indiana and SH 93 not safe for bikes
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail system is essential within Rocky Flats • Trails that benefit visitors, minimize environmental impacts • Trails secondary to wildlife needs • Refuge purpose suggests limited trails • Keep trails out of riparian areas • Trails should avoid sensitive areas • Provide loop trails • Not a regional trail hub • Perimeter trails better for wildlife • Create trails for wildlife observation • Let good science dictate where and for who • Make trails go where people want them to go • Appropriate trails across site, not just perimeter • Safe and pleasant trails • No trails next to highways • Wheelchair access to trails • Create good bike and rollerblade trails • Consider horse trails • Segregate hiking and biking trails • Don't need a lot of trail miles • Provide trails only to unique resources/sites • If safe, would like to see hiking and mountain biking trails • Segregated trails for different users • Open some trails to bikes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide north-south trail along eastern part of Refuge • Consider implications of Arvada development • Place trails near water • Use current access points/roads for paved trail • Surrounding communities need to agree on locations and linkages • Trail underpasses • Design trails will to limit dispersed use • Plant trees and put in benches near trails • Prohibit off-trail vehicle, horse, bike and foot travel • Consider multiple trails for separate users • Linkages to current and future trail systems • Develop trail connection between Rocky Flats and Two Ponds NWR • Link Front Range Trail to Visitor's Center • Regional linkages seem premature – not all pieces are in place • Trail users best unpaid security • Trails can help manage people • Rocky Flats should not be a trail hub • Create adopt-a-trail program • Let science dictate where and for who • Consider regional state trails planning grant • Link trail plans with highway plans • Coordinate linkages with uses • Trails should support interpretive needs • Connect with visitors center/museum

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking-only trails – unmet need • If bikes allowed, hiking-only trails ok • Educate trail users to avoid conflicts • Soft surface trails – crusher fines • Connect to Colorado Hills/Great Western OS trails • Coordinate and integrate key north/south and east/west trail corridors • Consider existing trails in Boulder and Jefferson Counties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No trails planned west of SH 93 • Research use of existing two-track roads in Preble’s habitat • Trails need to be 100 meters from riparian habitat • Roads may not be the best for trails due to grade/materials • Keep trails on top of ridge lines • Consider impacts of Refuge users on other jurisdictions
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Public Access

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (none stated) 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much access and what type • Types of permitted uses, including hunting, fishing, ORV use, hiking, biking, equestrian use • Dogs permitted? • Multi-use pressures threaten the vision of restoration and preservation • Activities should be carefully managed to prevent degradation of ecosystem processes • Hunting – integration with surrounding sites that do not allow hunting • Hunting is an unmet need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any special restrictions associated with hunting • Compatibility of recreation with weed management • Timing/ hours of access – compatibility with wildlife viewing • Impacts of different human uses • Compatibility of hunting and environmental education • Compatible uses given proximity to metro area • ADA accessibility • Direct access for future adjacent residents
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow public access • Allow no public access • Limited access to protect ecosystem • Careful and controlled access • Allow no hunting • Allow hunting on the refuge • Don’t limit the types of hunting opportunities • Implement hunting in a way that is compatible with other uses • Allow no hunting, except for population or disease control • Short-range hunting ok: archery, black powder, etc. • Allow hunting for species other than just deer and elk • Hunting part of social/cultural norm for some • Allow falcon hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study impacts of dogs • Allow field trials for hunting dogs • Prefer environmental education and wildlife observation • Wildlife observation a legitimate and valuable use • Prohibit off-road vehicle use • Educational tours only • Allow pedestrian, equestrian and bike access • Minimum impact use • Determine public access based on extent of cleanup • Safe public access areas should be clearly defined • Restrict public access to dangerous areas • Restrict access to areas that would highly impact wildlife • Considerable pressure to allow public recreational access

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting is not year round • Educate public about hunting • Hunting as a management tool only beneficial public use – others have impacts • Hunting not permitted on nearby open lands • Hunting is not appropriate in an urban area • Consider dispersed recreation opportunities • Guided access and tours • Consider modes of access • Provide bike access • No bike access • No light rail access • Provide access by bus • No access by car • Cars are useful as viewing blinds • Allow equal access for hikers, bikes, and horses • Open refuge to scientific research • Education and research are important • Close site to all anthropogenic activities • Dogs off leash are significant wildlife impacts • Dogs on leash may impact wildlife observation • Many dog owners ignore leash laws 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent form for any human access • Prohibit access until site is safe • Manage people through restriction, fences, and trails • Explain benefits and risks of access • Educate about proper wildlife viewing • Consider impacts of observation and photography on wildlife • Provide undeveloped opportunities • Everything can cohabitate on 6,000 acres • Need comprehensive travel management plan • Walk-in access from Superior • Bicycling can provide quiet, clean, low impact access for visitor use • Once a use is permitted, difficult to pull back • Establish transition areas where management differences are conveyed • Consider impacts of horse use (weeds, trails, parking) • Prevent unofficial “backdoor” access • Limit number of people per day • Consider seasonal closures • Access helps develop supportive public and sense of ownership • Make hours of access reflect dawn and dusk wildlife observation times • Compare current and future levels of use • Interested organizations should take some management responsibility • Close access to site if not managed/maintained properly
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Recreation Facilities

