

Response to Comments

From the White River National Forest
Travel Management Plan
Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

3/17/2011

USDA Forest Service

White River National Forest

Introduction

The Comments and Responses are presented in separate documents for ease of review. This document includes programmatic and site-specific comments and responses.

Many comments were received on the first Draft EIS for the Travel Management Plan. Those comments calling for a response in terms of either explanation or further analysis are recorded as part of the Supplemental DEIS.

Comments received during the Supplemental Draft EIS are addressed here. Comments ranged from very specific to general observations and opinions. Individual comments and letters are part of the project record. Forms were recorded once as comments are not votes, rather to be examined as individual, unique statements.

Process

The content analysis process used on this project is qualitative and does not treat input as a vote or survey. Rather, the goal is to ensure that the substance of every comment—what to do and why—is considered in the planning and decision process.

There were 713 comment letters, e-mails, and faxes, received on the proposed White River National Forest Travel Management Plan and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement during the public comment period, from November 7, 2008 to January 6, 2009. Of the 713 comment letters, 155 were organized response (form) letters and 558 were unique responses. These submissions contained a total of 2,996 identified comments or expressions of concern on specific topics.

The process used to track and analyze these comments was developed by the Forest Service Content Analysis Team (CAT). As submissions were received, data technicians entered tracking information into a database. All distinct comments in the submissions were identified and categorized by analysts, then entered into the database. Comments that did not address specific locations were then extracted from the database, sorted by topic, and used to formulate Public Concern statements that comprise this report. Public Concern statements attempt to concisely summarize and organize the full range of comments: what the Forest is being asked to do and why. Since Public Concern statements are less detailed than many of the actual comments, they do not eliminate the need to read the comments themselves. Rather, they are a tool to help Forest personnel consider and respond to comments collectively as well as individually. For this purpose, selected sample comments for each Public Concern are included in this report.

Each public concern statement is an analyst's succinct rephrasing of one or more comments expressing similar views of what action the agency should take. Each concern statement is assigned a unique number. Concern statements may also be accompanied by sub-concerns, which provide the various rationales given for why that action should be taken, or some other qualifying element for the action. Sub-concern statements are identified by an alphabetical letter. Each concern statement or sub-concern is followed by

one or more sample comments which illustrate respondents' specific perspectives and rationales regarding that concern. These sample statements do not include all the comments from which the public concern statement was derived; rather, they are examples provided to show the range of perspectives and demonstrate the variety of comments related to the concern. Each sample comment contains an attribution at the end identifying the letter number, comment number, and whether the comment was from an individual or organization.

Comments about specific roads or trails exported from the database to a spreadsheet to facilitate independent consideration and response. Since these comments are typically quite specific, Public Concerns were not written for them.

Responses

The responses to comments are of several types. Those comments expressing opinion for the Forest Service to consider are recorded and generally responded to by "Thank you for the comment". The Forest Service welcomes these kinds of comments and does take them seriously; however, they do not call for a direct response in this document. Comments outside the scope of the analysis or decision being made are generally responded to by "Comment is outside the scope of this analysis or decision-making process"

The Forest Service is required by regulation to make the NEPA process as efficient as possible and to address our attention to only the decisions to be made based on the purpose and need of the project and the analysis of significant environmental, social, and economic issues which allows us to consider the effects of the alternatives.

Those comments calling for a response in terms of either explanation or further analysis are recorded and followed by a brief reply. In some cases they led to more in-depth or revised analysis in the Final EIS.

Responses were written by Forest Service staff over the past year; prior to development of the Final EIS. The responses are based on knowledge of the Supplemental Draft EIS, professional judgment, field observations, and shared discussions among other staff members as well as other government agencies and publics. A number of Forest Service employees were involved in preparing comment responses depending on the issue and/or geographical location referenced in the comments. Therefore you may notice different writing styles and/or approaches to the various responses.

We recognize the sincerity of people taking the time to send in their comments, and appreciate all that was stated. Many people on the White River National Forest took a great deal of time and devoted considerable energy to reviewing the letters, comments and developing responses. These same people utilized the comments to help develop the Final EIS and Travel Management Plan.

Chapter 1: Decision Making Process

PC 1 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not extend the comment period

- A) TO OFFER A REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE TIME FRAME FOR PUBLIC REVIEW
- B) BECAUSE THE COMMENT PERIOD CONTAINS THREE NATIONAL HOLIDAYS
- C) BECAUSE THE COMMENT PERIOD COINCIDES WITH ANNUAL LEAVE FOR USFS STAFF
- D) BECAUSE OF MANY MAPPING ERRORS THAT REQUIRE MORE TIME TO BE COMPLETELY EVALUATED
- E) INCLUDING A 30-DAY EXTENSION
- F) BECAUSE OF THE TMP WAS RELEASED DURING THE BUSIEST TIME OF THE YEAR
- G) TO ALLOW BETTER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND INPUT FROM LOCALS
- H) BECAUSE AN INADEQUATE COMMENT PERIOD VIOLATES THE TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE

Response PC 1: The comment period for the SDEIS was for 60 days. Under CFR 40 1506.10, for an EIS, the minimum requirement for a comment period is 45 days. The WRNF has conducted three formal and numerous informal opportunities for public input into the travel management process since the NOI was released in the fall of 2003.

PC 2 Public Concern: The WRNF should develop a new travel planning framework

- A) TO BE BASED ON A COMPREHENSIVE LOOK AT ALL RESOURCES, INCLUDING NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT AND BARK BEETLE MANAGEMENT
- B) TO BE PROGRAMMATIC
- C) TO USE LANGUAGE CONSISTENT WITH THAT OF THE TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE
- D) BECAUSE THE CURRENT PLANNING FRAMEWORK IMPLIES A FOREST SERVICE CENTRIC APPROACH TO TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
- E) TO ENHANCE A BALANCED SET OF RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL USERS
- F) BECAUSE THE VAST AMOUNT OF DATA, RULES, REGULATIONS, PROPOSALS, ETC., PROVES DIFFICULT FOR THE LAYPERSON TO UNDERSTAND AND FOLLOW
- G) TO FACILITATE TRUE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
- H) TO BE SITE SPECIFIC

Response PC 2 A: In part the decisions to be made for the TMP are to define the designated forest roads and trails; and what uses are allowed on each; for **general public** use. The decision does not include future roads for timber or natural gas development. These must be examined as they are proposed. The cumulative effects section does examine and acknowledge the presence of commodity, other special use, and non-Forest Service roads contributions to the system.

Response PC 2 B, H: The TMP contains both programmatic and site-specific information and analysis to inform the decision. The process used a systematic process to examine site-specifically each route and area for consideration. The routes and area designations were then examined at various scales including forest-wide, as to the effects.

Response PC 2 C, D, E: The TMP decisions include elements to be consistent and meet the Travel Management Rule. Chapter 1 includes documentation on how the plan uses and meets the TMR. As stated in the purpose "The purpose of this initiative is to identify the transportation system with the goal of balancing physical, biological, and social values of the forest." The process to produce the alternatives and maps follow the process that is outlined in regulations for developing an EIS. Issues brought forth during scoping drove the alternatives for the DEIS, and comments from the DEIS drove the SDEIS

alternatives. The FEIS will represent the final version based on all the information, guidance, direction, and goals set out to meet the TMP purpose and need.

Response PC 2 F, G: There is a large amount of data and information needed to meet the goals of producing a TMP. The WRNF needs to present enough data so the public can understand all the elements that went into the plan, while making it as easy as possible to get information one might be seeking. One primary reason for releasing the SDEIS was to allow the opportunity for the public to be able to focus on a preferred alternative and hopefully weigh in on a more focused version of the TMP. The SDEIS did utilize the input from the DEIS comments prior to its development and the FEIS took into account all input since the beginning. The TMP adheres to the regulations and planning documents that guide the Forest Service as well.

PC 3 Public Concern: The WRNF should support cooperative planning efforts

A) TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES IN TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS

B) TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT MANAGEMENT ACROSS JURISDICTIONS

C) TO DEMONSTRATE GOOD FAITH WITH SUCH GROUPS AS CBTRA AND COHVCO

D) BECAUSE THE PUBLIC OUTREACH SEEMS HASTILY ORGANIZED AND ANNOUNCED

E) INCLUDING EMS DISTRICTS IN EAGLE COUNTY AND OTHER AGENCIES TO CONDUCT SAFETY STUDIES

F) TO WORK WITH SUMMIT COUNTY REGARDING JURISDICTION OVER COUNTY ROADS AND PRESCRIBED USES

G) TO WORK WITH SUMMIT COUNTY ON SEAMLESS MANAGEMENT WITH COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY INTERESTS

Response PC 3: The WRNF has worked with and is continuing to work with partners and other government agencies to coordinate travel management systems where possible across various jurisdictions and land ownership. The WRNF met with county officials, road managers, BLM representatives, CDOW representatives, neighboring Forest Service personnel, and others to coordinate travel management across boundaries. The parameters for decisions to be made in the TMP are limited to roads, trails, and areas that are under Forest Service jurisdiction. The WRNF has worked through-out the TMP process to provide several opportunities for extensive public input.

PC 4 Public Concern: The WRNF should provide sufficient resources to implement the TMP

Response PC 4: The WRNF agrees that providing a travel management system that considers economically feasibility should be a serious component. The transportation and recreation analyses in Chapter 3 discuss costs to maintaining roads and trails. District personnel took into consideration their ability to manage routes when providing their input toward the final alternative.

PC 5 Public Concern: The WRNF should take advantage of partnerships and volunteer groups

A) INCLUDING ASSIGNING FS PERSONNEL TO MANAGE PARTNERSHIPS AND VOLUNTEER GROUPS

B) IN A WAY THAT ENSURES PROJECTS ON THE FOREST ARE IMPLEMENTED IN A PRIORITIZED, PLANNED ORDER

Response PC 4: The White River National Forest has received assistance from a variety of individuals, groups and organizations and hopes to continue partnering with interested entities on future projects, including the implementation of travel management on the forest. All the Ranger Districts on the WRNF have volunteer organizations and individuals they have been working and hope to continue to do so. The WRNF is very appreciative of the many volunteers who take the time to make the Forest a better place.

Priorities are established at the Districts to establish where work needs to take place. Volunteers also have favorite trails, locations, or trails that are dedicated to certain uses that they want to work on i.e. the adopt-a-trail program which the WRNF will continue to encourage.

PC 6 Public Concern: The WRNF should respect the legal rights or claims of existing road or trail easements on National Forest System lands

Response PC 6: The Forest Service does respect legal rights established by laws and regulations. The FEIS addresses this issue in the Valid Outstanding Rights section in Chapter 1.

PC 7 Public Concern: The WRNF should listen to the majority of users

A) BECAUSE THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE USE MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

B) INCLUDING LISTENING TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC, NOT JUST CERTAIN USER GROUPS

Response PC 7 A, B: As directed by 40 CFR 1503.4 “An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively.” “The content analysis process used on this project is qualitative and does not treat input as a vote or survey. Since respondents are self-selected, their comments may not represent public sentiment as a whole. Rather, the goal is to ensure that the substance of every comment—what to do and why—is considered in the planning and decision process.” Summary of Public Comment Report, DEIS and SDEIS.

PC 8 Public Concern: The WRNF should base decisionmaking on multiple-use land management

A) TO AVOID DAMAGE TO PUBLIC OPINION OF THE FS AND BLM

B) TO INCLUDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND SHARING FOR MOTORIZED AND NONMOTORIZED RECREATION

Response PC 8 A: See Purpose and Need in Chapter 1 for description of why this action is needed.

Response PC 8 B: Thank you for your opinion on which option should be taken. The EIS process examines a range of options for consideration.

PC 9 Public Concern: The WRNF should review and adopt management practices from other travel management plans

A) INCLUDING OUTHouses, BYPASS GATES, AND SIGNAGE

Response PC 9 A: The WRNF will be developing an implementation plan for TM. These suggestions for implementation are very helpful.

Chapter 2: SDEIS and Alternatives

PC 10 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not support Alternative G

A) BECAUSE ACCEPTING OTHER ALTERNATIVES WILL LEAD USERS TO DISRESPECT CLOSURES

B) BECAUSE IT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF FOREST USERS

C) BECAUSE IT IS TOO RESTRICTIVE AND RESULTS IN POOR USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

D) BECAUSE IT DESIGNATES ROUTES THROUGH MOTORIZED RESTRICTED AREAS

E) BECAUSE SNOWMOBILING OPPORTUNITIES WOULD DECREASE

F) BECAUSE HUNDREDS OF MILES OF TRAILS WOULD BE DECOMMISSIONED

G) TO BALANCE PUBLIC INTERESTS

H) BECAUSE IT IS AN IMPROVEMENT OVER THE ORIGINAL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

I) TO PROTECT WILDLIFE AND ECOSYSTEMS

J) TO PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY NON-MOTORIZED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES

K) BECAUSE IT TARGETS PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS

L) BECAUSE IT DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE EXECUTIVE ORDER ON FACILITATION OF HUNTING HERITAGE AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION.

