

# Outdoor Empire *9/7/69*



## Private Land, Public Hunt

By Charlie Meyers

How do you feel about shooting preserves? You know, those beautifully managed tracts of upland game cover which allow you to beat the hunting pressure and season restrictions all in one fell sweep and at a price most can afford.

Great, you may think. A section of land well spent. A good way to utilize private land in relieving the crush of public hunting.

But what if that section of land becomes 170,000 acres and the game is no longer pheasant, but elk, deer and bear? And what if the thousands of big-game animals which inhabit this vast area are legally the property of the state of Colorado and, hence, the sportsmen therein?

As you may ascertain, the conversion of such an area to a shooting preserve is fraught with many problems. Yet, this is precisely the situation which confronts us with the proposed establishment of a massive preserve on the Trinchera Ranch east of Fort Garland in Costilla County.

Trinchera Ranch, 260 square miles of prime game range, evolved from an old Spanish land grant and never has been open to public hunting. That it will remain in private hands has been assured by its recent purchase by Malcolm Forbes of New York City, a wealthy magazine publisher. His magazine, which bears his name, is a giant in the realm of business publications.

Forbes' plans are to construct a game-proof fence around the entire property in accordance with the provisions of state law. He then would manage and harvest big-game animals on a commercial basis, charging hunters for the privilege

C  
I  
4  
M  
F  
n  
G  
c  
T  
F  
H  
F  
M  
k  
I  
C  
M  
L  
n  
G  
R  
D  
a  
M  
A  
C  
7  
N  
b

A

8/24/69

Forbes Trinchera Ranch Inc.

# ELK-DEER-BEAR HUNTING

The Forbes Trinchera Ranch at Fort Garland, Colorado will be opened this year for the first time to public hunting. A limited number of Trespass Permits will be issued for the taking of bull elk, deer and bear. Permit holders will have access to over 260 square miles of the finest big-game country in the nation. One of the largest elk and deer herds in Colorado makes its home on this ranch.

## Schedule of Trespass Fees

(Season is October 18 through November 6 only)

Bull Elk plus Deer	\$1,000	Limited to 75 Permits
Black Bear plus Deer	1,000	Limited to 10 Permits
Buck Deer	500	Limited to 100 Permits

For information concerning Trespass Permits, contact Client Landen, Ranch Manager, or Errol Ryland, Game and Fish Manager, Forbes Trinchera Ranch Inc., Fort Garland, Colorado 81133. Telephone: (303) 379-3431.

To establish this preserve, Forbes must acquire the permission of the Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Commission, which has the authority to grant or refuse such a request.

The two prime requisites which must be met before the commission might give its approval are the construction of a satisfactory fence and the disposition of game animals already on the property.

The former requires merely the expenditure of a million or so dollars, something Forbes stands ready and willing to do. The latter poses more of a problem.

Just how does one transfer that many animals (rough estimates range from 4,000 to 7,000) from a large private tract into the public domain. To drive them out would be unthinkable, if for no other reason than the physical improbability of the task. Also, the burden of that many animals upon the neighboring range could only result in extreme pressure upon the game which already inhabits it. Range damage and starvation are the likely results.

In a recent meeting to explain his plan to various sportsmen's groups and the Game, Fish and Parks Division, Forbes suggested two alternatives. Both require a preliminary census by the division to accurately determine the number of big-game animals on the property.

permits under market...  
\$1,000 and that the advertisements specified the species of animal which could be shot at the price.

The relative cost of a trespass permit is academic, but the stipulation of any price for a specific animal may be construed as a violation of a law which prohibits the sale, or advertisement for sale, of game owned by the public. The Trinchera game remains public property until some plan for its transfer is approved. Just how the Game, Fish and Parks Division reacts to Forbes' advertising campaign remains to be seen.

In the meantime, Forbes and his staff will finalize the proposal to be presented the commission early next year. The recodified game laws which provide for the establishment of big-game shooting preserves don't take effect until Jan. 1.

# Farm Bureau Submits Questions on Ranch Deal

By MONK TYSON  
Denver Post Staff Writer

The Colorado Farm Bureau (CFB) continued Saturday to press its opposition to acquisition by the U.S. Forest Service of the major portion of Trinchera Ranch, covering 173,000 acres in Costilla County, primarily in Colorado's San Luis Valley.