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for collaboration with Cold War Museum 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor center • Cold War Museum location • Water supply for visitors center • Access via the east and/or west entrances • Existing firing range 	
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up viewing areas • Interpretive overlooks • Develop scenic overlook on Highway 128 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If visitor center built, should be subtle construction • Visitor Center supported as long as it is a new facility not owned by DOE 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide parking for cars and bikes • Parking lot size and location can drive visitor use/volume • One motorized vehicle loop • Restroom facilities • Co-locate Visitor's Center with Cold War Museum • Cold War Museum – provide archive for Rocky Flats documents • West entrance for visitor's center • Visitor Center is not in line with Refuge purpose • No Visitor Center • Visitor Center in conjunction with Rocky Mountain Arsenal NWR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor Center should be a multi-purpose facility • Keep visitor center site oriented • Education center is important for surrounding metro area • A kiosk is not enough to serve recreational needs • Arsenal serves as “flagship” visitor center • Ponds would be nice • Do not create something that is not there (fishery) • Firing range fills an unmet community need • Firing range compatible with hunting on refuge • Create a wildlife viewing blind
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Environmental Education/Interpretation

<p><i>Qualities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boulder Valley an opportunity for education because of proximity • Untouched landscape within urban sprawl • Opportunity for recreational learning • Opportunity for mentoring • Rich cultural history – integrate it! 	
<p><i>Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Boulder OS guided nature programs are full • Statewide need for high school trips • Public perceptions of site safety • Eldorado Springs SP under-utilized • Division of Wildlife program • Unmet market – day camps, scouts, after school, home schoolers, seniors • Time constraints for teachers • Most school grades take environmental trips • Program follow-up in schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish/bilingual programs • Time frame for education programs • Partnerships – School of Mines, Naropa, Urban Wildlife Partnership, Earth Storage, Chatfield • Facility needs (bathrooms, shelter, water, conference room, etc) • In -school programs are expensive • Organized site tours • Teacher training • Over development of educational and interpretive sites
<p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide educational and interpretive opportunities • Interpretation opportunities both on and off site • Set up weather measuring devices for education • Provide geological education • Provide rattlesnake hill and ant hill • Put Refuge in Colorado context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tie-in to refuge via website or class work • Use to inform residents about ecosystem functions • Well developed program can apply to all schools • Blend environmental and social science programs – provide balance • Need outreach to parents • Need outreach to school boards

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show how different groups are connected to the site • Share USFWS successes, including Arsenal • Collaborate with other agencies/jurisdictions on environmental education • Keep kids and day trips out of there • Educate why things are done or not done • Provide educational tours based on stewardship management, history, and wildlife • Focus educational programs on native plant/animal species and their conservation • Implement volunteer program on site • Provide historical/archaeological interpretation • Educate the public to the reduced post-closure risks of the site • Educate on wildlife and contamination • Involve students in remediation • Need programs for older students (data collection on resources, prebles, etc.) • Need a good website • Create ambassador program for community outreach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need outreach to surrounding communities • Need proactive approach to issues • Convey that access is restricted to certain areas • May need complex education plan – different partnerships, audiences, programs, etc. • Focus on unique characteristics of site • Consider changing site name • Begin with public perception – move slow • Develop programs before facilities • Define difference between interpretation and environmental education • Teach about grassland education, weed mitigation, and ecological restoration • Look at other grassland education programs • Loop trail for education programs • Need multiple trails to disperse groups on site • Avoid the “build it and they will come” trap • Need very clear outline • Piggyback on other agencies |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Cultural Resources

Qualities

- Historic Lindsay Ranch
- History of nuclear weapons production
- Rocky Flats is an important part of our history
- Native American resources
- Historical significance of site

Issues

- Preserving the history of the site
- Lindsay Ranch – how to preserve the history it represents
- Stabilizing cultural resources – Lindsay Ranch
- Addressing Lindsay Ranch protection and access simultaneously
- Lindsay Ranch type structures are increasingly rare along Front Range
- Lindsay Ranch is of local interest, not national significance
- Native American history, cultural significance
- Tribute to the legacy of the Cold War

Recommendations

- Preserve Lindsay Ranch
- Keep people away from Lindsay Ranch
- View Lindsay Ranch from a distance
- Create a picnic or rest area at Lindsay Ranch
- Begin Lindsay Ranch preservation efforts immediately
- Allow nature to take its course at Lindsay Ranch
- Offer historic and interpretive tours to Lindsay Ranch
- Explore retaining key structures for landmarks
- Construct Honor Wall to honor former employees
- Preserve historical memory of site – cold war and reminder of need to protect human health and environment from residual contamination

Property

General

Qualities

- (none stated)

Issues

- Lands to be transferred from DOE to USFWS
- Section 16 – can it be included in Refuge, compensation, mineral rights, land trade potential
- The area between highway 93 and the Refuge

Recommendations

- Consider implications of Arvada’s development
- Buffer adjacent private lands
- Add state land to Refuge
- Acquire strip of land between Refuge and Highway 93

Mineral Rights

Qualities

- (none stated)