M) BECAUSE IT PROTECTS STREAM AND RIPARIAN AREAS

N) BECAUSE OF NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY

PC 37 Public Concern: The WRNF should establish a balanced use between all recreation users

A) BECAUSE TAKING AWAY RIGHTS FROM AN INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP IS ILLEGAL

B) BECAUSE IT IS DISCRIMINATION TO ACCOMMODATE ONE USER GROUP OVER ANOTHER

C) CONSIDERING NOT ONLY THE NUMBER OF ACRES BUT THE TYPE OF ACRES

D) BECAUSE THE WRNF HAS NOT PROVIDED ADEQUATE OR A BALANCED USE FOR MOTORIZED RECREATION

Response PC 10, 37: Many people wrote in and voiced an opinion in clear support or opposition to one of the alternatives (or a combination of alternatives) presented in the draft and supplemental draft. Many of these opinions were offered with supporting or opposing reasons. The Forest Service does not treat these as votes. Rather the Forest Service reads each comment and reviews them for specific content. Many of the issues raised and reasons for support or opposition are listed in the above sub-public concerns. The reasons demonstrate the same issues that formed the themes for each alternative are still key issues and/or justifications for public desires. Subsequently it becomes apparent that the desires reflect the need for the WRNF to balance travel/recreation use with the protection of the natural resources. The term balance does not mean every element is equal rather that consideration of the various uses with regard to natural resource protection is taken into account when trying to provide for recreation opportunities with respect to maintaining land values.

Also apparent is that some recreationists support a system that provides them the most opportunity to participate in their sport of choice. Some are willing to share with others who are participating in a different sport, some are not. Some understand the need for balance with other uses / conditions of the forest, others do not. The comments demonstrate the issues originally identified are still the main issues that arise when developing the travel management plan. Namely volume and type of recreation use, user conflict, and protection of the natural resources. The Final EIS addresses effects, impacts, and options that address the above concerns. The Forest Service weighs all these issues, ideas, and reasons when formulating the final decision.

PC 12 Public Concern: The WRNF should consider a full range of alternatives

A) BECAUSE OTHER VIABLE ALTERNATIVES COULD HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED

B) BECAUSE THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE SDEIS TRUNCATE PUBLIC INPUT

C) TO INCLUDE A ROUTE-SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE

D) BECAUSE THE ALTERNATIVES FALL SHORT OF MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE MOTORIZED COMMUNITY

E) TO INCLUDE A "NEW CONSTRUCTION" ALTERNATIVE

F) INCLUDING A “PRO-ACCESS” ALTERNATIVE

G) INCLUDING A “PRO-RECREATION” ALTERNATIVE A, B, C

Response PC 12: 40 CFR 150.14(a) states: “Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives...” The WRNF provided a range of reasonable alternatives that were considered reasonable to meet the purpose and need in the Draft EIS and subsequently utilized those to develop the alternatives presented in the Supplemental EIS. How the WRNF developed the alternatives is explained in Chapter 2 Development of Alternatives in the DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS. When alternatives were developed, many factors / aspects were considered. These considerations are analyzed for both positive and negative effects for each alternative. Analysis is done so the decision maker can examine all the alternatives and their effects in relationship to meeting the purpose and need.

PC 11 Public Concern: The WRNF should address inaccuracies and misleading statements in the purpose and need statement

A) BECAUSE SOCIAL VALUES ARE DETERMINED BY PEOPLE AND THEIR NEEDS, NOT BY FOREST SERVICE NEEDS

B) INCLUDING CONTRADICTIONS TO THE TMR, WHICH CALLS FOR REASONED AND SITE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS OF ROUTES

C) BECAUSE MANY ROADS IDENTIFIED AS ILLEGAL WERE APPROVED, PERMITTED, AND MAINTAINED BY THE FS WITH DUE PROCESS

D) INCLUDING A BIAS TOWARD NON-MOTORIZED USES AND SKI AREAS

E) INCLUDING A PURPOSE AND NEED BASED ON PREDETERMINED RESULTS DESIRED BY FOREST SERVICE STAFF

PC 29 Public Concern: The WRNF should not adopt user-created roads/trails into the designated transportation system

A) BECAUSE THESE TRAVELWAYS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED TO BE NECESSARY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF NFS LANDS

B) BECAUSE THESE ROUTES NO LONGER SERVE THEIR INTENDED PURPOSE AND WERE NEVER PROPERLY CLOSED

C) BECAUSE THESE ROUTES WERE CREATED BY OFF-ROAD/TRAIL RECREATION USE WITHOUT DUE PROCESS

D) INCLUDING A DETAILED SCHEDULE FOR REHABILITATING THOSE ROUTES NOT BEING BROUGHT INTO THE OFFICIAL TRAVEL SYSTEM

Response PC 11A: The Forest Service recognizes that social values are based on public wants, needs, and ideals. The National Environmental Policy Act specifies in **Sec. 102 [42 USC § 4332]**

“The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible: (1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall --

(A) utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment;”

Response to Programmatic Comments

It is the Forest Service responsibility to recognize social values in conjunction with physical and biological factors when making decisions that effect use on National Forest System lands. The Purpose and Need reflects this.

Response PC 11 D, E: The WRNF conducted the EIS without prejudice or bias. The process to develop a travel management plan followed the NEPA process entirely including considering comments from scoping, two formal comment periods, and several meetings with publics, interest groups, and government agencies.

Response PC 11 B, C AND PC 29: The WRNF followed the process outlined in the Travel Management Rule, Forest Service Manual and Handbook direction, and NEPA regulations for development and consideration of routes for the Travel Management Plan. Chapter 1 reiterates the process and parameters used. While the comment implies non-designated or unauthorized routes should actually be a designated route because people are using them or they have existed for sometime is not reflected in regulation. The definition of a designated road or trail is a National Forest System road, a National Forest System trail, or area on National forest System lands that is **designated** for motor vehicle use pursuant to 36 CFR 212.51 on a motor vehicle use map. The process outlined in the TMR under Subpart B dictates how a route becomes designated. The TMP is giving consideration to unauthorized routes based on their potential contribution to the forest transportation system. These routes along with system routes are being examined in light of what is needed for the transportation system, and what is not. Criteria for what should or should not be part of the system were examined as per direction outlined in 36 CFR 212.55 *Criteria for designation of roads, trails, and areas.*

The Travel Management Rule (TMR) addressed unauthorized routes “Stating that an unauthorized road or trail is not included in a forest transportation atlas does not imply that it can be authorized simply by including it in the atlas. As stated in the preamble to the proposed rule, “user-created roads and trails may be identified through public involvement and considered in the designation process. After public consideration and appropriate site-specific environmental analysis, some user-created routes may be designated for motor vehicle use pursuant to § 212.51 of the final rule. These routes would become NFS roads or NFS trails and would be included in a forest transportation atlas and reflected on a motor vehicle use map. The final rule contains a prohibition at 36 CFR 261.13 pertaining to motor vehicle use. Under this provision, after NFS roads, NFS trails, and areas on NFS lands have been designated pursuant to 36 CFR 212.51 on an administrative unit or a Ranger District, it is prohibited to possess or operate a motor vehicle on NFS lands in that unit or District other than in accordance with those designations. At that point, motor vehicle use off designated routes and outside designated areas will be prohibited under § 261.13.

The Department expects that some user-created routes will become designated roads and trails, after site-specific evaluation. The overall network of routes designated for motor vehicle use would then expand. These designated routes will form a more stable base for long-term management and will receive increased maintenance, through agency resources and cooperative relationships, thereby expanding opportunities for motor vehicle users.

At the same time, unregulated crosscountry motor vehicle use will no longer be permitted. Unauthorized routes that are not designated will be closed to motor vehicle use, which would limit opportunities for motor vehicle users but might expand opportunities for other recreational visitors seeking a nonmotorized experience.”

The WRNF Travel Management Plan seeks to meet the direction outlined in the TMR with the idea that the end result will reflect the designated travel system. By designating the system it will be clear where motorized and mechanized travel is allowed. This allows the public to know where they can go and what to expect. Clearly defining the travel system allows forest staff to prioritize and manage the travel system as well as rehabilitate other routes that are not designated.

PC 13 Public Concern: The WRNF should conduct adequate studies

A) TO MEET THE NEEDS OF MOTORIZED RECREATIONISTS

B) TO PROVIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

C) INCLUDING THE GROWING NEEDS OF MOTORIZED RECREATIONISTS

D) INCLUDING A DISCUSSION ON THE ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS ROADS MAY HAVE BEYOND THEIR FOOTPRINT

Response PC 13: The DEIS, SDEIS, and the FEIS all contains a comprehensive analysis of the effects from the travel management plan alternatives in Chapter 3. The analyses address recreation opportunities as well as the physical and biological effects from the proposed transportation systems. Measures of demand, opportunity, along with manageability are discussed in the recreation and transportation sections.

PC 15 Public Concern: The WRNF should analyze economic resources in more detail

A) BECAUSE NO THOUGHT WAS GIVEN TO SMALL BUSINESSES

B) BECAUSE HUNTING AND WILDLIFE GENERATE SUBSTANTIAL SUMS OF MONEY FOR LOCAL ECONOMIES

Response PC 15: Economic analysis was conducted and disclosed in the Social section of Chapter 3. The WRNF will continue to provide hunting opportunities across the forest. Analyses for elk populations and effects from travel were disclosed in the MIS and wildlife sections.

PC 16 Public Concern: The WRNF should analyze roadless areas in more detail

A) BECAUSE THE ROADLESS AREA DIRECTION IS INACCURATE

B) BECAUSE THERE IS NO IDENTIFIED BASIS FOR CLOSURE OF EXISTING ROUTES IN ROADLESS AREAS

C) TO CONSIDER THE RECENT 9TH DISTRICT COURT RULING CONCERNING ROADLESS AREAS

D) TO CONSIDER THE IMPLICATIONS THAT IT MAY HAVE ON THE TMP

E) INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS RELATED TO SNOMBILING IN ROADLESS AREAS

Response PC 16 A-D: Rules and regulations for the designation and management of inventoried roadless areas are outside the scope of the TMP. The WRNF TMP is compliant with current roadless direction. The WRNF TMP does not propose any new road or the adoption of any user-created roads in roadless areas. There are some motorized trails in some of the roadless areas that are proposed, some that have been traditionally used and some that lead to motorized networks.

Response PC 16 E: Under current direction inventoried roadless areas are not closed to snowmobiles. Non-motorized winter areas are based on many factors including direction outlined in the Forest Plan, recreation management needs, and resource protection measures such as effects to wildlife.

PC 17 The WRNF should/should not create any new wilderness areas

A) INCLUDING THE HIDDEN GEMS WILDERNESS AREA

B) BECAUSE WILDERNESS IS CONSIDERED SACRED BY MANY PEOPLE

C) SO FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL BE ABLE TO ENJOY THE SAME EFFECTS OF WILDERNESS

D) TO PROVIDE AREAS FOR QUIET RECREATION

Response PC 17: The decision for wilderness designation is outside the scope of the TMP. Only congress has the authority to designate wilderness. The TMP will be designed to recognize the rules and regulations in place for designated wilderness along with the current boundary designations for these areas.

PC 22 Public Concern: The WRNF should improve maps

A) BY IDENTIFYING PRIVATE PROPERTY BOUNDARIES

B) BY IDENTIFYING MOTORIZED USE ON WINTER ROUTES THROUGH PRIVATE LAND

Response PC 22: The WRNF will utilize the latest data it has available for private land boundaries. Identification of motorized routes through private land is shown for informational purposes. The WRNF does not have the authority to designate summer or winter routes through private land, unless these routes are actually public roads or are an easement to the Federal government. The FS does have permission through easement rights across some private lands. The maps will indicate where these are open to the public.

Chapter 3: Natural Resources Management

Enforcement, Monitoring, and Funding

PC 23 Public Concern: The WRNF should provide a clear and detailed monitoring plan

A) THAT INCLUDES THE NVUM PROCESS, INTERVIEWS, AND TIMING STANDARDS

PC 24 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not implement adequate enforcement

A) INSTEAD OF SHUTTING OFF TRAILS TO MOTORIZED USE

B) INCLUDING APPROPRIATE FUNDING

C) INCLUDING ENFORCEMENT OF NOISE STANDARDS

Response PC 23 and PC 24: Implementation of the OHV Rule including monitoring is a responsibility each National Forest is undertaking under the direction of that rule. The TMP may incorporate in the decision certain aspects to monitor. Other monitoring protocols are being implemented through other direction outlined in Forest Service Manuals and Handbooks, and that resulted from direction outlined in the OHV rule. Other monitoring requirements are being met by the monitoring direction outlined in the Forest Plan. Upon the issuance of a final travel plan decision, the forest will develop a Travel Management Implementation plan which will include any additional monitoring requirements if needed. The Forest recognizes that this plan including the ability to enforce designations is an important component to the successful implementation of the final decision.

The implementation plan will include the continuation of NVUM studies, other recreation studies, monitoring for wildlife and other resource impacts, outlining maintenance and decommissioning priorities, enforcement strategy, and a communication strategy. The WRNF has actually begun many of these aspects by building numerous information kiosks, conducting monitoring studies, constructing aquatic passages, maintaining roads and trails, beta testing the interactive map, conducting assessments for prioritization, conducting NVUM and other recreation studies. The concept and components are discussed in the DEIS, SDEIS and FEIS in Chapter 2 Monitoring.

