

ISSUES SUBMITTAL FORM

	Date: 08/09/2024
ISSUE:	Should emergency salvage regulations on Bonny Reservoir be removed?
DISCUSSION (FACTS AND FIGURES, EXPLANATION OF ISSUE):	
<p>Bonny Reservoir was a reservoir located north of Burlington on the Eastern Plains of Colorado. Chapter W-1 Special Regulations #108 B. 50 a. and b. were created to facilitate an emergency salvage of fish when Bonny Reservoir was being permanently drained starting in 2011. These regulations eliminated all bag and possession limits for all species of fish and also liberalized methods of take to include trotlines and jugs.</p> <p>Bonny Reservoir has been completely empty since 2012 and will be empty for the foreseeable future. Discussions regarding permanently breaching the dam are also underway.</p> <p>Since the reservoir is empty, there is no need for any special regulation to be in place on Bonny Reservoir, and it is particularly unnecessary to have regulations liberalizing harvest of fish.</p> <p>Area 14 and Southeast Aquatics staff support removing these regulations, as they are no longer necessary.</p>	
<p>STATE LAW REQUIRES CPW TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY BY THE PROPOSED RULES. THE FOLLOWING STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF AND INVITED TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE REGULATORY CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS ISSUE PAPER:</p> <p>*IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL NECESSARY INTERNAL PARTIES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED*.</p> <p>[List stakeholder groups and briefly summarize comments received]</p> <p>n/a</p>	
ALTERNATIVES: (POSSIBLE OUTCOMES or POSSIBLE REGULATIONS):	
<p>1. *Preferred Alternative*: Remove Chapter W-1 Special Regulations #108 B. 50 a. and b. Bonny Reservoir – Yuma County a. There is no bag or possession limit for any game fish species. b. Trotlines and jugs are allowed.</p> <p>2. Status quo</p>	
Issue Raised by:	Josh Nehring, Assistant Aquatic Section Manager
Author of the issue paper (if different than person raising the issue):	Cory Noble – Aquatic Biologist
CC:	
APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY:	Matt Nicholl
REQUIRES NEW SPACE IN THE BROCHURE?	NO
ARE ADEQUATE STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO IMPLEMENT?	YES
REGION, BRANCH, OR SECTION LEADING IMPLEMENTATION	Aquatic Section
RECOMMENDED FOR CONSENT AGENDA?	YES

ISSUES SUBMITTAL FORM

Date: 08/09/2024

ISSUE:	Should Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) eliminate the special fishing regulations for walleye and saugeye at Horseshoe Reservoir?
DISCUSSION (FACTS AND FIGURES, EXPLANATION OF ISSUE):	
<p>Horseshoe Reservoir is located west of Boyd Lake State Park, northeast of Loveland. Surface water recreational rights belong to the homeowners surrounding Horseshoe Reservoir and public fishing is no longer allowed on any portion of this water or shoreline. Fish stocking by CPW ceased in 2019 and the reservoir is no longer managed by CPW. We recommend removing the special regulations for walleye and saugeye given no public access exists.</p>	
<p>STATE LAW REQUIRES CPW TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY BY THE PROPOSED RULES. THE FOLLOWING STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF AND INVITED TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE REGULATORY CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS ISSUE PAPER:</p> <p>*IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL NECESSARY INTERNAL PARTIES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED*.</p> <p>[List stakeholder groups and briefly summarize comments received]</p> <p>Internal: Area 2 DWMs, Area 2 AWM, Aquatic Biologist</p> <p>CPW held a public meeting on June 20th and there was no opposition to the proposed regulation changes.</p>	
ALTERNATIVES: (POSSIBLE OUTCOMES or POSSIBLE REGULATIONS):	
<p>1. *Preferred Alternative*: Eliminate/remove the following regulation: HORSESHOE RESERVOIR – LARIMER</p> <p>1. Min. size for walleye and saugeye is 15 inches long.</p> <p>2. Only 1 walleye or saugeye in the aggregate longer than 21 inches may be taken per day.</p> <p>2. Status Quo - No changes</p>	
Issue Raised by:	Benjamin Swigle (Area 2 Aquatic Biologist) Clayton Brossart (Area 2 DWM) Jason Duetsch (Area 2 AWM)
Author of the issue paper (if different than person raising the issue):	Benjamin Swigle
CC:	Eric Grey, Kyle Battige
APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY:	Matt Nicholl
REQUIRES NEW SPACE IN THE BROCHURE?	NO
ARE ADEQUATE STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO IMPLEMENT?	YES
REGION, BRANCH, OR SECTION LEADING IMPLEMENTATION	Aquatic Section
RECOMMENDED FOR CONSENT AGENDA?	YES