Issues

- Federal government does not own mineral rights
- Possibility of on-site surface mining
- Mining conflicts with draft vision and goals and Refuge mission
- Effect of refuge designation on mineral rights and easements
- Effect on land to west of RF along Highway 93
- Effect on state land – Section 16

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration potential of gravel mining areas to benefit Refuge • Refuge and surface mining not compatible • How mineral rights will affect decisions about which lands are ultimately transferred to the Service • Mineral rights – acquisition possibilities • Oil and gas drilling
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include and restore mined areas • Subjugate mining rights through compensatory negotiation • All mineral rights should be acquired • Work with willing sellers to secure mineral rights • Address mineral rights fairly • Allow future access to private mineral rights • Clarify ownership and assess viability of mineral right ownership

Transportation Corridor

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (none stated) 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for transportation corridor • NEPA requirements for transportation corridor (regional impacts) • Timing and method of transfer of Indiana Right-of-way to CDOT or others • Compatibility of transportation corridor with draft vision and goals for the refuge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future road improvements in area • Impact of Refuge on regional road system • Air pollution due to increased traffic • Wildlife migration, noise, and air quality impacts
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve 300-foot right-of-way for transportation corridor • Identify and minimize impacts of transportation corridor on Refuge resources • Develop standards to determine impacts of transportation corridor • Provide mitigation measures for impacts due to transportation corridor • Consider effects of transportation corridor on off-site resources (streams, viewsheds, wildlife corridors, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider impacts and alternatives to transportation corridor, including no corridor • Consider alternative right-of-way (ROW) widths and identify narrowest possible ROW • Address effects of transportation corridor on regional environment • Plan for a narrower transportation corridor (no more than 50 feet) • 300-foot transportation corridor not necessary

Infrastructure

General

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (none stated) 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement of roads and pathways • Location of restricted areas • Future of the east and west entrances • Northwest Parkway – impacts, coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location and nature of parking lots • Appearance/character of refuge • Visible scars from roads and utilities
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize light pollution • Keep and use existing roads • No additional roads, powerlines, etc. • Leave existing roads as fire breaks • Install sprinkler system to control fire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate existing infrastructure as much as possible • Use existing infrastructure • No gas wells • No vertical structures

Fencing/Signage

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (none stated) 	
<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal and external fencing and signage • Boundary fences/signs • Appropriate fencing for species on refuge • Fencing and signs to keep people out of contaminated areas • How the outside boundaries will be marked • Fencing – public image of refuge boundary 	

Recommendations

- Incorporate good fences and good fence maintenance
- No signs or fences that mark the site as “blighted”
- Fencing should maintain rural character
- No fences
- Facilitate big game movement
- Don’t interrupt wildlife movement with fences
- Fully enclosed site with radiation signs on fence
- Fence – minimize aesthetic impacts
- Convey that the site is a regional asset
- Do not sacrifice refuge quality and safety with fencing
- Minimize fencing
- Simple messages in signs
- Pay attention to what you are not saying
- Control traffic-send people where you want them to go
- Be clear about what is restricted, where, and why
- Need to fence adjacent cattle out

Water Resources

Qualities

- (none stated)

Issues

- Retention of ponds not required for cleanup
- Measures to maintain/restore water quality and quantity
- Lack of water for visitor’s center and other facilities
- Minimum flow for Rock Creek
- Future hydrologic conditions

Recommendations

- Allow access to private water rights (ditches and canals)

- Protection of surface water rights held by others
- Lack of water rights owned by DOE
- Availability of water for wildfire control
- Water quality issues – Standley Lake, Woman Creek

Refuge Operations

Qualities

- (none stated)

Issues

- Preservation of rare resources – xeric tall grass, mouse, cultural, historic – sharing and protection
- Partnerships with local communities and open space programs
- Relationships with other existing ecosystem or watershed planning efforts
- Available funding for resource conservation and DOE’s long-term stewardship obligations
- Integration with adjacent and regional open spaces
- Intergovernmental agreements for emergency response
- Integration with adjacent developed lands, or privately owned open lands subject to development
- Funding for appropriate staffing
- Loss of tax revenue for Jefferson County
- Security staffing
- Character of site after closure
- Law enforcement and maintenance

Recommendations

- Identify priority items before assigning budgets to them
- Emphasize monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management
- Build relationship with area tribes
- Regional economy is important
- Continue to work with local governments
- Community outreach
- Lots of management due to location
- Educate public on the difference between refuge management and adjacent open space
- Staffing- single resident manager is cost effective

Cleanup Levels and Remediation

Qualities

- Opportunity to study effects of contamination

Issues

- Contamination
- Long-term stewardship
- Full characterization of site
- Bio-magnification
- Possibility of undetected radiation hot spots
- Chemicals will outlive responsible agencies
- Safe cleanup levels for public access
- Impacts of wildlife (prairie dogs) on contamination
- Underground process and transfer lines
- Reclamation strategy to inform environmental restoration
- Re-suspension of radionuclide particles
- Mistrust of DOE and their contractors
- Effect of residual contamination on wildlife and potential bioaccumulation in animals
- Past environmental crimes that have not been properly investigated
- Contamination of known carcinogens
- Independence and competency of Citizens Advisory Board
- Contamination is long-lived in the environment
- Conflicts of interest within the state health department
- Competency of state health department

