

6.0 LANDOWNER PLAN

This chapter presents the landowner plan for the Phase III planning area. The first section presents the purpose and objectives of the landowner plan. The second section describes the information that was gathered from each landowner while this plan was developed. The third section describes how the landowners were interviewed. The fourth section discusses the level of participation by landowners in this plan. Finally, the last section summarizes the findings of the landowner plan.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The landowner plan summarizes and combines each landowner's objectives for fire management into a comprehensive fire management plan for private lands in the Phase III planning area. Consequently, this section has four objectives:

- (1) Summarize landowner interviews, culminating in a fire management category recommended for each landowner's parcel.
- (2) Provide guidance for fire management on each parcel based on the wishes of the landowner.
- (3) Provide recommendations for fuel treatments to meet each landowner's goals for fire management.
- (4) Provide the county with a contact list for all participating landowners in the Phase III planning area.

LANDOWNER INTERVIEW TOPICS

The Phase I and II reports for the fire plan were reviewed to identify the types of information that were gathered in the planning process. Based on these reports, an interview form was developed to ensure that all necessary information was gathered from each landowner. The following topics were discussed during the landowner interviews.

Land Cover Description – This section compiled the types of vegetation present on each parcel. It also included the approximate percentage, condition, and typical aspect of each vegetation type. The vegetation on a parcel represents the fuel for a fire and is important in evaluating risk of fire. Vegetation types typical of the Phase III planning area are discussed briefly in Chapter 4 of this report and in more detail in **Appendix C**. The percentage of each type of vegetation helps to create an overall picture of the fuel types on the parcel. The condition of vegetation was described as sparse, moderate, dense, grazed, ungrazed, young/vigorous, or old/decadent. This description provides additional information about the condition of the vegetation as fuels for a fire. The aspect indicates the exposure of the fuels to sun, which suggests whether they might be dry and flammable.

Land Use – Land use was described as residential, agriculture, ranching, mining, native, or other descriptors, as appropriate. Land use provides an overall picture of how the parcel is used and the types of constraints that may be present.

Fuel Model – Information for the fuel model was based on the Fire Behavior model (Anderson 1982) and the National Fire Danger Rating System (NFDRS) fuel model. Wildland firefighters use a system of fuel models that are standardized across the United States. For example, the Fire Behavior model provides 13 fuel models that range from grasslands to forests. The fuel models selected provide information for an area that can be used to model fire behavior and risk.

Topography – Topography was described as flat, rolling hills, mountainous, valley, ridge, or another appropriate description. Topography can significantly affect fire behavior in an area by affecting the way fire travels. For example, fire travels faster along steep slopes and narrow canyons. Parcels with these features are at increased risk of fire.

Slope – Slope is defined as the upward or downward incline of the terrain on a parcel. A fire that travels up a slope will move faster and the flames will be longer than will a fire traveling on flat terrain.

Aspect – Aspect is the direction a slope faces (north, south, east, west, or flat). The aspect indicates how much exposure to sun the vegetation receives. For example, north-facing slopes tend to be shadier than south-facing slopes. Aspect affects the vegetation density, type of vegetation, and fuel moisture.

Fire Management Category – This plan is based on the use of four fire management categories. The categories described in this section are identical to Phases I and II (Ecosystem Enhancement 2001; Land Stewardship Associates 2002) and to the management categories BLM and USFS use in planning fire management on public lands. These categories represent fire-management options for landowners. Common use of the same fire planning categories is intended to facilitate seamless management among the private property owner, the county, the state, and BLM.

- **Category A** – In these areas, fire is not desired at all. These areas would include ecosystems where fire never played a significant positive role in the function of the environment or where the reoccurrence of fire would result in undesirable changes in the plant community. In these areas, suppression is required to prevent direct threats to life and property. All fires in these areas will be aggressively suppressed.
- **Category B** – These are areas where wildland fire is not desired. Included in this category are ecosystems where an unplanned ignition could have negative effects without mitigation. Like Category A, fire suppression in these areas will be aggressive. “Negative effects” includes risks to structures and urban interface areas (communities), areas with unnatural buildups of fuel, and areas where the seed bank does not exist for natural reseeding. Mitigation efforts could include fuel reduction through mechanical means or prescribed fire to reduce fuel loading around structures and communities. These areas would be prime for identification of hazard fuel reduction projects to mitigate existing hazards.
- **Category C** – In these areas, fire is desired, but there may be social, political, or ecological constraints to be considered. Significant prescribed burning would be expected in these areas for safety of the public and firefighters as well as to help attain desired resource and ecological conditions.
- **Category D** – These are areas where fire is desired and there are few to no constraints to its use. These areas offer the greatest opportunity to take advantage of the full range of options available to landowners for managing fire under appropriate management response.