Locatable, Leasable Minerals

PC 18 Public Concern: The WRNF should analyze the impacts of oil and gas developments

A) BECAUSE THEY AFFECT LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND PRIVATE RESOURCES

B) INCLUDING THE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH GRAVEL PITS

C) INCLUDING IMPACTS TO AIR QUALITY

D) INCLUDING THE DEGRADATION OF CLASS 1 AIRSHEDS

E) BECAUSE THERE WAS NO ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF INDUSTRIAL ROADS IN THE SDEIS

F) BECAUSE OF RELATIONSHIPS OF OIL AND GAS TRAFFIC TO THE AGENCY'S MANAGEMENT OF ROADS AND ROUTES

Response PC 23 A, B: Analyzing the impacts from local gravel pits (off NFS lands) in the area is beyond the scope of this analysis. Although it is certainly plausible some use of local gravel pits results from oil and gas activity on NFS lands, the social, economic and environmental impacts related to the increase in local gravel pit operations in the region from Glenwood to Grand Junction is attributable to many other factors as well. These factors are beyond the scope of this analysis. Additionally, the impacts associated with proposed oil and gas exploration and development roads are disclosed and analyzed during site specific project level NEPA analysis (SDEIS pgs. 59 and 60).

Both the air quality (FEIS, Ch. 3) and transportation (FEIS, Ch. 3) cumulative effects sections acknowledge likely future impacts from oil and gas development activities on NFS lands. Any future oil and gas exploration and development activity would likely include the use of gravel pits, both on and off NFS lands. Site specific NEPA for oil and gas exploration and development will be conducted at the project level and would include the associated impacts to Forest Service roads from gravel pit use. Trying to quantify where and when the oil and gas exploration and development will occur is highly speculative and beyond the scope of this analysis.

Response PC 23 C, D: Quantifying the number of vehicles, road miles, emissions (including carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, sulfur dioxide and particulate matter) and the associated infrastructure resulting from oil and gas exploration and development activity is beyond the scope of this analysis. Surface disturbance from oil and gas facilities, access roads and pipelines are estimated in a reasonable foreseeable development scenario (RFDS) and used as a baseline scenario for an oil and gas leasing analysis. The WRNF completed a RFDS and Oil and Gas Leasing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and signed a record of decision (ROD) in May 1993. More recent information from Energy Office surveys were used to evaluate the cumulative effects to the transportation system. The FS used the latest information to measure current conditions for the FEIS, including roads used for oil and gas. The focus of the TMP is to decide what roads and trails are available and on the system for the public. Special use roads are subject to the NEPA process as decisions are made on the projects that drive the need and use of these roads.

PC 19 Public Concern: The WRNF should not allow mining or oil drilling

Response PC 19: The opinion to not allow mining or oil drilling on the forest is outside the scope of the TMP.

PC 20 Public Concern: The WRNF should recognize backcountry skiers/riders as a new user group and recognize their needs in the Travel Management Plan

A) INCLUDING IDENTIFYING TERRAIN AVAILABLE TO THEM

B) INCLUDING AVALANCHE-SAFE, ABOVE-TREE-LINE SKIING

C) INCLUDING SOUTH-FACING SLOPES ABOVE TREELINES

D) INCLUDING NORTH FACING SLOPES BELOW TREELINES

E) INCLUDING USER CONFLICTS BETWEEN WINTER MOTORIZED/NON MOTORIZED ACTIVITIES

Response PC 20: The backcountry skiers/riders are recognized as motorized users as snowmobiles are used to perform this activity. This use is addressed under the more general winter motorized category because motorized access is required for the activity. Opportunities for this activity are numerous within the motorized use areas. This use was considered when mapping for motorized winter use.

Scenery

PC 14 Public Concern: The WRNF should analyze visual resources in more detail

A) BECAUSE SCENIC ACTIVITIES ACCOUNT FOR 11 MILLION WRNF VISITS ANNUALLY

B) BECAUSE THE SCENIC INTEGRITY OBJECTIVES DOWNGRADE SCENIC RESOURCES

C) BECAUSE PEOPLE DEFINE THE QUALITY OF SCENERY, NOT ECOLOGY

Response PC 14 A: All activities that forest visitors experience are performed in a scenic environment defined by the arrangement of the natural character of the landscape along with components of the built environment. Management of multiple resources has altered the natural landscape character. Management decisions are not only based on multiple use but also provide a range of experiences across the forest for both motorized and non-motorized customers. Scenery, as well as other natural resources, should be managed to maintain quality scenery for future generations and to provide a range of experiences for a variety of users of the forest. Effects for scenery are discussed in the DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS under Chapter 3 Scenery.

Response PC 14 B: The Scenery Management System (SMS) has two different landscape elements which have similar names, Existing Scenic Integrity (ESI) and Scenic Integrity Objective (SIO), but are very different. The ESI is a snapshot in time of the existing condition of the landscape. The SIO is one of the components of the desired condition for scenic quality. SIO's are derived by combining the ESI with other landscape elements. SIO's are expressed as forest plan objectives. The table 3.9 of the Travel Management DEIS was developed as a summary table in the Forest Plan FEIS. This table illustrates the acres of Existing Scenic Integrity (ESI) at the time of the Forest Plan analysis versus the Scenic Integrity Objective (SIO) of the selected alternative in the Forest Plan. This table has nothing to do with proposed activities or events anticipated in the Travel Management Plan rather it was used for the development of desired conditions for the Forest Plan. The analysis for the Travel Management Plan discusses effects to scenery objectives.

Response PC 14 C: The Scenery Management System is a systematic approach for assessing scenic resources in a project area and then using the assessment findings to help make management decisions on the project. The system is founded on an ecological aesthetic which recognizes that management which preserves the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community preserves the scenery as well. It is important to evaluate the management of multiple resources and the possible effects associated with scenic resources. Management of multiple resources has altered the natural landscape character into the existing condition of the landscape. The most obvious and significant effects on scenic resources are from vegetation and landform alterations. Multiple resource management that has altered scenic resources include but are not limited to timber management, mining, oil and gas extraction, recreational facility development including ski areas, roads and trails, campgrounds and picnic grounds, utility corridors, fire management (suppression and prescribed burning), and livestock grazing. The Scenery Management System provides the framework to effectively manage scenic resources within an ecologically aesthetic discipline.

Water Resources Management

PC 25 Public Concern: The WRNF should protect water resources

A) INCLUDING PROTECTING RIPARIAN AREAS along Red and White Mountain for snowmobiling

Response PC 14 A: The Forest Service will monitor this situation and make any changes needed to protect the resource.

B) BY REINSTATING AS MANDATORY THE ORIGINAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES REGARDING WATER QUALITY AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

C) TO ASSURE WATER QUALITY AND VIABLE FISH POPULATIONS

Response PC 25 B, C: The Forest Service's Watershed Conservation Practices handbook identifies management measures as performance expectations consistent with applicable laws and regulations that are overseen by the EPA and the Colorado State Water Quality Control Division. Applicable management measures have been identified in the Travel Management Plan and their attainment will ensure compliance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations by management actions related to travel management on the WRNF.

D) BY PERMANENTLY CLOSING THE WAYS AND ROUTES LOCATED ADJACENT TO STREAMS IN THE ROARING FORK WATERSHED

Response PC 25 D: Any unauthorized routes will be rehabilitated through appropriate means.

E) BY NOT CONSTRUCTING NEW ROADS/TRAILS ADJACENT TO PERENNIAL STREAMS OR IN RIPARIAN ZONES

Response PC 25 E: No new construction of roads or trails is being presented in the TMP.

F) BY MAINTAINING EXISTING ROADS AND TRAILS TO STANDARDS THAT MAINTAIN OR IMPROVE STREAM OR RIPARIAN HEALTH

G) BY CONDUCTING A SITE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS FOR NEW ROAD/TRAIL CONSTRUCTION

Response PC 25 F, G: Applicable management measures designed to protect soil, aquatic and riparian systems have been identified in the Travel Management Plan and their attainment will ensure compliance with applicable federal and state laws, regulations, and Forest Plan by management actions related to travel management on the WRNF. Impacts to riparian conditions was one of the factors Ranger District personnel used to evaluate roads and trails that should remain on the system, be improved if so, or removed.

H) INCLUDING ONGOING EFFORTS WITH THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CDOT) TO REDUCE WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION FROM I-70 SEDIMENT RUNOFF

I) INCLUDING SPECIFIC MIGRATION AND MONITORING PLANS FOR RESTORING THE IMPAIRED STREAM SEGMENTS TO THEIR INTENDED USES in particular Black Gore Creek

Response PC 25 H, I: Additional information requested by the EPA has been added to the Final EIS. It should be noted the WRNF continues to be an active participant with the cooperative group (includes CDOT) for issues and project rehabilitation on the Black Gore Creek.

Wildlife and Habitat Management

PC 26 Public Concern: The WRNF should protect wildlife and habitat

A) INCLUDING LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION OF HABITAT SECURITY BLOCKS

Response PC 26 A: Potential impacts to a wide range of habitats are included in the various analyses sections of the DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS. The impacts on a wide range of habitats and vegetation cover types, including mountain shrub communities are analyzed for all alternatives. The Forest Plan included a detailed analysis of fragmentation and landscape characteristics. This analysis is included by reference in the TMP EIS. The TMP EIS analyzes a range of options for the various uses of the Forest, including alternatives designed to reduce the impacts of roads and trails in all habitats across the Forest. The TMP is compliant with Forest Plan objectives, standards and guidelines, including those that promote the protection of wildlife and habitat.

B) BY NOT INCREASING ROADS IN SUBWATERSHEDS WITH COLORADO RIVER CUTTHROAT TROUT

Response PC 26 B: As part of our Forest Plan compliance check as well as the cutthroat trout analysis, an analysis was conducted in the DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS of the change in road density in all 6th field watersheds containing a conservation population of Colorado River cutthroat trout. The Modified G Alternative maintains or reduces road density in all 6th field Hydrologic Unit Codes (subwatersheds) containing a conservation population of cutthroat trout, meeting the Forest Plan Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Standard 2 requirement to maintain or reduce the net density of open and closed roads.

Vegetation Management

PC 27 Public Concern: The WRNF should make pine beetle management a higher priority

A) BECAUSE PINE BEETLE WILL WIPE OUT THE FOREST AND MORE ROUTES WILL BE REQUIRED

B) BECAUSE PINE BEETLES INCREASE FIRE DANGER

C) BECAUSE PINE BEETLE KILL WILL RESULT IN LOGGING AND LOGGING RESULTS IN AREAS BEING CLOSED

Response PC 27: Many initiatives including plans and projects are being conducted on the WRNF and neighboring forests to deal with the pine beetle epidemic. Implementation of a travel management plan will not interfere with efforts to manage the situation on the forest. As a side note, the WRNF did complete an EA under HFRA to treat roads and trails where dead trees threaten pathways. Having a travel management plan will help the forest know where to treat and where to set priorities for treatment. Actual projects for forest treatments including access are outside the scope of the travel management plan and will be addressed in site-specific project proposals.

PC 28 Public Concern: The WRNF should adopt a weed management plan

A) WHEN DECOMMISSIONING AND REHABILITATING NON-SYSTEM ROUTES

B) INCLUDING AN AGGRESSIVE AND SITE SPECIFIC POST-DECOMMISSIONING WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN

C) TO INCLUDE ELIMINATING EXISTING WEEDS ALONG ROUTES TARGETED FOR DECOMMISSIONING TO PREVENT NEW SEED SOURCES

D) AND DISCUSS MILES OF ROADS AND TRAILS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC USE BUT RETAINED ON THE SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS

Response PC 28: Many good ideas are presented here. A weed treatment plan will be part of the implementation plan for travel management. Currently the WRNF has a decision that allows for treatment under an adaptive management approach so implementation can be done in a timely manner.

Cumulative

PC 21 Public Concern: The WRNF should analyze cumulative impacts in more detail

A) BECAUSE THE SDEIS DOES NOT PROPERLY EVALUATE PROJECT CONTEXT TO INCLUDE RELATIONSHIPS AND COORDINATION WITH ADJOINING NATIONAL FORESTS, PUBLIC LANDS, AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Response PC 21: The WRNF worked with BLM and neighboring forests in the design of the selected alternative. The uses on neighboring lands helped the forest determine what systems were needed along the boundaries. The WRNF also considered where opportunities existed on the neighboring lands and in so doing helped determine what uses were needed, could be provided for, or perhaps needn't be provided for, based on what was available elsewhere.