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spread of contamination through wildlife • Matching the locations and levels of residual contamination to the designated uses and the level of access • Coordination with the cleanup decision making and progress on the cleanup record of decision • Interface between Refuge and DOE – controlled areas • CCP is not a cleanup document – cleanup trumps refuge • Support long-term study of site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distrust of government and their statements about risk • Perception of risk and accountability • Responsibility of DOE to communicate risk • Internal and external communication needs • DOE controls on capped and covered areas • On-going testing and evaluation • Impacts to wildlife are poorly understood
<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider effects on human environment • Cover site with protective mesh and sprinkler system • Provide risk assessment for those concerned about radiation in soil • Citizens need to be convinced that the site is safe • Do not separate nuclear waste and wildlife refuge issues • Study phytoremediation to draw contaminants from the soil • Mark perimeter of site with signs indicating past use and contamination • Consider refuge to be called a “Restricted Access Nuclear National Wildlife Refuge” • No commercialization or promotion of site • Require personal protective equipment for all humans on site • Test carcasses of deer killed for disease or population control • Complete aerial gamma surveys of site • Ensure continuous monitoring • Display all available information about contamination • Allow independent review of contamination levels • Minimize potential danger to public • Can not discuss refuge issues without clear understanding of cleanup levels • Take a prudent approach to potentially harmful health effects • All remediation infrastructure should be clearly marked and identified • Utilize latest exposure risk data and clean-up technologies • Purge all technically incompetent people from the decision-making process • Purge from the process all people with conflicts of interest • All final decisions should be reviewed by competent, independent, civilian review board • Scientifically develop risk levels for different users 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate the public on where we are now and who’s responsible for what (DOE, FWS, etc.) • Educate on history, contamination, and resources – signs, programs, etc. • Educate and involve the public • Focus outreach on each level of concerned citizens • Build trust of community – acknowledge that all are concerned • Comprehensive community outreach and education • Communicate about similar sites • Address community issues • Don’t forget what is out there • Ask public about trade-off decisions about risk • Consider credibility of risk information • Provide good, clear, and reliable information about risk so public can make own choices • Education about risk should not come from DOE • Need independent spokesperson to community • Trail signs that say “don’t dig anywhere” • Create robust stewardship program • Create advisory groups • If risk doesn’t limit use then communicate USFWS standard procedures in alternatives • Alternatives need to clearly state which areas will be reassessed following cleanup • The public will trust a person more than an entity • Acknowledge that everybody is equally concerned • Don’t pretend site history never happened • Dialogue with past generations for information and stories • Final decisions should be reviewed by an independent board 	

Planning Process

<p>Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public scoping meetings were a productive step – generated thoughtful discussion between and among citizens and agency staff 	<p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness of site for NWR Concern about whether “proposed trails” on land use maps represent plans for the site Public discussion and comment opportunities at meetings Prioritization of goals Political maneuvering undermining public concerns 	<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FWS continue to work with RFCAB and other community groups More dialogue about the future infrastructure needs of the Refuge Allow plan to mesh with other county-level planning efforts Need better outreach for public meetings Would like an open forum at public meetings More substantive presentations at meetings Allow for questions during presentations at meetings Should not have pre-selected comment categories at meetings EIS overly-rushed Opportunities for public involvement are overly constrained Scoping process has not been adequate Focus groups do not represent environmental viewpoints Focus groups not convenient for citizen participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus groups – address issue of managing a contaminated wildlife refuge Conduct a field trip for stakeholders Interest groups should meet with land managers early in the process Provide a set of aerials to stakeholders at meetings Extend EIS scoping period Close the site and stop planning Conduct additional public scoping meetings Meetings should allow substantive oral comments Week of September 11 a poor week to hold meetings Use trained facilitators/note takers for small groups at meetings Do not create a plan that cannot be achieved (through resources) Support re-use of the site as a NWR Develop a 50-year vision for the site
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**APPENDIX E —
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS**

Appendix E. Summary of Written Comments

Author	Date	Summary of Comments
Ron Jones No address (email)	8/26/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memories of site in 1940's • Access to refuge by light rail would have major consequences • Limit light pollution • Educational opportunities including rattlesnake hill and ant hills
Charles McKay Church Ranch 10050 Wadsworth Blvd. Westminster, CO 80021	9/3/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral rights are privately owned by various parties • Do not impair access to these minerals
Charles McKay Church Ranch 10050 Wadsworth Blvd. Westminster, CO 80021	9/4/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent grazing activities • Coyote impacts on adjacent calves • Impacts from Rocky Flats deer herd on range land
Charles McKay Church Ranch 10050 Wadsworth Blvd. Westminster, CO 80021	9/4/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue noxious weed control • Keep proper fence design and maintenance in mind • Do not introduce prairie dogs • Do not want endangered species on adjacent property
Charles McKay Smart Reservoir and Irrigation, Inc. 10050 Wadsworth Blvd. Westminster, CO 80020	9/4/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family owns water rights, ditch rights and water storage rights • Do not hamper access to water rights
Len H. Carpenter Wildlife Management Institute 4015 Cheney Drive Fort Collins, CO 80526	9/5/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to metropolitan area • Serve large urban human population while maintaining natural habitats • Provide educational opportunities • Prevent and manage invasive species • Identify appropriate research opportunities • Plans should be independent of budget process • Identify priorities before assigning budgets to them • Identify educational and interpretive opportunities/partnerships • Specify the effect of expanded public use on wildlife • Address habitat/species restoration, protection and enhancement • Identify significant problems that may impact wildlife • Prioritize monitoring and adaptive management • Address restoration of threatened and endangered species • Address development of scientific database • Provide for quality wildlife-dependent recreation • Consider plans for adjacent managed lands • Address active management to benefit wildlife • Address methods, intensity and purpose of grazing • Address maintenance of water quality and quantity • Address relationship with existing ecosystem or watershed efforts • Address fire management and vegetation management