For Categories A and B, landowners do not desire wildland fire. In these areas, the landowners are responsible for protecting and improving the parcel to prevent destruction by wildland fire. For Category C areas, prescribed fire will be used to accomplish ecological objectives, such as habitat improvement, fuel reduction, improved forage productivity, and improved forest resilience to insects and disease. For Category D areas, fire will be managed under natural conditions. The intent in Category D areas is to improve ecological conditions by increasing the diversity of age classes and vegetation types. This approach will also improve the area’s resistance to large wildland fires.

The landowner has the option to change the fire management category at any time by contacting the Moffat County Natural Resources Department. Additionally, the county will adhere to the fire management category only if weather conditions allow and resources are available. For instance, if a landowner chooses category D for the parcel but winds are high, fuel moisture is low, and firefighting resources are limited, firefighters may elect to suppress the wildland fire to ensure their safety and prevent potential destruction to property.

Rationale for Selection of Fire Management Objectives – This section allowed the landowner to explain why the fire management category was selected. The rationale for the fire management category might include scenic, economic, and environmental reasons, among others.

Constraints and Priorities for Fire and Fuels Management – This section provided an opportunity for the landowner to identify the limitations on and priorities for fire management. Considerations might include structures, fences, wells, oil and gas development, mines, power lines, crops, livestock, historical or cultural values, or watershed concerns, among others.

Existing and Proposed Fuel Reduction and Vegetation Treatments – In this section, the landowner described any existing and planned fuel reduction and vegetation treatments, such as grazing, fuel breaks, and prescribed fires.

LANDOWNER INTERVIEWS

Several steps were involved in interviewing landowners. First, the landowners who would be interviewed were identified. Second, the landowners were contacted and interviews were scheduled. Third, the interviews were conducted. Finally, the information that was collected was returned to the landowners for their review and concurrence.

Landowner Identification

A database from the Moffat County Assessor's Office identified 2,710 landowners who own 3,643 parcels in the Phase III planning area. Many of these landowners own smaller parcels within the 23 communities assessed in Chapter 5 of this report. Landowners with the best opportunity to contribute to effective and efficient management of wildland fire and fuels were interviewed. Generally, this group consisted of landowners with parcels that are more than 40 acres and that are not in a community. However, also interviewed were landowners with smaller parcels that are surrounded by larger parcels; landowners whose properties are adjacent to large tracts of private, state, or federal lands; or landowners with large parcels in a community. A group of 839 landowners were identified to be interviewed, which is 31 percent of the landowners in the Phase III planning area.

Landowner Contacts

Landowner names, addresses, parcel descriptions, and other data were provided by the Moffat County Assessor's Office. Phone books, database searches, agency knowledge, and directory assistance were used to obtain phone numbers for each landowner identified. When a telephone number was available, landowners were phoned between January and March 2003. During telephone calls, the Phase III planning process was explained and each landowner was asked to participate in an interview to obtain information for the landowner plan.

In some instances, multiple owners hold one parcel, in which case all landowners were interviewed. Conversely, some landowners owned multiple parcels. Additionally, during the course of the project, parcels were being purchased and sold. The data from the Moffat County Assessor's Office as of December 2002 were used to develop the landowner plan; therefore, in some instances it was difficult to contact the most recent landowner of a parcel.

Landowners were called multiple times before it was assumed that they were not interested in scheduling an interview. When a telephone number was not available for a landowner, a letter was sent requesting that the landowner contact a contractor representative to schedule an interview. Letters were also sent to landowners who did not respond to multiple phone messages, but who had the potential to contribute significantly to a comprehensive Phase III fire plan.

Meetings with Landowners

An interview was conducted with each interested landowner, generally at the home, so that the parcel could be directly assessed. Some out-of-state landowners requested that a representative, such as a lessee, relative, or neighbor, speak for them. The interview and site visit consisted of an explanation of the project and discussion of each of the topics for the landowner interview, as listed above. The most important piece of information collected was the landowner's desired fire management category and the rationale for the choice. In some instances, the parcel was not accessible because of snow or poor road conditions. In other cases, the landowner preferred to meet elsewhere (usually in Craig) because of time or other concerns. During the interview, the landowner was provided information about the fire plan, fire and fuels management, and contact information for the cooperating agencies, including Moffat County, CSFS, BLM.

