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INTRODUCTION

The Arkansas River Habitat Partnership Program Committee was established in March, 1994 to address conflicts between wildlife populations and livestock operators. The seven current committee members include Ted Grover, sportsman representative and chairman; Aaron Atwood, Werner Lengacher and Joe Cogan, landowners and livestock operators; Jeff Williams, Bureau of Land Management; Mike Wrigley, U.S. Forest Service; and Jim Aragon, Division Of Wildlife.

The Arkansas River program area is in central Colorado and includes all of Game Management Units (GMU) 48, 481, 56, 561, 57, 58, 581, 59, 591, 511 and 512 and the Lake and Chaffee county portions of GMU 49. Ownership of the 4,308 square miles in the program area is 40% private, 35% U.S. Forest Service, 13% Bureau of Land Management, 6% military, 6% State of Colorado, 0.2% National Park Service and 0.1% U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The area ranges from 4,800 feet elevation at the southeast corner, at Pueblo, to the highest point in Colorado, Mount Elbert, at 14,433 feet.

The program area includes the western half of the city of Colorado Springs, the northern portion of Pueblo and the towns of Woodland Park, Canon City, Salida, Buena Vista and Leadville. Around and between these cities are large expanses of rural residential developments ranging in density from one house per one half acre to one house per forty acres. Also included in the program area are Fort Carson and the Air Force Academy.

Big game populations and densities vary widely within the program area. The deer populations declined in the early 1990s and are now slowly increasing in most of the program area. Current deer populations remain significantly lower than historic highs; however, there has been some recovery in the western portion of the program area in the last three years. The pronghorn population is more erratic depending on winter conditions and harvest but is currently less than one half of historic highs in the late 1960s. The elk herd is currently slightly higher than objective but is nearing population objectives established for Elk DAU’s 17, 22, and 23.

The program area includes the following Data Analysis Units (DAU) which are considered to be separate herds: Eleven Mile elk herd (DAU E-23, GMU 581, 59, 591, 511 and 512); all but the eastern 270 square miles of game management unit 49 of the Buffalo Peaks elk herd (DAU E-22, GMU 49, 57 and 58) and the Collegiate Range elk herd (DAU E-17, GMU 48, 481, 56, and 561). The Cottonwood Creek deer herd (DAU D-15, GMU 48, 481, 56 and 561), the Cripple Creek deer herd (DAU D-16, GMU 49, 57, 58, 581, 59 and 591), except for the eastern 270 square miles of GMU 49; and the Rampart deer herd (DAU D-50, GMU 511 and 512) are also covered by the program area. The pronghorn in the program area are in game management units 57, 58 and 581 which are part of the South Park pronghorn herd (DAU A-30, GMU 50, 57, 58 and 581), the Collegiate pronghorn herd (DAU A-39, GMU 48, 481 and 56) and in the Fort Carson pronghorn herd (DAU A-31, GMU 59 and 591).

To assess the forage competition and fence conflicts that currently exist, and develop the Distribution Management Plan to address those conflicts, the committee held 15 work sessions when the original plan was written. Three public meetings were held. The committee also sent out 212 letters explaining the program with addressed and stamped postcards for landowners to return to indicate any conflicts. Each landowner indicating a conflict was contacted by telephone or in person and information gathered about the problems (see copies of letter, postcard and telephone survey form in
the appendix) to provide base line data on existing conflicts. 66 postcards were completed and returned with 24 indicating no problems or not in the program area. Of the 42 landowners with conflicts, 41 felt that fence damage was a problem and 36 felt that forage competition was a problem.

Complicating the successful resolution of conflicts with elk, especially in GMU 581, is the existence of numerous refuge areas where hunting is not allowed and population control efforts are thus limited. Historically, elk harvest has been below desired levels because the elk have learned to take advantage of the interspersion of these refuge areas, including residential subdivisions, Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, Mueller State Park, and other private lands throughout the program area, that are closed to hunting.

Conflicts from antelope are relatively rare because there is no winter wheat within this program area, however, historically in some winters the antelope from GMUs 57, 58 and 581 used to migrate to Shaws Park, west of Canon City, and concentrate in a small area owned by three landowners. Damage control hunts, authorized by the Wildlife Commission in 1987 to remove up to 25% of the antelope present in the conflict area, were held annually to reduce the number of antelope as well as disperse the problem animals. During the last ten winters, however, antelope have not concentrated in Shaws Park and thus the hunts have not been necessary. Currently, there are only two conflicts from antelope, one for fence damage and one for forage competition.