Chapter 4: Transportation Management

PC 30 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not support seasonal closures

A) INCLUDING WINTER AND SPRING SEASONS

B) TO PROTECT LAND WHEN IT IS MOST VULNERABLE TO EROSION

C) INCLUDING CLOSURES FOR DIFFERENT ZONES, REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN ELEVATION, CLIMATE, OR SOILS

D) TO PROTECT WILDLIFE STRESSED FROM WINTER CONDITIONS

E) BECAUSE CLOSURES SHOULD BE BASED ON ACTUAL CONDITIONS RATHER THAN IDEALIZED TIME SCHEDULES

F) BECAUSE ROAD CLOSURE DATES WILL BE DIFFICULT OR IMPOSSIBLE TO ENFORCE

Response PC 30: Seasonal closures are used to protect land, resources, wildlife, and to manage uses on National Forest System lands. The overall dates to switch from summer motorized to winter motorized and back were based on traditional hunting seasons and Memorial Day. These coincide with general changes in conditions and overall demand. The WRNF decided to use dates so the public knows what to expect and allows for management to plan operations. The WRNF is challenged based on the elevation range, topological variations, and ground conditions across the forest. Sometimes it can be dry at the beginning of a road but snow or wet conditions can exist further down the road, especially the shoulder seasons. We believe dates would be easiest to enforce rather than trying to manage based on a variety of ground conditions. The WRNF understands seasonal conditions can vary i.e. a late winter, early spring. The Forest Supervisor has the authority to issue a special order to change the date for that year by location if necessary. Seasonal closures for wildlife are based on Forest Plan direction and recommendation by WRNF biologist and CDOW specialists. (See Legend Categories section in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, and the site-specific spreadsheets)

PC 31 Public Concern: The WRNF should connect motorized routes

A) BECAUSE DISTANCE CAN BE TRAVELED QUICKLY

B) TO ENHANCE THE MOTORIZED RECREATION EXPERIENCE

Response PC 31: The WRNF considered connectivity and number of miles needed by each use type to provide a quality experience. Networks were designed to coincide across boundaries to enhance experiences. Where networks are not connected but logically could be, the WRNF will entertain building connecting roads and trails to enhance experiences.

Transportation-Related Structures

PC 33 Public Concern: The WRNF should provide signs, gates, and other transportation related structures

A) AT TRAILHEADS

B) AT KEY INTERSECTIONS

C) AT CLOSURE POINTS

D) INCLUDING TEXT SIGNS

PC 34 Public Concern: The WRNF should accommodate parking on NFS Lands

A) BECAUSE THE TMP IS LIKELY TO CONCENTRATE USES

B) BECAUSE PARKING IS VERY LIMITED AND NOT ALLOWED ON COUNTY ROADS

L) BECAUSE BACKCOUNTRY SKIERS AND RIDERS NEED TRAILHEADS THAT ARE CLOSE TO THEIR FINAL DESTINATIONS

Response PC 33 and PC 34: The WRNF has all ready begun putting up signs, information boards, gates, and other structures in key locations where the system does not change in any alternative. When designing the selected alternative, parking availability and/or opportunities were taken into account. The WRNF recognizes the need to enhance parking areas and strategically add more signs, gates, etc. in once the TMP is complete. The WRNF will be dedicating funds and prioritizing this work in an implementation plan.

Loop Opportunities

PC 35 Public Concern: The WRNF should provide more trail loop opportunities

PC 36 Public Concern: The WRNF should not concede loop opportunities to only certain groups

Response PC 35 and PC 36: The forest recognizes the publics' desire for a loop experience. As part of the system design, some unauthorized routes were identified and evaluated for inclusion as connectors with existing system routes for potential loop opportunities. Loop opportunities were explored for all user types, motorized and non-motorized alike. It should be noted that many other factors were also included in this analysis and, although a specific route may be important to make a loop, there may be other factors involved that conflict with designating a route.

Chapter 5: Recreation Management

PC 38 Public Concern: The WRNF should/not separate motorized from non-motorized uses

A) TO PROMOTE A QUALITY EXPERIENCE FOR USERS

B) TO LIMIT POTENTIAL HARM

C) TO MANAGE POTENTIAL RESOURCE DAMAGE

D) BECAUSE SEPARATION REQUIRES THE LEAST EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT

PC 52 Public Concern: The WRNF should manage conflict between recreation users

A) BY CLOSING MOTORIZED ROUTES THAT CONFLICT WITH QUIET FORMS OF RECREATION

Response PC 38 and PC 52: While the degree to which the separation of routes varies between alternatives, the DEIS, SDEIS, and FEIS identified a range of transportation alternatives, each identifying routes and areas that provide separation of uses as well as routes and areas where a mixing of uses will occur. Consideration in the development of a travel system does include trying to provide a quality

experience for users. Sometimes this means separating use types. Most user groups identified the desire to be away from other user types, while some did not mind sharing with others. When separating users on a finite space, there is a reduction of opportunity for those other uses that are not allowed. The issue section in the EIS addresses volume vs. separation of use as key issues, along with protection of natural resources. The selected alternative represents a blend of the three initial action alternatives presented in the DEIS. This blend demonstrates the forest's understanding of the need to try to address these issues. The forest also recognizes that these issues can off-set each other. In addressing one another may become more pronounced. Therefore in blending the initial alternatives into the preferred and then the final the forest is seeking to address each with respect to one another, thus hoping for a viable transportation system that can meet a variety of uses. If a forest unit decides that this situation does exist on/in a specific route/area, the unit will still be able address the conflict through a variety of methods in the future.

PC 39 Public Concern: The WRNF should not separate mechanized from non-motorized uses and clarify it on plan maps

Response 38: On the WRNF mechanized travel has to be on designated routes as per Forest Plan direction. Not all non-motorized routes are designated for mechanized travel. Also mechanized routes are not allowed in designated wilderness areas. Therefore it is important to show these as separate categories.

Motorized Recreation

PC 40 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not expand motorized uses

- A) BECAUSE OF CUMULATIVE EFFECTS
- B) BECAUSE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO MOTORIZED CLOSURES HAVEN'T BEEN PURSUED
- C) BECAUSE EXISTING ROADS AND TRAILS PROVIDE VALUABLE ACCESS TO DESIRED RESOURCES
- D) TO MAINTAIN VALID EXISTING RIGHTS OF USE AND ACCESS
- E) BECAUSE PROPOSED CLOSURES HAVE NOT BEEN JUSTIFIED
- F) BECAUSE IT CAUSES HIGHER CONCENTRATION AND DAMAGE TO SMALLER TRAIL SYSTEMS
- G) BECAUSE CLOSURES WILL CAUSE MAINTENANCE COSTS TO OTHER AREAS
- H) BECAUSE EACH YEAR THE MOTORIZED USE OF FORESTS ARE SHRINKING VERSUS BEING MANAGED
- I) BECAUSE TAX PAYING CITIZENS HAVE A RIGHT TO FOREST USE
- J) BECAUSE TRAIL RIDERS "TREAD LIGHTLY" AND RESPECT NATURE
- K) BECAUSE MOTORIZED TRAILS DO NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST OTHER FORMS OF RECREATION
- M) BECAUSE THEY PROVIDE ACCESS TO REMOTE AND SCENIC LOCATIONS
- N) BECAUSE IT WOULD CAUSE PEOPLE TO RIDE ILLEGALLY
- O) INCLUDING TRAIL MAINTENANCE OPPORTUNITIES
- P) BECAUSE USERS RESIDE CLOSE TO MOTORIZED RECREATION PURPOSES
- Q) BECAUSE NON-MOTORIZED USERS WILL RARELY USE THESE AREAS
- R) BECAUSE THE LOCAL ECONOMY WILL SUFFER
- S) BECAUSE USERS CAN ENFORCE "STAY ON TRAIL", "ONLY QUIET MOTORCYCLES", AND "SHARE THE TRAILS"
- T) BECAUSE MOTORIZED USERS LEAVE TRASH

U) BECAUSE MOTORIZED USE CAUSES TRAIL DESTRUCTION

V) BECAUSE MOTORIZED USE CAUSES SOIL EROSION

W) BECAUSE MOTORIZED USE DAMAGES FRAGILE WETLANDS

Z) BECAUSE EXCLUSIVE OF ROADLESS AND SKI AREAS, 50% OF THE FOREST IS ALREADY AVAILABLE FOR BACKCOUNTRY HUNTING

AA) BECAUSE IT WOULD DIMINISH THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR MANY MOTORIZED RECREATION USERS

BB) BECAUSE MOTORIZED RECREATION PROMOTES TOURISM

PC 41 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not decrease the miles of motorized trails and routes

A) INCLUDING ROUTES USED BY 4WD USERS

B) BECAUSE IT DEGRADES USER EXPERIENCE

C) BECAUSE THE FOREST HAS TOO MUCH WILDERNESS AND ROADLESS AREA

Response PC 40 Summer Motorized and PC 41: There are many thoughts and issues listed above. Some are opinion while others are issues that the WRNF staff has and will continue to address. Use of motorized vehicles (demand) is analyzed in the Recreation section of the FEIS (and was also in the DEIS, and SDEIS). The WRNF recognizes the need for motorized access to participate in other activities such as camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, and others. Also there are those who participate in motorized activities as a sport; Jeeping, ATVing, motorcycling, etc. In development of the travel system these needs were taken into account. The selected alternative was derived from previous alternatives, site-specific comments, needs, natural resource conditions, traditional and modern uses, and road and trail availability, conditions. The designated system is one that the Forest Service is committing to maintain so resources can be protected. Some felt there is an inherent right to travel where use has occurred in the past. Forest Service regulations (36 CFR 251) however dictate motorized summer activity can only occur on designated roads and trails (and small areas). This is to promote manageable systems and protect resources. The Purpose and Need section describes the reasons for undertaking the designation of motorized systems (along with other decisions). The rest of Chapter 1 describes the legal framework and reasons for the proposed action. When looking at the alternatives presented through-out the process it should be noted that the amount of motorized use presented was within a range of possibilities. These possibilities or action alternatives were designed to be implementable possibilities. The WRNF took into account many factors when developing the final selected alternative, including the above pros and cons to motorized use.

CC) BECAUSE DISABLED, AGED, AND SMALL CHILDREN NEED ACCESS TO AREAS

Response PC 40 CC: Any wheelchair or device that meets the definition of a wheelchair is allowed anywhere people are allowed to go. The definition of a wheelchair is any device or mobility device, including one that is battery-powered that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in motor pedestrian areas. Federal laws, regulations and policies do not require areas that prohibit motorized use to make exceptions (minus wheelchairs) because a person has a disability. All people are to have the same opportunities meaning special compensation is not required for a person with a disability, just that they have the same opportunity i.e. is not singled out. For example the Forest Service does not have to provide a person with a disability the right to use an ATV for access to hunt, when the rest of the public is not allowed to. Under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, no person with a disability can be denied participation in a Federal program that is available to other people solely because of his or her disability. In conformance with section 504, wheelchairs that meet the definition of 36 CFR 212 are welcome on all NFS lands that are open to foot travel. There is no legal requirement to allow people with disabilities to use OHVs or other motor vehicles on roads, trails, and areas closed to motor vehicular use because such an exemption would undercut the resource protection afforded by the closure and therefore could fundamentally alter the nature of the Forest Service's travel management program (7 CFR 15e.103). There are many access points and opportunities for those who cannot travel as far on foot to enjoy the forest. The WRNF encourages all people to come and enjoy the National Forest.

PC 44 Public Concern: The WRNF should not close or limit existing legal motorized single track trails

A) INCLUDING PRESERVING THE EXISTING TRAILS

B) BECAUSE LOOPS CONNECT TO OTHER AREAS, PROVIDE EXERCISE AND RELIEVE STRESS, AND PROVIDE TIME TO SEE ANIMALS AND NATURE AND TO CONNECT WITH FRIENDS

PC 42 Public Concern: The WRNF should add more motorized single track two-wheeled trails

Response PC 42 and PC 44: The WRNF examined both unauthorized and authorized routes to determine where single track opportunities could be best accommodated on the forest. In some cases the forest added routes and systems to an area and in other areas reduced or removed the use due to conflicts or resource concerns. The selected alternative has areas that emphasize motorized single track networks. Future opportunities for motorized trails may occur, especially in these areas of motorized emphasis through project proposals to enhance the experience.

PC 43 Public Concern: The WRNF should modify the dates for motorized recreation

A) TO INCLUDE THE SECOND WEEK OF NOVEMBER UNTIL THURSDAY BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY, TO MEET HARVEST OBJECTIVES

B) TO INCLUDE A WINTER USE PERIOD, NOVEMBER 30 UNTIL THE THURSDAY BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY

C) TO REDUCE DAMAGE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

D) INCLUDING OPENING LICENSED MOTORIZED ROUTES SEPTEMBER 15 UNTIL NOVEMBER 30 TO MOTORIZED AND NON-MOTORIZED

E) BECAUSE THE WINTER START DATE IN DECEMBER WOULD PREVENT EARLY SEASON TRAIL BASE COMPACTION

Response PC 43: These comments were from CDOW. Their concern was to allow for OHV travel during the winter for late hunting seasons. The WRNF discussed the issue with CDOW and conveyed the date was based on what was traditionally third rifle season. The WRNF can issue exceptions for roads that may be open during the winter season by special order. The WRNF did incorporate in the selected alternative to allow certain roads in Berry Creek (Edwards) to be seasonally open during the winter hunting season. This was agreeable with CDOW.

PC 45 Public Concern: The WRNF should be less restrictive to unlicensed motorized travel

A) BECAUSE IT WILL IMPACT THE CDOW'S ABILITY TO DISPERSE HUNTERS AND IN TURN MEET WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT GOALS

B) BECAUSE HUNTERS ARE AN AGING USER GROUP

C) BECAUSE HUNTERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO RETRIEVE DOWNED GAME

Response PC 45 A, B: The WRNF met and worked with the CDOW to come up with solutions to help meet some of the concerns described. The WRNF understands the need to accommodate hunters where possible but needs to do so in conjunction with other forest goals and users of the forest. Comments received by hunters varied when it came to motorized access. Many of the older hunters wanted access by OHV or ATV, but at the same time there is concern about the impacts from these vehicles as far as disturbance to game and hunters. Some preferred the non-motorized hunting experience. The selected alternative is an attempt to meet the variety of needs by hunters.