Some landowners elected to be interviewed over the telephone, particularly when they did not live in Moffat County. In these instances, the physical description of each parcel was based on information provided by the landowner and from 1:24,000 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps. Some landowners were not familiar with the parcels and requested that a contractor's representative view the parcel and recommend fire and fuel management. In all cases, however, the decision about fire management on a parcel was based on the landowner's wishes.

In addition to discussing private parcels of land, landowners who also leased state lands were interviewed to identify their desires for fire use and fuel reduction on the leased lands. Information from lessees of state lands was presented to the State Land Board for final determinations of Fire Management Category. In general, the wishes of the lessee will be honored, unless they conflict with the management objectives of the State Land Board

Parcel Information

The information gathered at the interview, including the landowner's desired fire management category, were summarized in a report specific to each parcel that was mailed to the landowner for verification. Landowners were encouraged to make corrections by telephone, mail, or fax. All changes requested were recorded, and revised reports were re-mailed to the landowners. When they received the final parcel report, landowners were asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding, Agreement of Participation, and return it to the Moffat County Natural Resources Department. A blank copy of this memorandum is included in **Appendix G** of this report.

LANDOWNER PARTICIPATION

Attempts were made to contact all landowners who met the criteria for interviews. **Table 6** summarizes the level of participation of this group of landowners. Seventy-three percent of those landowners were contacted. The remaining 27 percent were not contacted after multiple attempts, including telephone calls and follow-up letters. Sixty-one percent of landowners agreed to participate in the plan, while 12 percent declined to participate. **Figure 31** shows the level of participation across the Phase III planning area. **Appendix H** contains two lists: one shows the landowners who declined to participate, and one shows landowners the contractor was unable to contact.

TABLE 6 – LANDOWNER PARTICIPATION

Criteria	Number	Percent of Landowners
Landowners that met interview criteria (contact attempted)	854	100
Landowners not interviewed (unable to contact)	229	27
Landowners contacted	625	73
Landowner contacted, but declined to participate	106	12
Landowners interviewed	519	61

LANDOWNER INTERVIEW REPORTS

Landowner interview reports are included in **Appendix I**. Each landowner report summarizes the information for an individual parcel in the Phase III planning area. These reports contain information on each of the topics for the landowner interviews, as outlined above.

FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORY SUMMARY

Based on the information gathered from private landowners and public agencies, the majority of the land (60 percent) in the Phase III planning area should be managed using wildland fire or prescribed fire (Categories C and D). Category C was most prevalent, as it comprised 46 percent of the acreage by jurisdiction on private land and 62 percent on public lands. **Table 7** shows acres by Fire Management Category for public and private lands.

Conversely, 40 percent of the acreage in the Phase III planning area should be managed by suppressing wildland fire (Categories A and B) and by using fuel reduction, including prescribed fire (Category B). Of the landowners who prefer full suppression of wildland fire, a large minority (21 percent) preferred full suppression of wildland fire and no use of prescribed fire (Category A). Most landowners who prefer Category A are private landowners, while a relatively small area of public lands would be managed under this category. Two types of private landowners contributed to acreage of this category: (1) landowners who were interviewed and did not want any fire on their parcels; and (2) private landowners who declined to participate or who did not participate in the plan. Category A was assigned by default for this second group of private landowners.

Figure 31 – Landowner Participation

TABLE 7 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES IN THE PHASE III PLANNING AREA

Jurisdiction	Fire Management Category				Total by Jurisdiction
	A	B	C	D	
Private Lands – Participating					
Acres	99,594	110,800	313,599	157,471	681,464
Percentage by Acre	15%	16%	46%	23%	100%
Private Lands – Non-Participating					
Acres	208,032	0	0	0	208,032 ¹
Percentage by Acre	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Public Lands – State, BLM, USFS, Other Federal ²					
Acres	12,967	188,003	410,473	54,576	666,019
Percentage by Acre	2%	28%	62%	8%	100%
All Lands					
Acres	320,593	298,803	724,072	212,047	1,555,515
Percentage by Acre	21%	19%	46%	14%	100%

¹ Of these acres, 166,016 are those of landowners who declined to be interviewed or who were not interviewed, and 42,016 are in communities. Of the 208,032 acres, parcel numbers are unassigned for 5,635 acres because they are rights of way for highways, within the Craig city limits, or because of other factors.

² Other Federal lands include an additional 141 acres that are controlled neither by BLM nor by USFS. These lands were assigned to Fire Management Category A by default.