<p>Ann J. Lockhart 2332 Eudora St. Denver, CO 80207</p>	<p>9/9/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of mountains and Standley Lake • Set up viewing areas • Provide risk assessment for contamination • Provide parking for cars and bikes and bus access • Consider wheelchair access to trails • Set up weather measuring devices • Create good bike and rollerblade trails • Consider horse trails • Plant trees and put in benches near trails • Co-locate visitor’s center with Cold War Museum • Could have bird watching, photography, and other classes/lectures • No hunting unless for certain circumstances • Collaborate with other agencies and organizations • Preserve Lindsay Ranch but keep people away
<p>Paul Kilburn, President Jefferson County Nature Association 6695 Terry Court Arvada, CO 80007</p>	<p>9/10/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refuge is centered in a much larger wild open space area • Encourage use of burning and grazing for tallgrass prairie • Include and restore mined areas
<p>Paula Elofson-Gardine Susan Elofson-Hurst Environmental Information Network, Inc. P.O. Box 280087 Lakewood, CO 80228</p>	<p>9/10/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as “Restricted Access Nuclear Reserve” • Site has been CERCLA and RCRA site for over 15 years • Some areas will not be cleaned up • Restrict access for perpetuity • No commercialization, promotion, hiking trails, or tours • Contamination extremely long lived in environment • Re-suspension of particles is an extreme health hazard • Require personal protective equipment • Wildlife are “radiologically hot” • Test carcasses of killed wildlife • Permanent moratorium on burning • Conduct aerial gamma surveys • Minimize use of herbicides • Attachment: Actinide Concentrations in Cattle Grazing Near the Rocky Flats Plant • Attachment: Rocky Flats – Not a Park and Recreation District • Attachment: Rocky Flats and the Haystack Fire • Attachment: Living within a Radioactive Fallout Zone • Attachment: Stop the Nuclear Brushfires • Attachment: Rocky Flats Liability Disclaimer (Suggested) • Attachment: Notes for a meeting with EPA, 9/22/00
<p>Martha Bushnell, Ph.D. 502 Ord Drive Boulder, CO 80303-4732</p>	<p>9/11/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit public access until site is pristine • Allow for scientific research on contamination
<p>Jyoti Wind/CCNWI PMB 371, 1705 14th St. Boulder, CO 80302</p>	<p>9/12/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No human involvement on site • No access for environmental education • Should be closed down with radiation signage on perimeter fences

Lynn Segal 538 Dewey Ave. Boulder, CO 80304	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No human or wildlife use because of contamination Enclose the site in a fine mesh Install a sprinkler system to control fire No fire under any condition Vulnerability of insects used in weed control to contamination
Anonymous	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to study long term effects of contamination Close the site and stop planning Do not ever allow public access
Anonymous	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contamination Public access will be fatal
Lee Carlson No address (telephone call)	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should existing ponds be retained?
Nancy Lee 1520 Lodge Ct. Boulder, CO 80303	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hunting should not be allowed Allow a safe place for prairie dogs
LeRoy Moore, Ph.D. Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center P.O. Box 1156 Boulder, CO 80306	9/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised 9/16/02 – same topics Site is badly contaminated and should be managed as such Entire site is contaminated to some extent Site has not been thoroughly characterized, or is incomplete Undetected hot spots of various contaminants Thorough cleanup is not planned or intended Plutonium constitutes a permanent danger Plutonium at Rocky Flats may reach humans Impacts to wildlife are poorly understood No public access Perimeter should be marked to indicate danger Research the effects of contamination Attachment: 1993 Letter from F. Ward Whicker, CSU
Mark Testa 3011 Broadway #11 Boulder, CO 80304	9/13/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep kids and day trips out of there
Suzanne Webel 5735 Prospect Road Longmont, CO 80503	9/13/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nexus of regional trail systems Trail opportunities and design Co-existence of wildlife and trails Make large loop trails Connect with other trail systems No trails next to highways Pedestrian/equestrian/bike access Open site to public access
Kandi McKay Church Ranch 10050 Wadsworth Blvd. Westminster, CO 80021	9/13/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritized public uses: hunting, interpretation, photography, fishing, wildlife observation, and environmental education
S. Aeoghegan P.O. Box 3011 Boulder, CO 80307	9/15/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe cleanup levels Site not appropriate for wildlife refuge Site is contaminated by chemicals that will outlive charge of USFWS No public use Allow the public to speak

Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board – Technical Review Group 9035 Wadsworth Parkway, Suite 2250, Westminster, CO 80021	9/19/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study relocation, carrying capacity, impacts of prairie dogs • Study tunnels under roads for wildlife movement • Determine public access • Consider an independent review of site to determine access • Study phytoremediation at the site • Study how lack of water will shape facilities • Ensure monitoring in the buffer zone • Consider use of grazing and prescribed burning • Study fire history • Study fencing • Establish vegetation management needs • Study effects of residual contamination on wildlife • Study effect of mineral rights • Study extent and nature of contamination • Develop vision of site in 50 years • Study coordination of trail with other jurisdictions • Study whether to allow hunting • Research permitted recreational activities
Anne Fenerty No address (email)	9/20/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of outreach for public meetings • Poor timing of public meetings • Public meeting format not conducive to free and open exchange of information • Consideration of contamination issues on site • Requirements under NEPA to consider effects on the human environment
Cynthia Cody Director, NEPA Program U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 999 18 th Street, Suite 300 Denver, CO 80202-2466	9/25/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Wildlife first” mission • Multi-use pressures threaten vision of restoration/preservation • Carefully manage activities that could degrade habitat • Minimize spread of noxious weeds • Prohibit off-trail travel • Subjugate mineral rights • Wildlife health – contamination • EPA will be assured of site’s safety
Robert Poeschl 3100 Broadway #307 Boulder, CO 80304	9/26/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not open to tours or the general public • Site is contaminated by known carcinogens • Let me know when next public hearing is scheduled
Eric Vogelsberg Boulder Area Trails Coalition PMB 201 1705 14 th Street Boulder, CO 80302	10/1/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail system within Rocky Flats is essential • Concern that “proposed trails” shown on Surrounding Land Use maps are outside of Refuge • Create trails component within Rocky Flats • Provide north-south/east-west trail connections • At least, a trail loop within Rocky Flats should be created • Trails should allow equestrians, bicyclists, and hikers • Attachment: Letter to Sen. Allard
Karl Johanson No address (email)	10/2/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife sanctuary is ok • No public access
Wes McKinley 9635 County Road 44 Walsh, CO 81090	10/2/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past environmental crimes have not been properly investigated • Dangerous to allow public access • Undeveloped wildlife refuge is appropriate

Dr. Peter Rickards DPM 2672 4000N Twin Falls, ID 83301	10/2/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose any public access • Contamination can be resuspended by wind • Warnings to keep out public
Jeffery Eggleston, Chair Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board 9035 Wadsworth Parkway, Suite 2250 Westminster, CO 80021	10/2/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study fencing and signs to protect public from contamination • Consider placement of roads and pathways • Effect of refuge on mineral rights • Effect of refuge on adjacent lands • Restore native ecosystems • Study effects of weeds and non-native species • Study prescribed burning, grazing and fire history • Study effect of residual contamination on wildlife • Study and monitor contamination on site • Study safe areas for public access • Study phytoremediation • Study constructed wildlife corridors • Look at potential connections for trails • Consider access for hunting, off-road vehicles, fishing, hiking, biking, horses and dirt bikes • Provide educational tours • Develop a 50-year vision of the site • Preserve Lindsay Ranch • Study prairie dog relocation • Study water supply for visitors center • Continue to work with RFCAB/ other community groups
Steven E. Davis Rocky Flats Cold War Museum 4131 Spy Glass Lane Niwot, CO 80503	10/3/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential opportunities for collaboration • Preserve Lindsay Ranch • Stabilize Lindsay Ranch buildings • Cold War Museum planning efforts
Ruth Schommer No address (email)	10/4/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like natural trails for walking and riding • No hunting on refuge
Unknown (web submission)	10/8/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting by Service for population control only • Hunting dangerous in urban area • Should not become Prairie dog dumping ground • Trails for educational tours only • Cold War Museum with Visitors Center would be a good feature
Lennard Zinn 7437 S. Boulder Road Boulder, CO 80303	10/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see bicycle trails • Believe bicycle trails are compatible with intent of Refuge
Joe Richardson 2370 Point of Pines Drive Boulder, CO 80302	10/12/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see a trail network open to mountain bikes • Mountain bike access would reduce pollution and traffic
Chris Echelmeier 4587 Tally Ho Trail Boulder, CO 80301	10/15/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear whether mountain biking, dogs and equestrian use will be allowed • Support a trail system and mountain biking