Response PC 45 C: The TMR stated “The Department believes that some discretion should be provided to local agency officials to consider limited use of motor vehicles within a specified distance of certain designated routes for these specific purposes. Consequently, the final rule includes a new provision in § 212.51(b), which allows the responsible official to include in the designation of a road or trail the limited use of motor vehicles within a specified distance of certain designated routes solely for the purposes of big game retrieval or dispersed camping.” In Region 2 the Regional Forester decided that not to allow game retrieval off designated roads and trails due to resource damage and ability to manage the use. (One exception is on the Rio Grande that is “grandfathered”). The WRNF Forest Plan does not allow open motorized areas. Adequate access is provided to hunters to hunt. Other options such as hiring outfitters are also available to those who do not want to pack out their game.

Winter Motorized Recreation

PC 40 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not expand motorized uses

X) BECAUSE THE SDEIS FAILS TO DISCLOSE WHY EACH SPECIFIC OPEN AREA IS PROPOSED TO CHANGE CLASSIFICATIONS

Y) BECAUSE IT WOULD ELIMINATE VIABLE SNOWMOBILING AREAS WHICH WERE ALLOCATED TO SNOWMOBILING BY THE FOREST PLAN DECISION IN 2002

Response PC 40: The mapping of winter areas was based on input from users including the need to simplify the process. The base for the map began with the Forest Plan, not the 1985 map. Comments on the DEIS expressed confusion on the part of winter users, therefore a process to present only where motorized is allowed was used in the SDEIS. This is to reflect the decision to be made. The SDEIS alternative G was based on input from users, wildlife protection needs, as well as eliminating small areas where there was little or no access. For the FEIS the forest utilized the site-specific comment from winter motorized, winter non-motorized, user groups and individuals.

Mountain Biking

PC 47 Public Concern: The WRNF should/should not keep trails open to mountain biking

A) BECAUSE IT PROVIDES QUALITY FAMILY TIME

B) BECAUSE OF INCREASING POPULARITY IN MOUNTAIN BIKING

C) BY LEAVING NON-SYSTEM AND NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS OPEN TO MOUNTAIN BIKING

Response PC 47 A, B, C: The WRNF recognizes the popularity of mountain biking and how popular it is on the forest (see demand analysis). The Forest Plan standards state all motorized and mechanized summer travel will be on designated routes. In the planning process for the travel management plan the forest inventoried and solicited comments for where mountain bike trails would be appropriate. All roads open for public use will allow bike travel in the TMP. In addition close to 600 miles of trail are available for mountain bike use as well to provide a variety of opportunities across the forest.

D) INCLUDING SNOW BIKES

Response PC 47 D: Snow bikes are allowed over snow based on how they are designed. If they have skis and no motor they are allowed on non-motorized winter areas. If they have skis and/or a track (similar to a snowmobile track) and a motor they can go where motorized snowmobiles are allowed. If they are wheeled they can only go where wheeled vehicles are allowed in winter, namely the plowed routes. Special restrictions may apply on groomed routes especially if the bike affects the groomed surface.

PC 48 Public Concern: The WRNF should not confine bicycles to designated routes

A) BECAUSE BICYCLES HAVE NO GREATER IMPACT THAN HIKING AND MUCH LESS IMPACT THAN HORSEBACK RIDING

B) BECAUSE IT IS FS POLICY TO MANAGE BICYCLE USE AS A NONMOTORIZED ACTIVITY

Response PC 48: The Forest Plan standard states all motorized and mechanized summer travel will be on designated routes. The TMP is designed to be compliant with Forest Plan.

Non-Motorized Recreation

PC 49 Public Concern: The WRNF should plan, protect, and expand quiet use recreational opportunities for winter

A) INCLUDING WINTER QUIET USE AREAS TO BE ACCESSED BY HUMANPOWERED RECREATIONISTS IN SAFE AND QUIET LOCATIONS

Response PC 49: The Forest Plan allocated areas for non-motorized winter activity through the management area prescriptions. Some prescriptions are open for winter motorized, some restrict travel to routes or small areas (play areas), and some are non-motorized. It is this baseline from which the travel management allocations for winter motorized use was developed. The final considered motorized user needs, routes for motorized use to connect areas, and areas where non-motorized users can go for a quieter experience.

User Education

PC 50 Public Concern: The WRNF should increase user education

A) INCLUDING A TRAINING COURSE FOR OHV USERS TO RESPECT THE LAND AND OTHER RECREATION USERS

B) INCLUDING A WEBSITE WITH SEASONAL CLOSURES

C) TO BRING MULTIPLE USES TOGETHER AND HELP PEOPLE FIND COMMON GROUND

Response PC 50: The forest agrees with the need for education in a variety of venues to help achieve management objectives and sustain the resources. The implementation plan will include an educational and communication plan component.

User Conflict

PC 51 Public Concern: The WRNF should create a monitoring plan for user conflicts

A) INCLUDING HOW USER CONFLICTS WILL BE MONITORED ON SHARED TRAILS

B) TO PROVIDE INFORMATION TO MANAGERS FOR FUTURE MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

Response PC 51: Chapter 2 Monitoring section outlines the strategy for monitoring the TMP. Monitoring is done to help managers understand the effects (including social aspects) of activities on the forest. Along with standard monitoring protocols the WRNF will be engaging in other studies such as dispersed camping in the near future. These studies as well as monitoring for projects are given to managers to help them evaluate future needs on the WRNF.

PC 52 Public Concern: The WRNF should restrict dispersed camping to designated sites only, 300' feet from a motorized road is too much

Response PC 52: The Travel Management Rule allows the deciding official the option for designating motor vehicle use for dispersed camping and game retrieval. 36 CFR 212.53(b) states "In designating routes the deciding official may include in the designation the limited use of motor vehicles within a certain specified distance of certain forest roads or trails where motor vehicle use is allowed...solely for purposes of dispersed camping or retrieval of a downed big game animal...". The WRNF LRMP allows for 300 feet from a designated road for dispersed camping. Chapter 2 Travel System Infrastructure Standard 5 reads "Permit motor vehicle travel up to 300 feet from designated travelways for direct access to campsites, parking, firewood cutting, or gathering forest products provided that minimal resource damage occurs and such access is otherwise not permitted". A premise from the onset of the TMP process is that the TMP would be compliant with the LRMP and not amend it. But at the same time the TMP must be compliant with current laws and regulations. Specifying a distance is allowed under the CFR stated above.

As to motorized vehicle travel for firewood cutting or gathering forest products the regulation gives allowance for driving off of designated roadways for a specified distance under a written authorization issued under Federal law or regulation (§212.51(a)(7)). This authorization is specified in the special use permits that are required for the activity.

The Travel Rule does not require the deciding officer make changes to the current designations. 36 CFR 212.50(b) states "The responsible official may incorporate previous administrative decisions regarding travel management made under other authorities, including designations and prohibitions..." Based on the Forest Plan and the CFR's the Forest is in compliance with the regulations by continuing to allow 300 feet for dispersed camping. The comment requested the Forest look at changing this allowance in this TMP process. To do so would be procedurally incorrect under NEPA regulations as this particular action, considering dispersed camping sites, restrictions, or a change in allowable distance for camping was not part of the Purpose and Need or Decisions to be Made.

The WRNF has however begun under a separate process to inventory dispersed camping sites to provide information to line officers about dispersed camping across the forest. Currently there are some areas where dispersed camping is restricted to designated sites. The inventory will help managers decide where dispersed camping could still be allowed within 300 feet of a road (or other specified distance) or whether an area should be restricted to designated sites. Changes to current conditions would be informed through the proper regulatory procedures.

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Aspen-Sopris Ranger District