The overall pattern of fire management categories in the Phase III planning area is shown in **Figure 32**. Areas where wildland fire suppression (Categories A and B) are preferred exist in and around Craig, near the Baker's Peak/Wilderness Ranch communities, along County Roads 3 and 7 and south of U.S. Highway 40 on a large BLM parcel. With the exception of the BLM parcel, suppression of wildland fire directly correlates to areas of residential development. Conversely, the majority of the rural portions of the Phase III planning area (northwest, southwest and an area north of U.S. Highway 40 and West of Range 94 West) allow for fire use, whether it is wildland or prescribed fire. Public and private lands and their fire management categories are shown in **Figure 33**.

Private Land

For the most part, only landowners with parcels larger than 40 acres were interviewed; however, in some instances, landowners with less than 40 acres were interviewed if the parcel provided an opportunity for managing wildland fire and fuel. For example, several landowners own small parcels interspersed with large parcels and preferred to select the same type of fire management on all parcels. **Table 8** reflects the preferred Fire Management Category of all participating private landowners.

More than half (51 percent) of landowners preferred to allow fire to play a significant role in future management of the area (Fire Management Category C and D); these owners collectively own 69 percent of the acreage in the Phase III planning area. Forty-nine percent of landowners were not comfortable allowing wildland fire to become commonplace in management of these parcels. These landowners expressed a preference for option A or B and own 31 percent of the land in the Phase III planning area. Landowners who did not participate or who were in communities were assigned Fire Management Category A and are not included in **Table 8**.

Figure 32 – Fire Management Categories

Figure 33 – Fire Management Categories with Public Lands

TABLE 8 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES OF PARTICIPATING PRIVATE LANDOWNERS

Units	Fire Management Category				Total
	A	B	C	D	
Acres	99,594	110,800	313,599	157,471	681,464
Percentage by Acre	15%	16%	46%	23%	100%
Number of Landowners	132	124	186	77	519
Percent of Landowners	25%	24%	36%	15%	100%
Parcels	226	180	323	193	922 ¹
Percentage of Parcels	25%	19%	35%	21%	100%

¹ 47 parcels that have multiple designated Fire Management Categories were split into a total of 83 sub-parcels, and are included in the parcel total. The actual number of full parcels is 875.

Private Landowner Issues

Each landowner expressed a unique set of issues related to wildland fire or fuel management, which are recorded in each landowner report in **Appendix I**. Many landowners expressed similar concerns on the same issues. These issues include: impacts to and liability for sage grouse; protection of structures, power lines, wells, fences and livestock; burning on Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) lands; noxious weeds; and post-wildland fire reclamation. Each one of these issues is further discussed in more detail below.

Sage Grouse

Moffat County supports one of the largest and most stable populations of sage grouse remaining in Colorado. Many other populations of sage grouse in Colorado and surrounding states have declined because of habitat loss, development, and other factors. Some landowners are concerned that the widespread use of fuel treatments, prescribed fire, and wildland fire could cause the population to decrease in Moffat County. If the population declines, sage grouse could be legally protected, preventing landowners from managing the lands as they wish.

One factor in the health of the population in Moffat County is the large areas of contiguous sagebrush stands that are found throughout much of the Phase III planning area. Sage grouse depend on moderately dense, healthy sagebrush shrublands for most of their life cycle. Sagebrush is easily killed by wildland fire and does not re-sprout, as do other shrubs. Over time, sagebrush stands will re-occupy a burned area if a sufficient source of seed is present nearby. Development of sagebrush stands that are dense enough to provide for the needs of sage grouse may take decades after a moderate or high-intensity wildland fire.

Sage grouse can adapt and survive if small patches of sagebrush within the range burn. However, widespread fuel treatments, prescribed fire, and wildland fire in sagebrush could reduce the availability of stands to the point that the population of sage grouse declines. This potential effect can be avoided by ensuring that significant portions of the available sagebrush stands are maintained in a condition that is suitable for use by sage grouse. Fuel and fire treatments can be rotated across the landscape so that, over time, all stands are treated but enough remain in a mature condition at a specific point in time to support the sage grouse population.