In the last 30 years, very large areas of deer and elk habitat, especially historic winter ranges, have been converted from agricultural use to seasonal and year-round residential use. The committee has not attempted to address the conflicts between deer and urban landscaping and gardens that have expanded as development has encroached on deer habitat throughout the program area. This type of conflict is the primary type currently indicated for deer and is outside the guidelines for the habitat partnership program to resolve fence and forage conflicts. There is one site within the program area with increasing pressure from deer on cultivated alfalfa hay. Impacts in this area have not reached previous levels and are just beginning to lead to complaints from landowners.

The committee has reviewed the revised DAU plans and recognizes that elk numbers may need to be reduced in some areas. There are no serious conflicts at this time with the deer and pronghorn antelope populations. In fact, some concern has been expressed about the reduced deer population in most of the program area. The committee will continue to monitor conflicts caused by the elk herds and recommend appropriate changes in the objectives if either the long term populations are achieved and unacceptable levels of conflicts persist or conflicts are reduced to acceptable levels while the populations are above the population objectives.
GOALS

The committee's goals for the Arkansas River HPP program area include:

1) Reduce conflicts from elk, deer, antelope and moose impacts on forage and fences where those impacts occur now or develop in the future.

2) Improve communication between the Division of Wildlife, ranchers with big game on their property, sportsmen, the general public and land management agencies.

3) Modify population objectives through the DAU plans, when necessary, to reflect habitat availability, wildlife conflicts and public desires.
## Data Analysis Unit (DAU) Management Plan Summary

### Elk DAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HPP Area</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>2008 Post Hunt Population</th>
<th>Long Term Objective Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-17</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-22</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-23</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-17 includes GMU 48, 481, 56 and 561  
E-22 includes GMU 49, 57, 58 (all but the east half of 49 are in this program area.)  
E-23 includes GMU 581, 59, 511, and 512

### Deer DAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HPP Area</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>2008 Post Hunt Population</th>
<th>Long Term Objective Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-15</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-16</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-50</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-15 includes GMU 48, 481, 56, 561  
D-16 includes GMU 49, 57, 58, 581, 59 and 591 (all but the east half of 49 are in this program area)  
D-50 includes GMU 511, and 512

### Pronghorn DAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HPP Area</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>2008 Post Hunt Population Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-30</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-31</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-39</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-30 includes GMU 50, 57, 58 and 581 (GMU 50 is not in this program area)  
A-31 includes GMU 59 and 591  
A-39 includes GMU 48, 481 and 56
## Land Ownership within Arkansas River HPP (Square Miles and % of DAU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deer DAU</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>USFS</th>
<th>USFWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35 - 4%</td>
<td>21 - 2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184 - 19%</td>
<td>706 - 74%</td>
<td>5 - 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>506 - 21%</td>
<td>187 - 8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1029 - 43%</td>
<td>633 - 27%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>70 - 6%</td>
<td>55 - 5%</td>
<td>243 - 19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>531 - 42%</td>
<td>351 - 28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elk DAU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35 - 3%</td>
<td>21 - 2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184 - 19%</td>
<td>706 - 74%</td>
<td>5 - 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>331 - 23%</td>
<td>127 - 9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>576 - 41%</td>
<td>384 - 27%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>204 - 11%</td>
<td>92 - 5%</td>
<td>244 - 13%</td>
<td>9 - 1%</td>
<td>960 - 50%</td>
<td>430 - 22%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antelope DAU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>469 - 17%</td>
<td>196 - 7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 - 1%</td>
<td>1181 - 43%</td>
<td>894 - 33%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>69 - 8%</td>
<td>34 - 4%</td>
<td>215 - 25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415 - 48%</td>
<td>129 - 15%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>27 - 3%</td>
<td>19 - 2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174 - 21%</td>
<td>598 - 73%</td>
<td>5 - 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Land Ownership within Arkansas River HPP Area (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMU</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>CDOW</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>SLB</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>TNC</th>
<th>USFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,220</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,824</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>29,228</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,060</td>
<td>11,486</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>210,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,370</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>8,466</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,447</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,385</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>29,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,494</td>
<td>10,956</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>64,125</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269,863</td>
<td>60,830</td>
<td>8,363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>89,954</td>
<td>7,103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>259,709</td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>45,090</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258,436</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>82,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137,241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275,188</td>
<td>17,398</td>
<td>137,241</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>1,120,802</td>
<td>128,190</td>
<td>15,340</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1,074,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT TYPES AND PRIORITIES

In order to accomplish its goals and objectives, the Arkansas River HPP Committee may utilize the following types of projects:

Habitat Manipulation - to include, but not limited to:
- Prescribed burning
- Water developments

Weed control
- Fertilization
- Seeding
- Hand Thinning
- Mechanical (chaining, roller-chopping, hydro-axing, etc.)