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
356	2	1-103W.2X, 1-103W.2Y, 1-103W.2Z	1-103W.2X, 1-103W.2Y, 1-103W.2Z, Old Larkspur Mtn Road. This route consists of 3 sections of single-track trail that roughly parallel Forest Route 103, which connects Lenado to Kobey Park. These trails are generally ridden in the downhill direction by cyclists returning to Lenado from Kobey Park and Margy's Hut areas. These trails provide a high value, exhilarating alternative route for mountain bikers looking beyond the 2WD dirt route of Forest Route 103. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that these existing routes be preserved for continued recreational use.	The FS will consider this proposal. Currently this system of trails is not part of our system though there are some safety considerations as well.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	31	1-107.1, 1-2182.1	1-107.1, 1-2182.1, New York Creek Trail. This route is categorized as limited to foot and horse (animal) traffic. The portion of the trail below 1-144.1, NY Canal Service Road should be re-categorized as open to Mechanized (Bicycles) for the following reasons: 1-144.1 has been categorized for bicycle use. New York Creek Trail is traditionally ridden as part of the following loop ride: Lincoln Creek Road, NY Canal Service Road, NY Creek Trail. Route 1-107.1 is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends re-categorizing this high value recreational route to accommodate existing use.	Although a loop opportunity could potentially exist, staff felt this route was too steep to maintain for bicycles and there is not a suitable crossing for bicycles across Lincoln Creek at this location.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
228	5	1-1198.1	1-1198.1 Hannon Creek Trail-Add horses-eliminate bicycles.	Trail Number is actually 1998. Hannon Creek is shown open to horses and bicycles in all alternatives and will remain so for hunting access and to create a loop opportunity via Rd 103	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	3	1-131w.1h	1-131W.1H, Smuggler Mtn.Trail. This route is shown south of Smuggler Mountain Road (Forest Route 131) that goes to Warren Lakes. RFMBA's [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] field investigations show that the trail does not exist as mapped. However, a historic stock driveway trail does exist along the same general terrain, south of the road. Due to its close proximity to the City of Aspen, we recommend that this trail be preserved for continued recreational use. For trail sustainability, a re-route should be pursued at its steepest point: the portion nearest the Reflector along Forest Route 131. RFMBA will prepare an email for Bruce Davidson that will include the route's actual, existing alignment, via GIS data.	Comment Noted and the FS welcomes more accurate GPS data. The FS has the concern here that if this trail is opened to bicycles it will invite additional motorcycle use in this area. Before future inclusion of this trail the FS needs to verify it and survey it.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	21	1-1897.1, 1-1987.2, 1-1987.3, 1-1989.1	Aspen Ranger District: Hunter Creek 1-1897.1, 1-1987.2, 1-1987.3, 1-1989.1 – these lie within an elk production area. Need an elk production seasonal closure May 1 – June 30.	District staff will meet with CDOW to discuss issues related to elk calving areas now and in the future and possibly amend calving dates as the WR Forest Plan lists calving dates as May 15 - June 20. Previously a closure in this section was not presented in any alternative to the public. The M.A. here is 5.41 Deer and Elk Winter Range and the recreation guideline is to restrict activities that would disturb elk during winter and spring periods. Recreation use here is minimal until early June.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
228	4	1-1933.1	1-1933.1 Add ATV vehicles to these trails.	Red Canyon Trail 1933 is primarily a single-track trail and due to trail width ATV's are not considered suitable.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	17	1-1957.1, 1-n116.1, 1-1957.2b	Aspen Ranger District: Hay Park Trail 1957.1, N116.1, 1957.2B – this trail passes through elk production area and needs a seasonal closure May 1 – June 30.	District staff will meet with CDOW to discuss issues related to elk calving areas. Previously a closure in this section was not presented in any alternative to the public. This trail does not fall into a Management Area 5.43 Elk Habitat in the Forest Plan.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	18	1-1959.1, 1-1962.1n	Aspen Ranger District: Johnny Draw 1-1959.1 – maintain this as a system trail to private property boundary. Trail is used extensively by sportsmen in the fall. Public access to this trail is via 1-1962.1N (Child's). Needs an elk production seasonal closure May 1 – June 30.	This trail is not a system trail currently and will not be listed as a system trail in the Final TMP, and thus will receive no maintenance. However, hunters on foot or horseback are still allowed to access this area from Nickelson Creek. The Johnny Draw trail dead ends at private property where a public easement does not exist. Re: Elk Calving closure, see comment above.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	19	1-1980.1, 1-1980.1n, 1-n151.1	Aspen Ranger District: Government Trail 1-1980.1, 1-1980.1N, 1-N151.1 – maintain seasonal elk production closure but seasonal dates need to be changed to be consistent with the Town of Snowmass Village trail closures in East Village to protect spring migration and production periods April 25 – June 20. Consistent dates will help remove confusion with the public.	Area is listed as M.A. 5.43 in the Forest Plan with Elk Calving dates are listed as May 15- June 20 and spring migration dates of April 15 - June 20, though current special order closing this trail and surrounding NF lands is 5/15 - 6/20.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	4	1-19981a	1-1998.1A, Hannon Creek Spur A. This route is the southernmost trail in a large complex of routes being proposed for decommissioning in preferred Alternative G (along either side of Forest Route 508 and Forest Route 528). This route provides a traversing option to the steep gully continuation of 1-1998.1A, Hannon Creek trail. Also, retaining this trail creates a loop ride opportunity from the Kobey Park area. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. This existing trail should be retained in the system for its high quality recreational attributes.	Comment Noted. To provide a connection the District with public input decided to use the Hannon Creek road and adopt 508W.1A Cascade Creek rather than Hannon Creek spur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
356	5	1-2186.2, 1-N124.1	1-2186.2 and 1-N124.1, Arbaney-Kittle Trail. This route is the traditional start to the single-track portion of the classic Arbaney-Kittle Trail. Many published maps indicate this route for the A-K Trail. This route departs west from Forest Route 508, at the top of Red Canyon. Retaining this route will also allow for a recreational loop opportunity with trail 1N127.1, which would otherwise become the de facto, yet, shortened beginning to this high value, classic mountain bike ride. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that this existing route be preserved for continued recreational use. At the very least, this route should remain open, with trail 1N127.1 being considered for decommissioning.	FS met with RFMBA and believes this is a reasonable and valid suggestion and will consider it relation to the official start of the Arbaney-Kittle Trail #2186.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	6	1-2188.1	1-2188.1, Dry Woody Creek. This route is a historic connection to Kobey Park, Triangle Peak, and various areas along the Arbaney Kittle Trail. While not currently a preferred route for mountain bikers, RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] notes the existence of a recreation easement granting access to this portion of public lands. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA recommends not decommissioning this existing recreational route.	Currently the FS is not aware of any County easement on this old stock driveway.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	7	1-2189-1a	1-2189.1A, Red Canyon trail. This route is a historic connection to Kobey Park, Triangle Peak, and various areas along the Arbaney Kittle Trail. While not currently a preferred route for mountain bikers, RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] notes the existence of a recreation easement through Aspen Valley Ranch, at the base of Red Canyon. A new trailhead and easement re-route are currently under discussion by the concerned entities. RFMBA recommends not decommissioning this existing recreational route, especially considering current easement access.	The FS understands the easement issues between the county and landowner at this time. The FS will not add the route to the system at this time as further study is warranted.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	20	1-2190.1, 1-2190.2	Aspen Ranger District: Smuggler Mountain/Warren Lakes/No Name Creek 1-2190.1, 1-2190.2 – maintain these 2 unauthorized trails for foot and horseback only.	These two trails are in M.A. 1.11 Pristine Wilderness and adding trails is not allowed. The desired condition is to provide for natural conditions and limit the amount of man-made features including trails. This area is still open to foot and horseback travel, though maintenance of these trails will not occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	8	1-2198.1, 1-2198.2, 1-2198W.1C	1-2198.1, 1-2198.2, 1-21-98W.1C, McFarlane Creek trail. This historic route parallels Richmond Ridge to the east for 5 or 6 miles. These routes provide a recreational out and back and loop opportunities with Richmond Ridge Road, Forest Route 123. If mountain bike access to the top of Aspen mountain ski hill becomes a reality in the future (as has been discussed) the McFarlane's road could become a valuable asset to recreation in the area. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that these existing routes be preserved for continued recreational use.	Both routes cross private property where easements do not exist at this time. 2198.1 also enters into the Collegiate Peaks Wilderness where we currently have trespass problems from motorcycles and mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
228	3	1-289.1	1-289.1 Add ATV vehicles to these trails.	Comment refers to trail 2189, an extension of Red Canyon Trail 1933. This is primarily a single-track trail and ATV's will not be considered for this route though it is recognized that portions of the trail have been ridden illegally by hunters and others on ATV.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	23	1-528.1	Aspen Ranger District: Kobey Park 1-528 – maintain this as mixed use during fall hunting seasons	Road 528 is currently open to all uses but was proposed as closed to all motorized uses in Alt. G to protect soils and reduce maintenance cost. For the same reasons, final alternative is keeping this route as non-motorized.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	14	1-534W.2M, 1-2189.1, 1-1933.1, 3-2186.2	Motorized Trails in Proximity to Waterways: Alternative G results in 11 additional miles of motorized trails in close proximity (300') to stream channels in the Roaring Fork Watershed, as well as an additional 55 stream crossings. A portion of these new motorized trails (FS Trails 1-534W.2M (Triangle Peak Trail), 1-2189.1 (Sloane Cut-Off, 1-1933.1 (Red Canyon) and 3-2186.2 (Small section of the Arbaney-Kittle Trail, on top) fall within Pitkin County - where "bandit" trails and a portion of a "currently-recognized bicycle trail are being authorized for motorcycle use. Pitkin County recognizes that one of the goals of the previously-adopted WRNF Land and Resource Management Plan (the "Forest Management Plan") is to provide a wide range of motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation opportunities and difficulty levels spread across the WRNF, and that the Travel Management Plan must be consistent with the Forest Management Plan. This directive has, apparently, played a large part in the decision to bring FS Trails 1-534W.2M, 1-2189.1 and 1-1933.1 into the WRNF system and to authorize these "bandit" trails for motorcycle use, together with FS Trail 3-2186.2. Motorized trails in proximity to streams create a greater risk to water quality and may degrade wetlands and riparian areas, particularly where trails cannot be properly maintained (due to budget constraints, or otherwise). The USFS's response to prior comments submitted on the proposed changes to these routes which note the need for seasonal wildlife closures (see, e.g., comments previously submitted by Wilderness Workshop) also concern us. Pitkin County does not support legitimizing the 3 "bandit" routes for motorcycles, or opening the upper portion of FS Trail 3-2186.2 to motorcycle usage. If the 3 "bandit" routes are included in the WRNF trail system, they should only be made available to hikers and equestrians, when and if wildlife demands allow (with suitable barriers in place to prohibit unauthorized vehicular use). As the USFS has recognized in the SDEIS: National Forest System Lands are finite. While it is the agency's goal to provide for public use, the agency also has a responsibility to manage the land	Trails 1933 and 2189 are not bandit trails but rather system trails being converted in use classification. The area in question will be closed to motorized use until June 20 at least for elk migration. Trail 534W.2M was analyzed for motorcycle use in 1996 and 1997 and a Biological Assessment and Evaluation was written stating that the trail would have a negative impact on some wildlife species but this could be mitigated with spring seasonal closures. Currently this area is closed until late June annually and will remain so in the Final TMP.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	48	1966W.3, 1966W.2, 1954W.1, 310W.1F	<p>Carbondale Ranger District:</p> <p>Trails: The DOW supports the overall reduction of non-system trails within the Sopris Ranger District. Especially important are the elimination and decommissioning of trails 1966W.3 – Bears Gulch, 1966W.2- Old McClure Pass, 1954W.1- Crystal Canyon R.R., 310W.1F - Janeway R.R. as these all pass within either critical bighorn sheep habitat, critical elk winter range or elk production areas. The DOW would like to make recommendations on the following trails:</p> <p>Trail 1957.1 series - Hay Park. These trails run through critical elk production habitat in both the Sopris and Aspen Ranger Districts. A seasonal closure from May 1- June 30 is recommended.</p>	<p>Trails 1966 and 1954 will not become system trails due to wildlife and maintenance concerns. Trails 1954W1. and 310W.1F will also not be system trails though the district acknowledges a strong desire by the county and some members of the public to utilize these routes for a possible future mixed-use trail. These latter two routes will remain non-system trails but will also not be physically decommissioned at this time. Trail 1957 is not in a Forest Plan M.A. that identifies elk habitat as the primary management focus, nor was a seasonal closure identified in any of the alternatives presented to the public thus far.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	9	1-n121.1	1-N121.1, Un-named trail. This single-track route parallels Forest Route 508, and is valued as a high quality preamble for those continuing on to start the Arbaney-Kittle Trail. This trail provides a rare traversing experience, and a quality, recreational alternative to the adjacent 2WD dirt road. Decommissioning this route would eliminate an existing, high value, single-track trail from the system. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that this existing route be preserved for continued recreational use.	This trail is a bandit trail the FS has tentatively named the Outland trail, which was surveyed and GPS by FS staff. Comment will be considered.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
228	2	1-n130.1	1-N130.1 road up to Sloans Rim-Add ATV and four wheel drive vehicles.	This section of "road" was closed by the FS 1996 after illegal improvement work occurred on this route, which has turned back into a single-track trail from the end of Rd. 534 up to the Sloane Peak vicinity where it connects to Trail 2186. In no alternatives did the FS consider adding this section as a road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	32	1-N130.1	1-N130.1, Red Rim. This route accesses Sloane Peak and the Arbaney-Kittle Trail via Triangle Peak is categorized as open to two wheeled vehicles (motorcycles). In reality, this route is an existing 4WD road that easily accommodates full size vehicles. The road ends just south of Sloane Peak where it meets the Arbaney-Kittle trail. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] has GIS data that will be shared with the WRNF's Bruce Davidson to clear up this error. RFMBA recommends re-categorizing this high value recreational route to accommodate existing use (licensed and unlicensed categorization recommended). RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] will prepare an email for Bruce Davidson that will include the route's actual, existing alignment, via GIS data.	The FS looks forward to seeing additional information that may correct mapping errors, but from on the ground survey by the FS our map of this area is fairly accurate.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	22	1-N130.1, 1-2189.1, 3-2186.2, 1-1933.1	<p>Aspen Ranger District:</p> <p>Kobey Park/Triangle Peak – 1-N130.1, 1-2189.1, 3-2186.2, 1-1933.1 – remove these as motorized. These trails pass through elk summer solitude area. They are also very impactful during the fall hunting seasons and disrupt sportsmen opportunity. Many complaints during 2008 hunting seasons regarding motorcycle use. If a motorcycle loop trail is going to be provided without regard to wildlife values, then remove 1-1933.1 at cow camp. A loop would still be provided using 1-523.1, 523.4A, 1-508.1, and 3-2186.2. Removing 1-1933.1 would then still provide an undisturbed core area. If the USFS decides to keep these open for motorized use, then a seasonal closure during the fall hunting seasons should be implemented.</p>	<p>The Forest Plan does not recognize a Summer Solitude Area. The M.A. for this location is 5.41 Deer and Elk Winter Range so a closure will remain in place from the end of fall hunting season until June 20 at least, in addition to spring road access closures to protect road soils during mud season. This is one of two areas on the district that could accommodate summer and fall motorized trail use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	33	1-N151.1	1-N151.1, Un-named trail. Sometimes referred to as the Sugar Bowls, this route creates a loop ride from the top of Buttermilk Ski Area, to the west, then drops north to connect to the 1-1980.1, Government Trail. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] applauds the inclusion of this single-track trail into the WRNF system. However, this trail includes portions of unsustainable trail falling straight down the fall line. RFMBA recommends limited re-routes be considered to provide a sustainable trail for future generations.	The FS included this trail in the final alternative for inclusion which will allow the FS and volunteers to maintain the route to sustainable conditions.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	10	1-n152.1	1-N152.1, Un-named trail. This route is shown as being located on the lower slopes of Snowmass Ski Area and appears to be located where the popular Powerline trail is located. Other recreation trails are not shown within ski area boundaries. Note that TMP data in excel spreadsheet (mistakenly?) locates this route at Aspen Highlands Ski Area. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] has learned that Aspen/Snowmass ski areas are managed under a separate permit and TMP, and that separate mapping exists outside this DEIS TMP process. RFMBA needs more information on what trail this is before accepting proposed decommissioning.	There are two trails labeled n152.1 (unfortunately some duplicate numbers occur, but each route is tracked separately). One is the trail on the ski area and is open to mountain bikes. The administration of trails on the ski areas is under the permit system and operating plans. See ski area discussion in EIS in Chapter 2. The second trail is a user-created route and is not going to be added to the system as it was found to not be needed with respect to all the other opportunities in the area.	Provide Additional Information or New Studies