Structures, Power lines, Wells, Fences and Livestock

Although many landowners saw benefits to wildland fire on their parcel, they were concerned about effects to various structures, utilities, and other resources on their parcels. Many of the landowners wanted firefighters to be aware of these issues in the event of the wildland fire. These concerns were noted in the “Rationale for Fire Management Category” and “Constraints and Priorities” portion of the individual landowner reports. By default, structures or utilities such as houses, corrals, barns, old cabins, power lines, natural gas wells, and fences are managed under Fire Management Category A. All attempts will be made to protect these resources; however, because of the level of detail associated with the data, the scale of the map, and scope of this analysis, polygons for Fire Management Category A were not delineated around each of these resources in **Figures 32 and 33**.

Conservation Reserve Program

Multiple parcels under the CRP program belong to many landowners within the Phase III planning area. The U.S.D.A. Natural Resources Conservation Service has stated that wildland fire use will be permitted on CRP land as long as property and human life are not in jeopardy (Stephenson 2003). Prescribed fire is not allowed on CRP land. Therefore, CRP land will be managed in accordance with the rest of the Phase III plan.

Noxious Weeds

Noxious weeds and invasive plant species are opportunistic and are capable of invading disturbed soil, such as may occur after prescribed or wildland fire. Once they have become established, non-native species can out-compete and eventually replace native species, thereby reducing forage productivity and the overall vigor of native plant communities. As a consequence of these effects, many of these species are viewed as detrimental to the environment. Their occurrence, distribution, and density are variable and are influenced by many factors that include disturbance type and frequency, climatic conditions, soil conditions, and local management efforts. Noxious weeds can be introduced into an area in several ways, including escape of ornamental plants from landscaped areas, transport of weed seeds with livestock, use of recreational vehicles, transport of agricultural products (especially hay) along roads, and movement of heavy equipment from site to site.

Burned areas should be monitored and treated to prevent noxious weeds and invasive plant species from becoming established. In areas of low-intensity burns, vegetation is likely to reestablish without the need for reclamation. Additional measures may be needed in areas of high-intensity burns, where weeds are already present or where native vegetation may not provide an adequate source of seed for revegetation. Rapid reclamation using appropriate methods and certified weed-free seed mixes is often the easiest and least expensive way of preventing the spread of noxious weeds and invasive plants.

Weeds can be managed through a variety of mechanisms, including physical removal and application of pesticides. Moffat County Pest Management and the Colorado State University Cooperative Extension Office provide services in weed management, including:

- Technical consultations and advice
- Education, prevention, and control recommendations
- Assistance with integrated weed management plans
- Weed identification, mapping, control, and evaluation

- Financial assistance through integrated weed management plans
- A Weed Bounty program for physical control of biennial weeds

Reclamation

After a fire has moved through an area, reclamation may be necessary to establish good vegetation cover in areas where a source of seed is not naturally present. The land can be reclaimed at the discretion of the landowner. In general, land should be reclaimed in a timely manner to reduce invasion of weeds and prevent soil erosion. There are no requirements for private landowners to reclaim land after a fire in Moffat County. Federal and state agencies reclaim public lands in accordance with the agency's practices. The recommendations discussed in this section are general suggestions and are not requirements of the Phase III plan.

Impact of fire on the landscape varies with the intensity of the fire and the health of the ecosystem. Fire can affect the structure of the soil, increasing soil erosion and reducing the moisture available for plants. Additionally, the loss of surface vegetation contributes to increased erosion. Erosion causes the loss of nutrients in the soil, making the area more susceptible to invasion of weeds.

Burned areas within pinyon/juniper, mountain shrub, or sagebrush communities may require reseeding with perennial grasses. If a fire is relatively small, nearby vegetation may provide a natural source of seeds. However, it may be necessary to seed with a plant species mix in the fall after a fire or before the spring germination period.

More information on reclamation is available at the Colorado State University cooperative extension in Craig. CSU information is available at <http://co.moffat.co.us/coopext/index.php>. The Natural Resources Conservation Service and Colorado State Forest Service can also provide information on land reclamation after fire.

Public Lands

Fire Management Categories for public lands (state, BLM, and FS) were made available by the participating agencies and were incorporated into this report. The majority of public lands are Fire Management Category C (62 percent). Generally, the management objective for wildland fire on federal lands is fuel reduction, including prescribed fire, or using wildland fire to control fuels. Management of state lands is similar to federal lands; however, there are fewer constraints on state land (environmental factors based on management direction and use of state lands).

The current fire management categories are also identified on **Figures 32 and 33** and shown in **Table 9**. Specific fire management direction, by public jurisdiction, is also presented below.