Fencing Projects - to include, but not limited to:
- Fence vouchers distributed to landowners for materials
- Construction of new fences (usually > ¼ mile in length)
- Landowner reimbursement for fencing materials purchased
- Prototype or experimental fence designs for livestock and wildlife issues
- Wildlife crossings or retrofitting of fences to make more wildlife friendly
- Fencing repair materials allocations up to $400 per producer annually

Game Damage Projects - to include, but not limited to:
- Stackyard Repairs - materials and/or labor
- New stackyards - materials and/or labor
- Distribution hunts
- Hunt coordinators for distribution hunts, youth hunts, etc
- Forage purchases
- Baiting

Information/Education Projects - to include, but not limited to:
- Seminars
- Workshops
- Brochures
- Electronic media (websites, etc)

Research/Monitoring Projects - to include, but not limited to:
- Habitat
- Population
- Inventory
- Movement
- Habitat Assessment Model

Conservation Easements (transaction costs only)

Archaeological Clearances (and other NEPA required clearances)
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

HABITAT IMPROVEMENT - Designed to improve habitats and attract big game away from conflict areas.

1) Specific areas will be managed to increase their attractiveness to winter elk concentrations and thus draw and hold those animals away from conflict areas. Habitat improvement projects will be designed to impact areas as large as possible and practical. Large scale projects, beyond the limited resources of the committee and its cooperators, will be undertaken with Special Project Funds requested from the Statewide HPP council and nationwide conservation organizations.

2) Projects on federal, state or private lands will be considered as needed. Public lands will be given first priority, however, projects on private and state trust lands will be considered if the property is open to hunting and a cooperative agreement is signed protecting the benefits of the habitat improvement activities. Whenever possible, cost sharing funds will be sought to increase the effectiveness of management activities.

3) Grazing management, fertilization and vegetative manipulation, such as burning, roller chopping, hydro-axing, hand thinning, inter-seeding, and timber harvesting will be conducted in appropriate areas if the combination of distribution hunts and management of specific winter ranges is not adequate to reduce conflicts to an acceptable level.

4) When appropriate, support road closures and other restrictions of recreational activities in areas where those activities move animals out of desired habitats and into areas with conflicts.

5) Assistance will be provided to landowners with conservation easements and other long term protections for future habitat value and/or hunting availability.

DISTRIBUTION MANAGEMENT HUNTS - Designed to move and disperse big game concentrations creating demonstrable impacts.

1) When damages are shown to be occurring, hunts may be recommended to the AWM to disperse concentrations of animals and move them away from conflict areas.

2) Distribution hunts will be in conformance with Wildlife Commission regulations.

3) Distribution management hunts may not be available to any landowner who does not make a reasonable attempt to cooperate with the committee in addressing big game conflicts such as allowing hunting during the regular big game seasons.
**FENCING** - Designed to reduce conflicts in areas with high impacts from wildlife movements, to share in the construction costs of replacement fences that are wildlife compatible and to assist with costs associated with repair of wildlife caused damages to existing fences. This program is also intended to encourage landowner willingness to allow hunting on their property in order to reduce the number of animals contributing to the fencing damage.

1) The committee will make available information on alternative fence designs that reduce wildlife impacts or are more resistant to those impacts.

2) The committee may provide materials for replacement fences that are wildlife compatible in areas with high wildlife impacts to existing fences.

**EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

**DISTRIBUTE FENCE DESIGN GUIDELINES** - In cooperation with the Statewide HPP Council, a brochure is in publication to give landowners with conflicts guidelines on assistance available to them, recommended designs to reduce fence damage, and alternative fence types or techniques to help alleviate problems.

**SEMINARS** - If more intensive educational efforts are needed, the committee may set up or assist with seminars for local residents to help them reduce conflicts with wildlife on fence or forage.

**FORAGE PURCHASES** - Will be considered as a last resort in conflict areas where other techniques don't work or as a means to hold animals causing problems in acceptable areas.

**MONITORING** - The committee will monitor the use of the areas managed to attract and hold animals causing conflicts during the winter. Additionally, it will use the number of complaints received from landowners as an index of success of the program. Harvest data will be compiled for all distribution hunt participants and provided to the southeast regional office by March 10th annually. In specific conflict areas or areas with habitat improvement projects it may be necessary to conduct supplemental aerial or ground counts to quantify the conflicts and/or measure the effectiveness of habitat management actions.
BUDGET GUIDELINES:

The base-operating budget for the State HPP program is based on 5% of total annual revenues for big game license sales in the HPP areas. The Statewide HPP Council allocates funding to the individual HPP committees. The Arkansas River HPP budget, currently at $70,000 annually, was developed to best meet the goals and objectives outlined earlier in the plan, while maintaining the flexibility to deal with emergencies and take advantage of opportunities.

The statewide HPP financial system may allow local HPP committees to carry specific project dollars over from year to year if the project is ongoing or the funds have been committed.