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
356	11	1-n161.1	1-N161.1, Un-named trail. This single-track route follows the valley floor, south of the Hunter Creek. This trail provides a challenging, traversing experience. Due to its close proximity to the City of Aspen, RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that this existing trail be preserved for continued recreational use. Although prohibitively expensive at this time, installation of a bridge or a more primitive crossing over Hunter Creek at this route's eastern terminus, would allow for a loop ride back towards the west on route 1-1992.3.	This trail follows the creek behind the old reservoir cabin and is likely the result of historic foot traffic. The trail will not be added at this time due to expense, the method of decommissioning will be more toward signing and blocking the entrance thus if a user group such as the RFMBA wants to adopt the trail along with the expense of bringing the trail to standard and maintain the trail, it would be available for further study.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	12	1-n173.1	1-N173.1, Hurricane Road. This route provides access to Richmond Ridge Road via Little Annie Basin. The Aspen Cycling Club has historically run cycling races along this route. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that this existing trail be preserved for continued recreational use, especially in the event that easements through private property are one day revised.	Should easement rights be granted, further analysis for a system trail through the area could commence. Until then the trail will not be added to the system as the FS does not have right-of-way over private land.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	13	3-104.P1, 3-104.P2	3-104.P1, 3-104.P2, Lower Fryingpan Powerline. These historic wagon trail routes may provide future recreational users a safer alternative to the paved Fryingpan Road. Need further input from Mid-Valley Trails Committee. Route 3-104.P1 is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning these routes, even if future easements will be required to link these routes properly.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	97	3-107.1, 3-2182.1 connector	107.1-2182.1 New York Creek Trail to 144.1 NY Canal Service Road./Aspen RD This short section of non-Wilderness trail establishes an interesting side loop off the Lincoln Creek Road and should be retained as a mountain bike route.	Although a loop opportunity could potentially exist, staff felt this route was too steep to maintain for bicycles and there is not a suitable crossing for bicycles across Lincoln Creek at this location. Demand for this activity on this trail is minimal.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
392	5	3-133w.1b	On behalf of the Crystal River Caucus Wildlife Task Force I would recommend that the following areas adjacent to the Crystal River in Pitkin County, Colorado be deactivated and removed from future active trail status due to their proximity to critical wildlife habitat and riparian zones. These are active production areas for Bighorn sheep and elk. The valley floor is very narrow and restricted and these areas are relatively intact and buffered by the Crystal River. 3-133W.1B - Existing conditions are already compressing these riparian and upland habitats in this very narrow and constrained valley. Great recreational opportunity is currently available in this area and critical habitat needs to [be] protected into the future.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	14	3-1907.1	3-1907.1, Lily Pad Lake. This route is a historic 4wd jeep road that has been abandoned to vehicle traffic due to an impassable washout on the road. However, the route is still accessible via foot and mechanized (bicycle) travel. This route provides summer access to the Betty Bear Hut, as well as a recreational loop opportunity via the Ivanhoe Ditch Rd. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends that this existing route be preserved for continued recreational use.	The FS agrees with this recommendation due to summer use at Betty Bear Hut.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	15	3-1913.1	3-1913.1, Lower Bowers Gulch. This route provides a jug handle loop opportunity off of Cattle Creek Rd. / Forest Route 509. This trail is ridden in conjunction with Mill Creek and other Basalt Mountain routes. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	Both RFMBA and CBTRA recommend retaining this section of trail however as mapped it crosses a corner of private property for which there is no easement. There are also some conflicts with cattle grazing in this area if this trail is made part of the system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	107	3-1913w.1h, 3-1913w.1b, 3-19131e	Sopris Ranger District 3-1913W.1H, 1-1913W.1B Lone Tree Trail, 3-1913.1E Bowers System Spur All three of these routes are proposed motorcycle routes in ALT G. These routes exist at the present time because of non-authorized use. If the routes are designated, this would allow the Forest Service to apply seasonal closures. The CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a spring closure from May 1st thru June 30th for elk calving. The closures would reduce human activity in these areas during this time.	The FS will consider a seasonal closure in this area though the district has identified this area as one of our two emphasis areas for providing summer motorized recreation. M.A. is 5.43 Deer and Elk Winter Range. Currently the access road to this trail is closed by Special Order until June 10 annually and will remain in place.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	16	3-1924w.1	3-1924W.1, South Fork to Nast. This route provides a connection between the Norrie Road (Forest Route 504) where it joins the South Fork of the Fryingpan River and the Frying Pan Road at its turn off for Nast Lake. This connection provides a recreational loop opportunity in the upper Fryingpan Basin. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing recreational route.	The FS is not aware of the condition of this route nor has it been inventoried for inclusion.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	17	3-1925.1	3-1925.1, Chapman Campground trail. This trail segment is essential for connectivity/loop from Chapman Campground and allow for means of riding up valley without being on the main road by using existing water project roadways instead for better dispersed recreation. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	Though seldom used, the FS will keep this system trail open as an option from the Campground up to the 504 road as a non-motorized trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	95	3-1930.1	1930.1 Miller to Rocky Fork Trail/Sopris RD This short, and in our experience, good quality route creates a shorter and more viable mountain bike connection between the Roaring Fork and Fryingpan valleys than does the Rocky Fork Trail and should remain open to mountain bike use.	This trail exists on part of an old logging spur that was decommissioned as a road. However, keeping a single-track non-motorized trail is being retained in the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	18	3-1930.1	3-1930.1, Miller to Rocky Fork trail. This route provides a connection between the Kobey Park area and Thomasville. Additionally, this single-track trail provides a loop opportunity around Ruedi Reservoir via the Rocky Fork trail. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	This trail exists on part of an old logging spur that was decommissioned as a road. However, keeping a single trail along this route is being retained in the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
445	5	3-1930.1	Do not decommission 3-1930.1. Maintain or designate at least a foot/h hoof/ski route connecting Miller Creek (3-522.1) to Hunter Creek (via 1-528.1E).	This trail exists on part of an old logging spur that was decommissioned as a road. However, keeping a single trail along this route is being retained in the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	19	3-1937w.1	3-1937W.1, Mill Creek. This route is the upper portion of the popular Mill Creek single-track trail, north of Basalt Mountain. The portion of trail proposed to be decommissioned is above Forest Route 524. Although it is not as popular as the lower portion of the trail, this existing single-track is a high quality connection to the trail heading south to Almost High Park. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	The trail in question is currently not a system trail and due to its short distance and possible routing through wetlands it would need further review by the FS before inclusion will occur. And it should be noted that no trail from the end of the Blue Creek Flats Road will be open to mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	25	3-1937w.2	3-N1937W.2, Almost High Park. This route provides a connection between the riding area north of Basalt Mountain (Forest Route 524) and the Kelly Lake area, just north of the Lake Christine State Wildlife Area. Management policies of the Wildlife area may change from the current status of closure to a seasonal closure which could be compatible with multiple uses. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	This route will be decommissioned with barriers and signs and will not be shown as a system trail down to Kelly Lake. This could change in the future should CDOW alter its travel policy on their property, which is unlikely at this time. In no previous alternative from 2006 to 2008 was this entire route to Lake Christine shown.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	51	3-1949.1	Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW would like to make recommendations on the following trails: Trail 1949.1- Perham Creek. Maintain current winter closure for elk and deer winter range. Dec 1- April 30.	The current winter closure is actually a trailhead closure enacted on Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land. The FS at this time does not have any closures on this trail. This trail accesses Forest Plan Recommended Wilderness Area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	50	3-1950.1	Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW would like to make recommendations on the following trails: Trail 1950.1 – Middle Thompson Creek. This trail runs through elk production habitat. A seasonal closure from May 1- June 30 is recommended.	This trail was not recommended for a seasonal closure for elk calving in any previous alternative. The trail exists in M.A. 5.12 General Forest and Range Veg. Management, though it borders the edge of M.A. 5.43 Elk Habitat.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	80	3-1950.1	FST 1950.1 Middle Thompson/Sopris RD This trail is an attractive mountain bike route in many ways, but as constructed it cannot sustain long-term, regular mountain bike use – there are numerous watercourse crossings and wet areas that need to be reconstructed in order to prevent significant soil damage and erosion in this sensitive and ecologically valuable watershed. The Forest Service needs to take a genuine hard look at whether the foreseeable level of use on this trail that has no loop connections to other good mountain bike routes warrants the investment to bring it up to a sustainable use standard. If not, the route should be designated for non-mechanized only.	This comment warrants inspection by the FS to determine condition. Currently trail will remain open to foot/horse/bike as a non-motorized system trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	49	3-1952.1	<p>Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW would like to make recommendations on the following trails:</p> <p>Trail 1952.1 – Braderich Creek. This trail runs through elk production habitat. A seasonal closure from May 1- June 30 is recommended.</p>	<p>This trail was not recommended for a seasonal closure for elk calving in any previous alternative. The trail exists in M.A. 5.12 General Forest and Range Veg. Management, though it borders the edge of M.A. 5.43 Elk Habitat.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	20	3-1954w.1	<p>3-1954W.1, Crystal Canyon RR. This historic route parallels Highway 133 and could potentially be used as a trail segment in the planned Crested Butte to Carbondale bike path. Portions of these segments may be considered County Easement and if so would be outside USFS purview to decommission. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails but will also not decommission any segments understanding future analysis may occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
392	1	3-1954w.1	<p>On behalf of the Crystal River Caucus Wildlife Task Force I would recommend that the following areas adjacent to the Crystal River in Pitkin County, Colorado be deactivated and removed from future active trail status due to their proximity to critical wildlife habitat and riparian zones. These are active production areas for Bighorn sheep and elk. The valley floor is very narrow and restricted and these areas are relatively intact and buffered by the Crystal River.</p> <p>3-1954W.1 - segment immediately north of the Filohas Meadows Nature preserve and extending through the Avalanche Creek drainage.</p> <p>This is a habitat linkage corridor and critical Bighorn sheep and elk calving, lambing and critical winter concentration area.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	21	3-1957w.1a, 3-1957w.1d	<p>3-1957W.1A to 3-1957W.1D, Thomas Lake Way to Dinkle Lake Way. These routes are ridden as a popular loop from the Dinkle Lake area trailhead. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning these existing high value recreational routes.</p>	<p>Although the FS does not consider these routes popular their existence is acknowledged. Currently these are not system trails and they can be analyzed in the lens of trail density and need.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
392	4	3-1966w.1	<p>On behalf of the Crystal River Caucus Wildlife Task Force I would recommend that the following areas adjacent to the Crystal River in Pitkin County, Colorado be deactivated and removed from future active trail status due to their proximity to critical wildlife habitat and riparian zones. These are active production areas for Bighorn sheep and elk. The valley floor is very narrow and restricted and these areas are relatively intact and buffered by the Crystal River.</p> <p>3-1966W.1 - The Placita Willow Flat area of extremely high value riparian habitat adjacent to the Crystal River, Ranked by our wildlife task force as the most diverse riparian area on the Crystal River.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	96	3-1966w.1, 3-1966w.2, 3-1966w.3	1966W.1, 1966W.2, 1966W.3 McClure Dispersed Camp Spur, Old McClure Pass Road, Bears Gulch/Sopris RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] support the inclusion of these routes in the travel system to facilitate the development of a biking/hiking route between Carbondale and Marble.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	22	3-1966w.1, 3-1966w.2, 3-1966w.3	3-1966W.1, 3-1966W.2, 3-1966W.3, Old McClure Pass Road, McClure Dispersed Camp Spur, Bears Gulch. These historic routes are existing cultural and recreational amenities. Portions of these segments may be considered County Easement and if so would be outside USFS purview to decommission. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning these existing high value recreational routes, especially considering existing easements.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	98	3-1988.1a	1998.1A Hannon Creek Spur/Aspen RD This short connector between the Kobey Park area and the 1998.1 Hannon Creek Trail is gentler and smoother than the upper section of 1998.1 and should be retained as an alternate – or even a replacement – start to the Hannon Creek Trail for mountain bikes.	The district inspected the area and determined to keep the 1988 main trail as the system trail and decommission this route in the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	47	3-2090.1	Carbondale Ranger District: Trails: The DOW supports the overall reduction of non-system trails within the Sopris Ranger District. Especially important are the elimination and decommissioning of trails 1966W.3 – Bears Gulch, 1966W.2- Old McClure Pass, 1954W.1- Crystal Canyon R.R., 310W.1F - Janeway R.R. as these all pass within either critical bighorn sheep habitat, critical elk winter range or elk production areas. The DOW would like to make recommendations on the following trails: Trail 2090 series – Ski Sunlight/ Babbish Gulch. Managed under special use permit. These trails run through critical elk production habitat. A seasonal closure from May 1- June 30 is recommended. Includes trails 2090.2, 2090.1W, 2090.4W, 2090.5W, 300.2C, 300.2F, N166.1.	See comments regarding Crystal River trail corridor. Regarding Trails in the Babbish Gulch area of Ski Sunlight: Trails within ski area boundaries are managed as part of the Ski Area's permit though a seasonal closure could be enacted with cooperation with Ski Sunlight with minimal impacts to recreation demand.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	34	3-2092.1	3-2092.1, Beaver Creek. This route, located to the south of Sunlight Ski Area, is proposed to be limited to foot and horse (animal) traffic in Alternative G. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] analysis shows this route as open to Mechanized (Bicycles) in both existing conditions Alternative A, as well as Alternative F. This route currently allows for a recreational loop opportunity via Four Mile Rd. at Sunlight Ski Area, connecting to Jerome Park Rd. and Spring Gulch. The east end of this trail passes through a private property easement that is currently not open to bikes. A future easement revision will be pursued by RFMBA to allow mountain bikes. RFMBA recommends re-categorizing this high value recreational route to accommodate existing use.	If the current easement held by Pitkin County is amended to allow mountain bikes on this trail then this modification can occur at a future time. Currently this trail is open to foot/horse/bike as a system trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	83	3-2093.1	FST 2093.1 Lake Ridge Lakes/Sopris RD This trail is a mountain bike route only in theory – in practice it would be barely rideable if at all. The gentler, eastern side climbs 1000' in less than 2000m for a 16% average grade, the western side drops straight down the mountainside 400' in 470m for an average grade of 26% - far too steep to support the constant braking (and consequent rutting) that bike riders would impose on it. The fact is that few riders could successfully attempt this trail and it would be virtually impossible to maintain it properly if they did. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend that it be reserved for non-mechanized only.	Comment is noted. It is not known how many mountain bikes may ride this trail at present. The trail crosses private land as well.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	94	3-2186.2, 3-n124.1	2186.2 and N124.1/Aspen RD These routes are the traditional connection to the Arbaney-Kittle Trail from FSR 508.1. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] support retaining and maintaining them as mountain bike routes to retain the quality and character of this classic mountain biking experience.	The FS is considering adding and retaining these routes in the final TMP.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Aspen-Sopris Ranger District