State

Fire Management Categories for state lands were collected during interviews with lessees and CDOW using the legal descriptions provide by the Moffat County Assessor's Office. The primary categories selected by lessees for state lands are A and C. Based on interviews with lessees, 76 percent of the state lands in the Phase III planning area should be managed to allow wildland and prescribed fire on some level (Categories C and D). CDOW's wildland fire and fuel management preferences were based on the current CDOW direction. For response to CDOW parcels, Dan Prenslow (970-878-6090), Brad Petch (970-878-6061), or State Patrol Dispatch should be contacted.

TABLE 9 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES ON PUBLIC LANDS

Jurisdiction	Fire Management Category				Total by Jurisdiction
	A	B	C	D	
State					
Acres	11,924	20,495	49,150	54,451	136,020
Percentage by Acre	9%	15%	36%	40%	100%
BLM					
Acres	902	138,755	348,467	126	488,250
Percentage by Acre	<1%	28%	71%	<1%	100%
USFS					
Acres	0	28,752	12,856	0	41,608
Percentage by Acre	0%	69%	31%	0%	100%
Total Public Lands					
Acres	12,967 ¹	188,003	410,473	54,576	666,019 ¹
Percentage by Acre	2%	28%	62%	8%	100%

¹ Total Public Lands include an additional 141 acres of federal lands that are controlled neither by BLM nor by USFS. These lands were assigned to Fire Management Category A by default.

The lessee was identified for several parcels but was not interviewed because the telephone number was not published; the lessee did not respond to telephone calls or letters; or the lessee declined to participate in the fire plan. Therefore, the SLB identified the preferred management objective for these parcels. The SLB reviewed the wishes of each lessee for all other parcels and provided final input on management of the parcel with respect to wildland fire and fuel reduction. Final SLB determinations for state lands are presented in **Table 10**.

Bureau of Land Management

Two fire management categories dominate BLM lands: Categories B (28 percent of BLM parcels in the Phase III planning area) and C (71 percent). This management direction is generally consistent with the desires of private landowners who are near BLM in the more rural portions of the Phase III planning area. The majority of BLM lands in the Phase III planning area have been assigned to Category C. This type of management allows for wildland or prescribed fire; however, social, political, or ecological constraints must be considered. In many instances, the private lands around BLM lands may have resulted in the determination of Category C because of the social and political constraints associated with private land. Based on information in this report, the BLM category has the potential to change. Specifically, BLM lands that were previously Category C could become D where private landowners have selected C or D adjacent to BLM. For example, Categories C or D were assigned to much of the private land north of U.S. Highway 40 and west of Range 94 West, BLM lands were assigned Category C. Management of BLM lands in this portion of the planning area could be altered based on these landowner's desires, if the geographic location of these private lands was the reason for the category determination.

Another example of how the Phase III data for private land could shape future management of wildland fire on BLM lands is illustrated by a tract of BLM land south of U.S. Highway 40 along the Yampa River and in Axial Basin. This very large parcel is currently assigned Category B. Much of the private land surrounding the parcel is Category C, however. The lessee of this BLM land has selected Category C for the private lands. Conversely, the landowners have a much more conservative approach to wildland fire and fuel management for other private parcels throughout the Phase III planning area that surround BLM lands.

TABLE 10 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES OF STATE PARCELS

