

Marge Vorndam, 719-489-2913, (representing S. CO Greenback Chapter, Trout Unlimited)  
1413 CR 671, Rye, CO 81069

## Comments on DRAFT BIP – July 29, 2014

### Overall Comments:

Supporting Ag Use also supports upstream Recreational users

Should there be a "Limit to Growth" to preserve the current/future status quo? How will going from 1.03 M population in 2013 translate to water use for 1.84 M population in 2050 without loss of current state-wide values somewhere? The resource has to be ultimately be SUSTAINABLE in whatever plan is developed. What is a MAXIMUM POPULATION that we should aim for? How many people should be served?

With an already over-appropriated system, where will future needs develop from?

### Specific Comments:

Table 4: Should specifically ALSO include wildlife values in general, not just avian values.

6., 7. Add – no further loss of wetland areas by filling of any wetland areas along the river or tributaries to the river.

Non-consumptive goals have to ALSO address preservation of wildlife values (85% of wildlife are dependent on 1.5% of wetland areas in the state as a whole - CO State Parks and Division of Wildlife, July 2011, retrieved from <http://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/LandWater/WetlandsProgram/CDOWWetlandsProgramStrategicPlan110804.pdf>)

This has to apply to ALL tributaries of the Arkansas River. Can wetland areas be preserved to maintain this ratio in the future?

Need to have broader emphasis – not just on the Arkansas River – what happens upstream affects downstream (for example – in Arkansas River Basin, St. Charles River, Millset Creek, Graneros Creek, North and South Apache Creeks, Huerfano River, Cucharas River, Beaver Creek, Purgatoire River, Grape Creek, Chalk Creek, etc.). Emphasis needs to be on also preserving flows in these creeks for purposes of consumptive and non-consumptive uses for recreation, wildlife and agriculture.

While we feel that Ag. Values are very important, channelization due to water rights has damaged traditional water courses (ex., hunting concentrated on cattle water tanks, for instance – I'm/we're NOT against hunting!!). Preserve what is LEFT of natural waterways!

(over)

**AR BIP - DRAFT**

Sect. 2.1 – 3. Add Frostbite Fish-Off Tournament (now in 5th year) – an economic benefit to Pueblo by the S. Colorado Greenback Chapter Trout Unlimited

6. Summary of Features ...

a.) iii. Wildlife Values

Non-consumptive goals have to ALSO address preservation of wildlife values (85% of wildlife are dependent on 1.5% of wetland areas in the state as a whole - CO State Parks and Division of Wildlife, July 2011, retrieved from

<http://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/LandWater/WetlandsProgram/CDOWWetlandsProgramStrategicPlan110804.pdf>)

This has to apply to ALL tributaries of the Arkansas River. Can wetland areas be preserved to maintain this present ratio in the future?

a.) iv. Other unique values:

-Graneros Creek through Graneros Gorge – a singular natural feature in SW Pueblo Co.

-Pueblo West – Turkey Creek preservation for riparian/wildlife values

-Tepee Buttes area of Pueblo County

- Pueblo Chemical Depot stream/lake preservation

- Ft. Carson stream flows and concern for endangered/threatened species

- Bear Creek Greenback Cutthroat preservation

- Upstream and Downstream AK River Natural Areas (known or not) wildlife values? (check with local agencies and conservation societies)

(c.f. Pueblo Co. Comprehensive Land Use Plan, for instance) c.f. other counties in AK River Basin

c.) iii See a.) iv. For suggestions on which to concentrate

e. iii, Fountain Creek Sediment, Flooding and Water Quality

We maintain that diversion of West Slope waters to Front Range communities is not an answer to long-term water needs.

Respectfully submitted by Marge Vorndam

August 29, 2014