ISSUES SUBMITTAL FORM

Date: 08/09/2024

ISSUE:	Should the special regulations, artificial flies and lures only, and bag and possession limit for trout is 2, be removed from Kerr Lake in Conejos County?
DISCUSSION (FACTS AND FIGURES, EXPLANATION OF ISSUE):	
<p>Kerr Lake is located in the mountains west of Alamosa and Monte Vista. CPW records show that a fly-and-lure regulation has been in place at Kerr Lake as far back as 1995 when the bag-and-possession limit was updated to 2 trout; however, no biological nor other reason was documented for this change.</p> <p>Kerr Lake is one of 39 high-elevation lakes stocked with recreational Rio Grande cutthroat trout. Many of these lakes do not support natural reproduction, and angling opportunities are maintained through stocking efforts from CPW hatcheries. The Pitkin Hatchery houses a brood stock of recreational Rio Grande cutthroat trout and produces fish to maintain these high-elevation angling opportunities throughout the Rio Grande drainage. Kerr Lake is stocked biannually with recreational Rio Grande cutthroat trout. This proposed change would allow for more fish to be harvested at Kerr Lake. Current stocking rates would maintain the recreational Rio Grande cutthroat trout population in the lake. Recreational Rio Grande cutthroat trout are not 100% genetically pure and do not have any influence on the conservation efforts of genetically pure Rio Grande cutthroat trout. The population of Rio Grande cutthroat trout in Kerr Lake is maintained through stocking efforts, and there is no biological justification for the current special regulations.</p>	
STATE LAW REQUIRES CPW TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY BY THE PROPOSED RULES. THE FOLLOWING STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF AND INVITED TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE REGULATORY CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS ISSUE PAPER:	
IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL NECESSARY INTERNAL PARTIES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED.	
[List stakeholder groups and briefly summarize comments received]	
<p>CPW Aquatic Section, Area 17, District Wildlife Manager, Brian Bechaver, Rio Grande National Forest.</p> <p>A public meeting was held in Monte Vista on June 13th. All attendees supported the proposed regulation change.</p>	
ALTERNATIVES: (POSSIBLE OUTCOMES or POSSIBLE REGULATIONS):	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. *Preferred Alternative*: Remove special regulations from Kerr Lake and change to statewide bag and possession limit. 2. Status Quo: Maintain current special regulations, and bag and possession limit for trout is 2 at Kerr Lake. 	
Issue Raised by:	Estevan Vigil (Area 17, Aquatic Biologist) Brian Bechaver (District Wildlife Manager)
Author of the issue paper (if different than person raising the issue):	Estevan Vigil
CC:	Matt Nicholl, Josh Nehring, Rick Basagoitia, Brain Bechaver
APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY:	Matt Nicholl
REQUIRES NEW SPACE IN THE BROCHURE?	YES
ARE ADEQUATE STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO IMPLEMENT?	YES
REGION, BRANCH, OR SECTION LEADING IMPLEMENTATION	SW Aquatics
RECOMMENDED FOR CONSENT AGENDA?	YES