Lloyd Sommerville of Grand Junction, CFB president, mailed a letter Thursday to David S. Nordwall, regional forester in Denver, in which he asked 11 sets of questions regarding government acquisition of the ranch.

An assistant to Nordwall, George Lafferty, said Nordwall would be in his office Tuesday. He said answers to the questions would be up to Nordwall.

**RICE ASKED**  
Lafferty said he didn't know the price for Trinchera offered by the forest service. This question was asked by Sommerville. Trinchera was put up for sale more than two years ago by its owners, John Simms, Albuquerque, N.M., attorney, and his wife, Dr. Albert Simms, also Albuquerque. A burdensomeheritance tax was the principal

reason for putting the ranch up for sale.

At that time, the Simms brothers asked \$4.5 million for the big ranch, part of an 1849 Spanish land grant.

At first, the owners stipulated they would retain 4,000 acres with some 20 buildings and 50 per cent of the mineral rights. Later, they withdrew the sale offer.

**PRESENT PLAN**  
Now, the Simms brothers would retain 10,000 acres of productive land and sell the remaining 163,000 acres to the Forest Service.

Although claiming he didn't know the price, Lafferty said the 163,000 acres, called "wildlands" in a report he later described as not a report, probably would be acquired for less than \$4.5 million.

A Forest Service spokesman said it was prepared by the service. On Friday, Lafferty said it wasn't exactly a report—for the public, that is.

He said it was information compiled for forest rangers and sent out with a "cover letter." He said the CFB might have obtained the "report" from a forest ranger.

**QUOTE CORRECTED**  
Lafferty said a press report quoting the Forest Service "report" stating a local wage incentive of \$500,000 a year was inaccurate. He said the period would be 10 years.

The Forest Service "report" stated: "Average annual wage income to the local economy of one-half million dollars." These are Sommerville's 11 sets of questions:

1. How will the transaction be consummated?
2. According to our present understanding, the ranch will be purchased by a third party and exchanged for other lands. Who is the third party? What is the purpose of the exchange?
3. Where are the GSA (General Service Administration) lands that will be given in exchange for the ranch located? What is their value? What kind of lands are they (range, urban, beach, etc.)? What is their quality?
4. Why shouldn't those GSA lands be sold outright under competitive bidding?
5. Will congressional action be required for the exchange or for national forest status?
6. What economic justification do you have for the exchange? What are the economics of the area? Will the present owners retain grazing privileges?
7. By what criteria do you believe these lands should be in public ownership for the public good? How do you define "public good"? Why is it essential that these lands be in public ownership? Can a real public need be demonstrated?
8. If we need more campsites and recreation areas, why can't the Forest Service develop many of the prime recreation areas it already owns?
9. If this goes into the Forest Service ownership, to which national forest will it be annexed?
10. Under Forest Service management, how much live-stock will be allowed to use the more wage earners?
11. When did the governor (of Colorado) approve the transaction mentioned in your report? Which members of the Colorado congressional delegation approved it and when?

Sommerville described the "report" as "one of the most biased and vague reports I have ever read."

In its summary, the Forest Service "report" made these claims:

1. Inflow to local economy from use of range, recreation, wildlife and timber resources — over \$3 million, of which nearly 50 per cent will accrue to labor and small business.
2. Inflow of government funds for resource development, maintenance and management of \$2,032,900 creating 280 man-years of work benefiting 53 or more wage earners.
3. Average annual wage in-

come to local economy of \$90,000.

4. Reduction of federal assistance and welfare programs as economy is improved.

5. Stimulation of travel to developed area and increased local business.

6. Much of the direct benefit, especially from ranching and labor, will accrue to resident Spanish-American population which comprises high proportion of low-income families.

7. It would provide a needed public recreation area for residents of Costilla County and surrounding areas.

**PRIMARY AIM**  
Primarily, the Forest Service would develop such recreation projects as fishing, hunting and camping on the big ranch. It also would generate income from livestock grazing fees and timber cutting.

Sommerville is checking the Forest Service claim that government acquisition has the approval of Gov. John Love and the Colorado congressional delegation. He's sending carbon copies of his letter to them.