Acres	Legal Description	Lessee	Lessee-Desired Category	Category as determined by SLB
41	T8N R90W SEC 23 LOT 4	Bill Simpson	A	A
639	T4N R93W SEC 8 LOT 6	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	A	A
640	T3N R93W SEC 16 ALL	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	A	A
390	T6N R95W SEC 4 SW	Ralph and Marcia Royster	A	A
80	T11N R92W SEC 20 LOT 2	Roger Pilgrim	A	A
637	T10N R93W SEC 16 ALL	Roger Pilgrim	A	A
118	T6N R91W LOTS IN SECS 13-16,21,23-36	Trapper	A	A
7732	T6N R91W LOTS IN SECS 13-16,21,23-36	Trapper	A	A
158	T6N R96W SEC 12 S2SW4	CDOW	B	B
161	T6N R95W SEC 6: LOT 14, SE4SW4	CDOW	B	B
324	T6N R95W SEC 17 N2NE4, SW4NE4, NW4,	CDOW	B	B
518	T5N R96W SEC 2 LOTS 7,8,SW/4NW/4,	CDOW	B	B
1345	T6N R95W SEC 4 SW	CDOW	B	B
1473	T6N R95W SEC 4 LOT 10	CDOW	B	B
3117	T6N R95W SEC 7 LOTS 5 TO 8,E2SW4	CDOW	B	B
676	T4N R91W SEC 16 ALL	Jim Redman	B	B
12397	T12N R92W SEC 13 LOTS 1,2,ELY PORTION	Smith Rancho/Cassey McKee/Harold Dietrich	B	B
644	T9N R93W SEC 36 ALL	Albert and Claire Villard	C	C
648	T11N R90W SEC 16 ALL	Battle Mountain Co.	C	C
657	T12N R90WSEC 16 ALL	Battle Mountain Co.	C	C
320	T9N R95W SEC 11 S2	CDOW	C	C
641	T9N R95W SEC 5 ALL	CDOW	C	C
3920	T9N R95W SEC 3 LOTS 3,4,S2NW4, SW4	CDOW	C	C
639	T5N R95W	CDOW	C	C
635	T9N R90W SEC 18 LOTS 13,14,19,20	Clarence Hannong	C	C
80	T5N R94W SEC 23 LOT 2	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
559	T5N R94W SEC 26 LOTS 4,5	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
638	T4N R94W SEC 25 LOTS 2,4,6,8,9,10,	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
639	T5N R92W SEC 16 ALL	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
639	T5N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
640	T3N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
640	T4N R95W SEC 36 ALL	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
644	T4N R94W SEC 8 LOTS 8,9	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
1433	T4N R92W SEC 9 LOTS 1,8	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C	C
652	T4N R96W SEC 16 ALL	Dave Johnson	C	C
640	T3N R96W SEC 16 ALL	Dave Johnson (Keystone Ranch)	C	C
640	T5N R93W SEC 16 ALL	Harry Kourlis Ranch Partnership	C	C
480	T12N R94W SEC 19 LOTS 6,7,15	James Randolph and Rebecca Menge	C	C
2561	T12N R94W SEC 13 LOTS 6 THRU 13,16,	James Randolph and Rebecca Menge	C	C
637	T8N R94W SEC 36 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis	C	C
644	T11N R93W SEC 36 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis/Norma Lee Evans	C	C
650	T8N R95W SEC 36 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis/Nottingham Land and Livestock	C	C
38	T7N R95W PORTIONS OF SECS 16 THRU	John and Steve Raftopolis/Nottingham Land and Livestock/Neil Chew/Hugh Turner/Sam McIntyre/Darryl Steele	C	C
9740	T7N R95W PORTIONS OF SECS 16 THRU	John and Steve Raftopolis/Nottingham Land and Livestock/Neil Chew/Hugh Turner/Sam McIntyre/Darryl Steele	C	C
622	T6N R96W SEC 25 LOTS 2,4,6,8	Mary Cook (John Cook)	C	C
637	T5N R96W SEC 36 ALL	Mary Cook (John Cook)	C	C
643	T5N R95W SEC 16 ALL	Mary Cook (John Cook)	C	C
640	T8N R96W SEC 16 ALL	Neil Chew	C	C
280	T12N R94W SEC 23 LOT 26	Norma Lee Evans	C	C
647	T12N R94W SEC 36 ALL	Norma Lee Evans	C	C
652	T9N R89W SEC 36 ALL	Rancho Greco Limited Partnership	C	C

TABLE 10 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES OF STATE PARCELS