ISSUES SUBMITTAL FORM

Date: 08/09/2024

ISSUE:	Should fishing regulations be adjusted to be more uniform on Los Pinos and Cochetopa Creeks on the Cochetopa State Wildlife Area?		
DISCUSSION (FACTS AND FIGURES, EXPLANATION OF ISSUE):			
<p>Los Pinos and Cochetopa Creeks are two special regulation streams located on the Cochetopa State Wildlife Area. Fishing regulations for both streams allow fishing by flies and lures only, but differ in the species that are included in the catch and release portion of the regulation. Cochetopa Creek requires that “All trout must be returned to the water immediately upon catch” while Los Pinos Creek requires that “All fish must be returned to the water immediately upon catch.” Creating a more uniform regulation will simplify regulations and regulation maps for the two adjacent streams.</p>			
<p>STATE LAW REQUIRES CPW TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY BY THE PROPOSED RULES. THE FOLLOWING STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF AND INVITED TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE REGULATORY CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS ISSUE PAPER:</p> <p>*IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL NECESSARY INTERNAL PARTIES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED*. [List stakeholder groups and briefly summarize comments received]</p> <p>No public engagement was pursued as this simply cleans up the language and makes it more consistent with nearby waters.</p>			
ALTERNATIVES: (POSSIBLE OUTCOMES or POSSIBLE REGULATIONS):			
<p>1. *Preferred Alternative*:</p> <p>243. Los Pinos Creek - Saguache</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. On that portion within the Cochetopa State Wildlife Area (Snyder Ranch):</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">1. Fishing is by artificial flies and lures only.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">2. All fish fish trout must be returned to water immediately upon catch.</p> <p>2. Status quo.</p>			
Issue Raised by:	Dan Brauch and Nick Gallowich		
Author of the issue paper (if different than person raising the issue):			
CC:			
APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY:	Matt Nicholl		
REQUIRES NEW SPACE IN THE BROCHURE?	NO		
ARE ADEQUATE STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO IMPLEMENT?	YES		
REGION, BRANCH, OR SECTION LEADING IMPLEMENTATION	Aquatic Section		
RECOMMENDED FOR CONSENT AGENDA?	YES		

ISSUE SUBMITTAL FORM

Date: 08/09/2024

ISSUE:	Should CPW remove “Walker Lake State Wildlife Area – Mesa County” and the associated water-specific fishing regulations from Chapter W-1?
DISCUSSION (FACTS AND FIGURES, EXPLANATION OF ISSUE):	
<p>Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Regulation W-1, Article II, #450. Walker Lake State Wildlife Area (SWA) is not a stand-alone SWA and should be removed entirely from the regulations. Walker State Wildlife Area (Mesa County) is a true SWA and once had a 53.6-acre lake named Walker Lake. Walker Lake was an abandoned gravel pit lake on the north side of the Colorado River when the property was designated as a SWA. Multiple years of high water and flooding of the Colorado River in this area has completely inundated the gravel pit, and what was once a man-made lake is now a functioning backwater and floodplain of the river.</p> <p>As Walker Lake no longer exists, there is no longer a need for the regulation. Furthermore, the seasonal fishing closure listed in the fishing regulations as “Walker Lake State Wildlife Area – Mesa County” should be removed as this is in reference to the historical seasonal fishing closure on Walker Lake and wasn’t originally intended to be a seasonal fishing closure on the Colorado River within the actual Walker SWA.</p>	
<p>STATE LAW REQUIRES CPW TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY BY THE PROPOSED RULES. THE FOLLOWING STAKEHOLDERS HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF AND INVITED TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE REGULATORY CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS ISSUE PAPER:</p> <p>*IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL NECESSARY INTERNAL PARTIES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED*.</p> <p>[List stakeholder groups and briefly summarize comments received]</p> <p>Stakeholders include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anglers 2. Public users of the SWA 	
ALTERNATIVES: (POSSIBLE OUTCOMES or POSSIBLE REGULATIONS):	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. *Preferred Alternative*: Remove regulation W-1, Article II, #450 450. Walker Lake State Wildlife Area – Mesa County a. Fishing is prohibited from October 1 through the last day of February 2. Status quo. 	
Issue Raised by:	Crystal Almaraz, Area 7 Admin: Ivan Archer, AAWM
Author of the issue paper (if different than person raising the issue):	Ivan Archer, AAWM
CC:	Kirk Oldham, AWM: Mark Richman, DWM: Ben Felt, NW Senior Aquatic Biologist.
APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY:	Matt Nicholl
REQUIRES NEW SPACE IN THE BROCHURE?	NO
ARE ADEQUATE STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO IMPLEMENT?	YES
REGION, BRANCH, OR SECTION LEADING IMPLEMENTATION	Area 7
RECOMMENDED FOR CONSENT AGENDA?	YES