Greg Marsh President Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission 7700 W. 61 st Ave., Suite 12 Arvada, CO 80004	10/15/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morality of the proper degree of cleanup • Lack of independent oversight and quality control • Apply newest exposure risks and cleanup technologies • No meaningful independent oversight • Citizens Advisory Board and CDPHE are incompetent • Conflicts of interest among responsible agencies • Purge all technically incompetent people from process • Purge people with conflicts of interest from the process • Have final decisions reviewed by independent board • No independent environmental audit has been completed • Site must be closed to all anthropogenic activities • Attachment: Trust for America's Health Update • Attachment: Public Citizen press releases • Attachment: Science News article • Attachment: 1987 Denver Post editorial cartoon • Attachment: Resume - CDPHE Radiation Control Director
Steve Gunderson Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment 4300 Cherry Creek Drive South Denver, CO 80246-1523 (email)	10/16/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleanup/Refuge interface • Need for a reclamation strategy to inform restoration • Consider mouse/habitat requirements post-closure • Implement long-term DOE use restrictions/fencing • Consider the status of mineral and water rights
Donna Diamond 1001 E. Moorhead Circle Boulder, CO 80305	10/21/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support public recreational use
Erin Geegan No address (email)	10/21/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not trust that land will ever be cleaned up • No public access unless it is safe • Protect current and future generations from exposure
Suzanne Webel, President Boulder County Horsemen's Association P.O. Box 19601 Boulder, CO 80308-2601	10/21/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a network of safe, off-road trails • Rocky Flats in unique regional trail context • Trails and wildlife can coexist • Concerned that "Proposed trails" on Surrounding Land Use map shown on other jurisdictions • Connect to trail systems outside of Refuge • Would like a field trip and aerial photos for stakeholders
Tom Scrimgeour 810 Alpine Ave. Boulder, CO 80304	10/22/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail system is essential • Would like bicycle and equestrian access • Question hunting • Is hunting compatible with environmental education?
Sue Butcher 4120 Gilpin Drive Boulder, CO 80303	10/24/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider access for cycling, birdwatching, hiking, and horseback riding • Trail design can accommodate different users
Puneet Pasrich No address (email)	10/24/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope to have mountain bike access

<p>John Giezentanner 10551 W. 105th Ave. Westminster, CO 80021</p>	<p>10/24/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem, habitat and scenic qualities • Important connection between other open space • What public access and use would be compatible? • Location of trails to maximize user experience while minimizing wildlife impacts • Close sensitive areas to public use • Visitor's center/museum location? • Protect wildlife and habitat • Allow only non-consumptive public use • Develop partnerships with communities • Safety should not be a big issue • Keep public out of hazardous areas • No fencing around refuge • Trails should not be paved • Prohibit road building, hunting, and off-road vehicle use • Visitor center construction should be subtle
<p>Barbara Taylor 853 Deer Trail Road Boulder, CO 80302</p>	<p>10/24/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space and wildlife qualities • Consider future uses and management • Interest groups should work with process • Consider multiple trails and separate users • Recruit volunteer stewards • People should take responsibility for management • Better to close site than allow it to be trashed • Should be a monument to cold war heritage
<p>Nathan Bufe 901 Miami Way Boulder, CO 80305</p>	<p>10/26/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleanup seems to be inadequate • Prohibit access until it is safe
<p>Scott Hoover Northeast Regional Manager Colorado Division of Wildlife 6060 Broadway Denver, CO 80216</p>	<p>10/29/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for hunting on the Refuge • Believe that hunting is compatible with other uses
<p>Tom Marshall Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center P.O. Box 1156 Boulder, CO 80306</p>	<p>10/29/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that scoping period be extended, and additional public meetings held • Public should be able to give substantive oral comments • Scoping process has not been adequate • Week of Sept. 11 was a poor week for meetings • Presentations on Sept. 12 were sparse with no opportunity for clarifying questions • Meeting structure did not allow substantive public input • Residual contamination was not addressed • Small group facilitators and note takers not trained • Comments not always • Adequacy of scoping process • Public meeting format • Contamination

<p>Michael C. Bestor City Manager City of Golden 911 Tenth Street Golden, CO 80401</p>	<p>10/30/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and minimize effects of transportation corridor on Refuge resources and the region as a whole • Avoid impacts to critical habitat for threatened species • Conserve plant and wildlife habitats on Refuge • Ensure environmental health in the Refuge • Identify actions to mitigate impacts from transportation corridor • Avoid impacts to wetlands and floodplains • Review the impacts of and alternatives to transportation corridor • Provide guidelines to minimize effects of transportation improvements • Develop standards to determine impacts of corridor, mitigation measures, and effects to offsite resources • Consider narrowest practicable right-of-way • Develop a complete inventory of resources • Effects of transportation corridor on regional environment • Assess effects of transportation corridor on regional environment • NEPA requires full assessment of regional impacts of entire highway • Assess impacts of highway on Refuge, Golden and mountain backdrop • Plan for a smaller corridor • Consider type of transportation project for corridor • Transportation corridor unnecessary for regional needs • 300-foot corridor not necessary for regional needs • Impacts from freeway would conflict with vision and goals • Highway would affect migration, noise, and air quality
<p>Dorian Brown Director of Public Works City and County of Broomfield One DesCombes Drive Broomfield, CO 80020</p>	<p>10/30/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned mineral rights have not been addressed • Mining conflicts with draft vision and goals • Address post-closure water supply • Do not support prairie dog/burrowing species reintroduction • Funding is a key issue for Service and DOE stewardship • Work with surrounding governments • Continue ecological monitoring • Require routine ecological surveys • Preble’s meadow jumping mouse protection • Do not oppose prescribed burns for weed management • Ensure thorough public process for Vegetation Management Plan and burning procedures • Public education about reduced risks • Preserve the Lindsay Ranch • Remind future generations of residual contamination needs • Visitor Center should be new, multi-purpose facility • Residual contamination should be clearly identified • Public access should be clearly defined • Communicate with surrounding governments • Would like more dialogue about future infrastructure needs • Clarify future of intergovernmental agreements • Determine how goals will be prioritized