Acres	Legal Description	Lessee	Lessee-Desired Category	Category as determined by SLB
640	T6N R93W SEC 16 ALL	Richard and Donna	C	C
188	T9N R90W SEC 32 LOTS 9,13,14,15,16	Ronald and Shirley Lawton	C	C
645	T6N R95W SEC 36 ALL	Seely Land and Livestock	C	C
2100	T8N R90W SEC 3 LOTS 11 THRU 18	Smith Rancho/Doug Camelletti/Lawton/Coyner	C	C
1507	T8N R90W SEC 26 LOTS 3,4,5,6,12	Smith Rancho/John and Steve Raftopolis	C	C
76	T9N R90W SEC 18 LOTS 7,10	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
114	T9N R90W SEC 18 LOT 17	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
203	T8N R96W SEC 6 LOTS 7,8	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
623	T9N R90W SEC 16 ALL	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
641	T8N R96W SEC 36 ALL	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
646	T9N R96W SEC 36 ALL	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
2697	T9N R90W SEC 18 LOTS 13,14,19,20	Visintainer Sheep Co.	C	C
659	T9N R96W SEC 15 LOTS 8,11,12,13	Visintainer Sheep Co. Sheep Co	C	C
650	T4N R92W SEC 1 LOTS 6,7,8	Colowyo Coal Co. LP	C South of Hwy 13; A North of Hwy. 13	A/C
644	T4N R95W SEC 8 LOTS 7,16,17	Colo State Land Board	D	D
1	T6N R96W SEC 10 S2	Cross Mountain	D	D
5	T6N R97W SEC 36 ALL	Cross Mountain	D	D
12	T6N R96W SEC 10 S2	Cross Mountain	D	D
1008	T7N R95W SEC 30 W PORTION OF LOT 27	Cross Mountain	D	D
1592	T6N R96W SEC 10 S2	Cross Mountain	D	D
627	T11N R89W SEC 16 ALL	Frank Duncan	D	D
643	T11N R92W SEC 16 ALL	Howard Lee	D	D
640	T11N R95W SEC 36 ALL	James Randolph and Rebecca Menge	D	D
350	T6N R94W SEC 9 LOT 3	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
639	T8N R92W SEC 16 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
639	T9N R95W SEC 36 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
670	T12N R95W SEC 35 LOTS 2,3,6	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
693	T5N R91W SEC 15,16 TRACT 66	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
1115	T6N R93W SEC 6 LOT 17	John and Steve Raftopolis	D	D
638	T11N R94W SEC 36 ALL	John and Steve Raftopolis/Norma Lee Evans/CDOW	D	D
638	T11N R93W SEC 16 ALL	Morgan Creek Ranch	D	D
10	T8N R89W SEC 36 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
321	T9N R94W SEC 23 SE4SE4	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
375	T10N R96W SEC 36 LOTS 2,4,6,13 THRU	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
637	T10N R96W SEC 34 NE4NE4	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
640	T10N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
640	T10N R95W SEC 36 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
640	T9N R94W SEC 36 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
646	T9N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
651	T8N R89W SEC 36 ALL	Nottingham Land and Livestock	D	D
12346	T12N R91W SEC 36 ALL	Peroulis/Willow Creek Ranch	D	D
646	T7N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Sam McIntyre	D	D
640	T11N R95W SEC 16 LOTS 7,9,11,13,17	Maneotis Sheep Company	Declined to participate	D
19382	T11N R96W ALL OF SECS 13,14,15,16,21,	Maneotis Sheep Company	Declined to participate	D
634	T8N R89W SEC 16 ALL	Smith Rancho	Declined to participate	D
636	T8N R91W SEC 16 ALL	Smith Rancho	Declined to participate	D
644	T11N R94W SEC 16 ALL	Smith Rancho	Declined to participate	D
644	T8N R91W SEC 36 ALL	Smith Rancho	Declined to participate	D
676	T12N R93W SEC 16 LOTS 6 THRU 13,15,	Smith Rancho	Declined to participate	D

TABLE 10 – FIRE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES OF STATE PARCELS

Acres	Legal Description	Lessee	Lessee-Desired Category	Category as determined by SLB
159	T5N R94W SEC 19 LOT 9	Bill Moore	No interview	D
161	T5N R94W SEC 29 LOT 5	Bill Moore	No interview	D
644	T5N R95W SEC 36 ALL	Bill Moore	No interview	D
40	T11N R92W SEC 36 LOT 5	Boyd Waitman	No interview	C
680	T11N R92W SEC 36 LOTS 2,3	Boyd Waitman	No interview	C
664	T12N R91W SEC 16 ALL	Cassey	No interview	D
658	T4N R92W SEC 25 LOT 12	Doug Camelletti	No interview	C
667	T5N R90W SEC 16 ALL	Gilbert Meyers	No interview	C
640	T4N R92W SEC 30 LOT 18	Jim Leander	No interview	D
644	T5N R91W SEC 36 ALL	Ray Durham	No interview	C
636	T5N R96W SEC 16 ALL	Rex Tuttle	No interview	D
644	T5N R94W SEC 36 ALL	Robert Bruchez	No interview	C
642	T7N R96W Sec. 18	Turner, Hugh	No interview	D

Forest Service

Two Fire Management Categories dominate management of wildland fire on USFS lands: Categories B (69 percent of USFS parcels in the Phase III planning area) and C (31 percent). The USFS lands on the Medicine-Bow/Routt National Forest are primarily Fire Management Category B; the lands are located south of the Bakers Peak and Wilderness Ranch communities in the northeast portion of the Phase III planning area. However, the northern portion of this parcel is Fire Management Category C. The USFS lands in the White River National Forest in the southeastern portion of the Phase III planning area are Fire Management Category C. In general, these management objectives are consistent with the surrounding private landowners.