The use of rollover funds will only be utilized in rare instances and with the approval of the Statewide HPP Coordinator and Statewide HPP Council.

Additional funds are also available through the Statewide HPP Council and the HPP Coordinator for special projects or unforeseen opportunities outside of the capacity of the local committees. These dollars supplement our existing budget and allow us to take on special projects from time to time.

The Arkansas River HPP Committee has developed a budget allocation in line with our vision, which allows for short-term strategies to deal with immediate fence and forage conflicts caused by big game, but concentrates on adaptive, long-term management strategies leading to the establishment of healthy and sustainable rangelands. Our budget for the five-year period has been broken down as follows:

ARHPP ESTIMATED BASE BUDGET ALLOCATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Manipulation</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Damage</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Education</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easements/NEPA Related Activities</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALLOCATION:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to acknowledge that the budget allocation is based on past projects, future projects that are likely to be proposed as well as committee emphasis in funding certain project types. While these are desired and/or likely allocations, the committee retains the ability to shift funds as needed between categories as projects and opportunities arise or as situations dictate.

HPP projects may be undertaken on public lands, private lands or a combination of both as needed wherever the local committee believes the project has the best chance to effectively reduce, minimize or eliminate the big game/livestock conflict.
Arkansas River HPP Committee Accomplishments:

### Habitat Enhancement Projects:
- **Mt. Shavano Wildlife Area**: Fuelwood Cuts
- **Droney Gulch STL**: Roller Chopping & Hydroaxe
- **Dome Rock SWA**: Meadow Burns
- **Table Mt. STL phase 1**: Hydroaxe, grazing mgmt.
- **Table Mt. STL phase 2**: Hydroaxe
- **Wilson Ranch/BLM**: Roller Chopping & Hydroaxe
- **Longs Gulch**: Hydroaxe
- **Big Hole**: Roller Chopping
- **Heckendorf SWA**: Water developments
- **Sledgehammer Gulch**: Timber thinning, mountain mahogany rehab.
- **Dirty Gulch**: Roller Chopping
- **Catamount Ranch**: Conservation Easement
- **Lake Co. Open Space Initiative**: Land exchange, resource mgmt.
- **Game Trail**: Conservation Easement assistance
- **Upper Ark. Land Trust**: Conservation Easement assistance
- **Moyer Ranch**: Conservation Easement assistance
- **Land EKG**: Range mgmt. monitoring kits
- **Smyth Lease**: Seeding
- **Sand Gulch**: Hydroaxe and hand thinning
- **Clark Ranch**: Conservation Easement assistance
- **Chubb Park**: Water developments
- **Pike San Isabel National. Forest**: Noxious weed treatment
- **Cache Creek Sagebrush**: Roller Chopping
- **Zelma L. Worden Ranch**: Water Developments
- **4-Elk Ranch**: Prescribed burn preparations
- **Limestone Ridge**: Prescribed burn preparations

### Fencing Projects:
- **Buena Vista Demo Project**: 5 landowners, 6 designs
- **Lake Co. Demo Project**: 1 landowner and Lake Co., 3 designs
- **Sand Park Project**: 4 landowners, 1 design
- **Densel Goodwin calving area**: 1 landowner, 1 design
- **Butch Howell winter range**: 3 landowners, two designs
- **Frank McMurray Ranch**: 1 landowner, 1 design
- **Al Snare Ranch**: 1 landowner, 1 design
- **Hayden Ranch**: 1 landowner, elk lay-down fence
- **Armentrout Aspen**: 1 landowner, aspen regeneration
- **Lake Fork**: 1 landowner, multiple designs

Provided up to $400 worth of fence materials for repairs to over 30 landowners per year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ranchers</th>
<th>Allotment</th>
<th>T Posts</th>
<th>Wooden Posts</th>
<th>Barbed</th>
<th>Smooth</th>
<th>Stays</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY'96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>$3,085.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$4,271.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$2,190.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'99</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>$3,803.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>$3,403.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'01</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>$6,978.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'02</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>$8,503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'03</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>$7,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'04</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$5,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>$6,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$4,587.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>$5,203.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY'09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>$11,439.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>15,251</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>$78,985.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education:
- Supported 3 conservation easement seminars for landowners in the program area
- Wildlife compatible fence designs brochure in production.

Distribution Management Hunts:
- Conducted numerous hunts each winter in the Salida, Buena Vista, Divide and Leadville areas.

Other:
- Placed 33 radio collars on cow elk to learn movement patterns and timing and aid in hunting season planning.
- Purchased tree sheerer and brush hog mowers for mechanical treatments
- Purchased chain saw sets and trailer for hand manipulation work by prison inmate crews.
- Aerial monitoring flights.
- $150 annual landowner herbicide vouchers.