David Meldman No address (email)	10/30/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow public access if areas tested safe for humans • Establish hiking and biking trails in safe areas • Test snow to determine current contamination levels
Dan Grunig Executive Director Bicycle Colorado (need address)	10/31/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a trail system • Provide equal access for all trail users • Consider of existing trails in nearby areas
Ken Fellman, Mayor Lorraine Anderson, Councilmember City of Arvada P.O. Box 8101 8101 Ralson Road Arvada, CO 80001-8101	10/31/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public scoping meetings were a productive step in process • Primary issues are public access and trail linkages • Two Ponds a good example of collaboration • Would like trail connection between Rocky Flats and Two Ponds • Would like a regional approach to public access • Minimize fencing, but do not sacrifice quality or safety • Appearance of refuge will reflect on Arvada • Firing range provides an unmet community need • Support Visitor's center near existing center
Gary Sprung Senior National Policy Advisor International Mountain Bicycling Association P.O. Box 7578 Boulder, CO 80306	10/31/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about anti-bicycling attitudes • Purpose of Refuge is wildlife conservation • Bicycling can provide quiet, non-polluting, low impact transportation for wildlife-dependent uses • Request that open some future trails to bicycles • Many refuges prohibit bicycling with little analysis • Can provide significant professional and volunteer resources for trail construction and maintenance • Consider impacts of bikes next to other uses • Support hiking-only trails • Can assist in educating trail users about cooperating
Kirk Cunningham Conservation and Water Quality Chair Sierra Club Rocky Mountain Chapter Indian Peaks Group P.O. Box 724 Boulder, CO 80306-0724	10/31/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concur with comments from Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center • EIS process seems overly rushed • Public input opportunities are constrained • Environmental viewpoint not represented at focus group meetings • Contamination data are incomplete and substandard • Considerable pressure to allow public recreation access • What wildlife resources need protection from humans? • What are impacts on identified resources from human use? • Display all information about contamination • Perform and independent study of contamination levels

<p>Deborah French Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board 9035 Wadsworth Parkway, Suite 2250, Westminster, CO 80021</p>	<p>10/31/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information gathered from public comment hotline and website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaine Nemeth, Arvada: No public access, should be for wildlife, not the public - Anonymous caller: Citizens should have access, but no hunting. Include bike trails and wildlife photography. - Anonymous writer: Refuge should not allow unwanted prairie dogs - Anonymous writer, Boulder County: Provide trails and access, at least around perimeter - Nathan Bufe, Boulder County: Cleanup seems to be inadequate, prohibit access until it is safe - Anonymous caller: Provide horse trails - Elaine Mongeaux, Golden: Would like horse trails • Online survey results
<p>William R. Toor, Mayor City of Boulder P.O. Box 791 Boulder, CO 80306-0791</p>	<p>10/31/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated grassland management could help achieve regional conservation goals • Unique biotic communities contiguous with over 50,000 acres of open space • Mineral extraction presents significant threat to ecosystems • Mining would increase spread of weeds • Prebles mouse can be impacted by changes in water flows • Support acquisition of mineral rights • Support additional groundwater monitoring • Recommend a integrated weed management plan • Concerned about use of biological weed controls • Manage to protect imperiled plant communities • Ensure restoration and revegetation of disturbed areas • Consider fire and grazing • Research re-suspension of contamination from fire or other activities • Coordinate with City's grassland management plan • Tallgrass prairie is important, support rare butterflies • Collaboration on Prebles mouse conservation • Collaboration on plains sharp-tailed grouse reintroduction • City has no position on bison or pronghorn reintroduction • City supports protection of adjacent lands outside of Refuge • Trail connections can benefit visitors and minimize impacts • Control public access to minimize danger to public • Interested in working at cross-boundary issues
<p>Doug Grinbergs P.O. Box 17455 Boulder, CO 80308</p>	<p>10/31/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed in public meeting format – did not include public discussion and comment opportunity • Don't separate nuclear waste dump and wildlife refuge • Citizens need to be convinced that site is safe • Mistrust of DOE and their partners in crime • Fires are a bad idea – decide on the site of caution • Moot to discuss refuge issues without a clear understanding of final cleanup

<p>Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners 100 Jefferson County Parkway Golden, CO 80419</p>	<p>10/31/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with other County planning efforts • Encouraged by Service lead and progress to date • Believe in need for transportation corridor • Preservation of 300-foot right-of-way is essential • Work with Open Space staff to maximize integration of wildlife corridor with adjacent lands • Multi-purpose trails are key to connections • Key linkages include trails across the site • Integrate key north-south/east-west trail corridors • Lindsay Ranch will increase in interpretive value • Balance access to Lindsay Ranch with preservation • Lindsay Ranch preservation should commence immediately • Visitor's Center/Museum is a tribute to Cold War legacy • Explore the retainment of key site structures/landmarks • Do not rule out prescribed fire for weed control • Fairly address mineral rights • County supports acquisition from willing seller • Not opposed to controlled hunting
<p>Tom Tobiassen No address (web submittal)</p>	<p>10/31/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider modes of access other than automobile • Consider trails and bike paths • Would like a place to bike/walk/jog
<p>Karen Falls No address (web submission)</p>	<p>Date unknown</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider an Honor Wall to honor former employees • Included design ideas