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	86	1-2172.1	2172.1 Grand Turk Trail/Aspen RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend that this trail be removed from the inventory. A field trip with staff from the Aspen RD, Pitkin County and the Wilderness Workshop failed to definitively locate most of this route. The one possible north end of the trail that was located had received little or no bike use and was too steep and treacherous to properly maintain.	This system trail will remain in the final TMP with priority to maintain to standard.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
228	1	3-2186.2	3-2186.2 Sloans Rim-Eliminate motorcycles and bicycles. Add horses and foot travel. Top of Sloans is Elk birthing area, etc.	Horseback and foot travel are allowed on all parts of the district. The current proposal is to allow motorcycles, and bicycles, on this trail to provide loop opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	23	3-2190.1	3-2190.1, Otto Creek. This route provides a potential connection to the NE side of Basalt Mountain, allowing for a loop circumnavigation of the mountain. This is the only possible route for such a loop, given the land managed as wilderness to the east and private property issues to the west. This route could eventually be extended to access the Taylor Creek Spur (Forest Route 510), given that straightforward access is not available via private property 2 miles up Taylor Creek from the Fryingpan River. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	Comment noted. The district determined that this route should be decommissioned due to the management emphasis and limited opportunities due to wilderness to the east and private property to the west.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	41	3-300.3	Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat. Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic. FRD 300.3- 4-mile/ Wolf Creek/Baylor Park/ Middle Thompson creek – Main access road from Glenwood Springs to areas above Sunlight Ski area.	There are no designated winter play areas in the M.A.'s. The FS has also met with the CDOW to discuss the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes. Comment noted.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	46	3-300.3	FSR 300.3 Fourmile Road/Sopris RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] ask for clarification on the status of this road that is obstructed and closed to public use but is still included in the travel system. Is it being maintained for planned future timber or gas access or some other purpose or simply not being decommissioned?	This is the main Fourmile Road through Fourmile Park. In Alternative G this road was opened to licensed vehicles only, which may be causing the misunderstanding.	Document Composition (clarity/grammar/spelling/punct.)
480	43	3-300.3e	Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat. Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic. FRD 300.3E- Sunlight Peak- maintain current closure to all motorized vehicles at locked gate on top. Seasonal closure for protection of critical elk production habitat May 1-June 30. At minimum maintain current closure until June 15 for resource protection.	There are no designated winter play areas in the M.A.'s. The FS has also met with the CDOW to discuss the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes. The Sunlight Peak road is closed with a gate annually until June 15. Comment noted.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	42	3-300.3r	Carbondale Ranger District: The DOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat. Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic. FRD 300.3R - 4-mile Park/Texas City- Popular camp area for hunters. Closure of this road and main 300 road would require hunters to trailer OHV's to spur roads that remain open to OHV use. Adequate parking and staging areas for trucks and trailers do not exist at these spur roads.	There are no designated winter play areas in the M.A.'s. The FS has also met with the CDOW to discuss the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	47	3-300.4m	FSR 300.4M Old Middle Thompson Park/Sopris RD Unless this route is definitively needed for vehicular access to active machinery at the old gas well at the road's end, We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend that it become part of the Middle Thompson Trail 1950.1 and be appropriately limited to foot and animal traffic.	This route is needed for utility access and will remain on the system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	44	3-305.2b	<p>Carbondale Ranger District:</p> <p>The DOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat.</p> <p>Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic.</p> <p>FRD 305.2B- South Thompson Creek- the main South Thompson Creek road is listed as "other public road" up to the old South Thompson Cow Camp and then designated as a forest road from that point. The road is extremely rough from the cow camp to the end of the road and should remain open to OHV travel. Use is primarily by hunters and livestock producers.</p>	There are no designated winter play areas in the M.A.'s. The FS has also met with the CDOW to discuss the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	48	3-305.2b	<p>FSR 305.2B Parsnip Flat/Sopris RD</p> <p>The initial part of this road is steep, soft and eroding into an ephemeral creek drainage. To reduce this impact travel on the route should be limited to that allowed on the Braderich Trail 1952.1, to which this road provides access.</p>	This section or road was not analyzed for closure in any alternatives though it is a comment worth considering in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	45	3-306.1	<p>Carbondale Ranger District:</p> <p>The DOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat.</p> <p>Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic.</p> <p>FRD 306.1 -South Branch of Middle Thompson-heaviest use by hunters during the hunting seasons. Road can become very nasty in precipitous weather. OHV access should remain to help facilitate hunter dispersal and achieve harvest objectives.</p>	There are no designated winter play areas in the M.A.'s. The FS has also met with the CDOW to discuss the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	49	3-307.1b	<p>FSR 307.1B Mine No. 3/Sopris RD</p> <p>The segment of this route between 307.1 and 307W.1N should remain open, the rest of the road up the side of the mountain should be decommissioned.</p>	The FS is not currently proposing any old mine roads in the Coal Basin area be open to public motorized travel in the summer.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	50	3-310.1c	<p>FSR 310.1C Sheep Road/Sopris RD</p> <p>This road is gated and derelict, and only provides access to the Broker Lode Mining Claim, which is under conservation easement with the Aspen Valley Land Trust. The only necessary purpose it serves is to provide foot access to the claim for yearly monitoring visits. As such it is appropriate to reduce its use level to a public foot trail.</p>	The FS has decommissioned this route along Bulldog Creek at its junction with the Avalanche Creek Road 310.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
392	2	3-310w.1f	<p>On behalf of the Crystal River Caucus Wildlife Task Force I would recommend that the following areas adjacent to the Crystal River in Pitkin County, Colorado be deactivated and removed from future active trail status due to their proximity to critical wildlife habitat and riparian zones. These are active production areas for Bighorn sheep and elk. The valley floor is very narrow and restricted and these areas are relatively intact and buffered by the Crystal River.</p> <p>3-310W.1F - This segment extends from the Avalanche Creek drainage along the Crystal River and through the historic and isolated old townsite of Janeway. This intact critical habitat of cottonwood/spruce/ponderosa/douglas fir is an elk production and winter concentration area.</p>	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
392	3	3-313w.1a	<p>On behalf of the Crystal River Caucus Wildlife Task Force I would recommend that the following areas adjacent to the Crystal River in Pitkin County, Colorado be deactivated and removed from future active trail status due to their proximity to critical wildlife habitat and riparian zones. These are active production areas for Bighorn sheep and elk. The valley floor is very narrow and restricted and these areas are relatively intact and buffered by the Crystal River.</p> <p>3-313W.1A - This segment contains the Red Wind Point open space and conservation easement. A small but high value riparian habitat exists here and provides overlapping Elk and Bighorn sheep calving and lambing and winter concentration. Production areas are active from May 1 thru June 31.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	103	3-504.1B, 3-504.1E, 3504.1, 3-505.1	<p>Sopris Ranger District</p> <p>Chapman area</p> <p>3-504.1B Rec Residence, 3-504.1E Chapman Creek, 3504.1 South Fork Fryingpan, 3-505.1 Granite under Alt G these routes are designated as licensed only. The CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends they be open to licensed and unlicensed vehicle. The use of ATV's would allow hunters to safely access the upper portions of the routes in inclement weather or when road conditions do not allow a full sized vehicle.</p>	<p>These routes are in good condition and allow for passenger cars. These routes also access wilderness trail heads. Because these are only connected by a County road which does not allow for ATV travel and access for hunters is available by FSV, these will remain as licensed only.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
483	1	3-504.1e, 3-504.1, 3-505.1, 3-105.3a, 3-527.1, 3-538.1, 3-400.2, 4-431.1, 3-512.1, 3-519.1; 3-536.1	<p>As ATV riders we would ask that roads need to be reevaluated prior to final implementation. These roads are now displayed with the ATV symbol for use and are proposed for licensed vehicles only. 3-504.1e, 3-504.1, 3-505.1, 3-105.3a, 3-527.1, 3-538.1 and 3-400.2 These roads have very little vehicle traffic and there are places for camping and a place to begin a day ride from. The following roads are 4-431.1, 3-512.1, 3-519.1; 3-536.1 are short roads but are access to hunting areas. All roads that have traffic count of less than 50 cars per day should be made open to ATV or unlicensed vehicle use. Colorado depends on hunting revenue and shutting down access by means of ATV or other unlicensed vehicles will make hunters look to different areas and possibly states. There are other states that also license the ATV's so they will be able to ride on roads that are closed to unlicensed. There are more roads that we have not ridden, but would like to have the opportunity to. But if this plan is put in to affect, then it will require the use of a licensed four wheel drive vehicle that weighs more and is more damaging to these roads. Most roads that are four wheel drive have two wheel ruts due to the width of the road ATVs wheel base and width are smaller and can ride out of the ruts not making them deeper.</p>	<p>The status and future implementation of the Forest Service's Mixed-Use Study is being considered at this time. This is a safety determination that affects travel on the forest, but is not solely a travel management decision to be made in this plan.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
480	46	3-517.1	<p>Carbondale Ranger District:</p> <p>The CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a winter play area closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.41- Deer and elk winter range. Winter closure on all wildlife prescription areas 5.42- Bighorn sheep habitat.</p> <p>Roads: The USFS has identified several roads within the Sopris Ranger District to be limited to licensed vehicles only in Alt. G, limiting OHV travel. The roads listed below should remain open to OHV traffic.</p> <p>FRD 517.1 Huntsmans Ridge- eliminated in Alt. G. Should be retained to provide hunter access. Access should be limited to OHV travel for resource protection. The CDOW supports the original closure at the top of ridge, 3 miles in.</p>	<p>The FS agrees with recommendation for road 517. The FS has met with CDOW to discuss issues related to the Mixed-Use study and its outcomes. In the winter, there are no play areas designated for snowmobiles in these M.A.'s.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	56	3-523.1, 3-526.1a	<p>FSR 526.1 Yeckel & 526.1A Porphyry Mountain Spur/Sopris RD</p> <p>Our principal recommendation is to decommission 526.1- a difficult to maintain route at best – at its useful end: the Margy Hut parking area. Barring that, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] find the continuation of both routes beyond their junction to be superfluous and damaging to the character of the roadless area they are entering and the Hunter-Fryingpan Wilderness that 526.1 borders. Of the two, 526.1 is clearly the more erosive and difficult to maintain, and hardly worth keeping open for the few who will drive it to enjoy the view from the summit of Mt. Yeckel.</p>	<p>The FS completed an analysis to close the Mt. Yeckel Road 526 near the old mine site below Mt. Yeckel in the late 1990's and is still a project the FS would like to accomplish.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
356	24	3-524.1b	<p>3-524.1B, High Park trail. This route is part of the popular system of trails north of Basalt Mountain. This route is proposed open to mechanized (bicycles) in both Alternatives A and F. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing recreational route.</p>	<p>This route is a dead-end route that is likely an old logging spur that is gated.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	105	3-527.1	<p>Sopris Ranger District</p> <p>Ivanhoe area:</p> <p>3-527.1 Ivanhoe Lake Route 527.1 is proposed as a licensed only route in ALT G. In the immediate area, routes 538.1, 532.1 and 105.1 allow for non-licensed travel. If route 527.1 was changed to licensed and non-licensed vehicles, this would allow for a longer loop, giving hunters using ATV's greater access during hunting season. If road conditions are bad the use of ATV's can lessen the damage to the base of the road.</p>	<p>527 is shown as licensed only due to the fact that the 105 Road to Ivanhoe Lake is a county road and Pitkin County has not declared this road open to unlicensed use, though they are working on it. Once this occurs the FS can change its classification. See also answer #90.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	57	3-528.1e	FSR 528.1E Rocky Fork Spur/Sopris RD FSR 528.1G Rocky Fork Spur/Sopris RD These short, flat, abandoned and overgrown logging spurs should be decommissioned and are of no reasonable use to mountain bikers.	These logging spurs are generally overgrown and are not included in the current system of trails, nor are they proposed to be.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
467	1	3-532.1, 3-538.1	Summer Travel: FS Road 3-532.1 and Part of FS Road 538.1 (Upper Fryingpan): These roads are now shown as being converted from all uses to open only to motorized vehicles < 50" in width. These roads have traditionally been graded by Pitkin County and cleared each spring with a bulldozer by the Bureau of Reclamation in order to provide access to the transmountain diversion structures. Thus, we [Pitkin County] request that the U.S. Forest Service ("USFS") clarify future County obligations with respect to these roads.	FS staff have met with Pitkin County Roads department and will correct this section of road in the final TMP.	
509	58	3-536.1	FSR 536.1 Freeman/Sopris RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend decommissioning the section of this road north of the powerline. It has little recreational value except for allowing a hunting camp or two in what is otherwise de facto wilderness.	FS completed some decommission work here in 2008 on 536.1A and on 536. Due to the number of hunters that access this area the FS believes it is important to keep these two roads open while maintaining the current closures on numerous side spurs, including ones that travel into the Recommended Wilderness Area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	104	3-538.1	Sopris Ranger District Elk Wallow area: 3-538.1 Middle Cunningham (lower section) In Alt G the lower section of route 538.1 is proposed as licensed only. The upper section is proposed as non-license travel. 538.1 connects with 532.1 and 105.1, both of these routes allow the use of non-licensed vehicles. If the lower section was changed to licensed and non-licensed vehicles, this would allow for a longer loop, giving hunters using ATV's greater access during hunting season. If road conditions are bad the use of ATV's can lessen the damage to the base of the road.	The Forest Service is considering changes in this area to facilitate loop opportunities for unlicensed vehicles (ATV's and dirt bikes) and eliminating full-size vehicles due to road conditions. The section in question on 538 will likely be changed back to licensed and unlicensed use based on need by Pitkin County.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	102	3-701.1, 3-400.2, 3-519.1, 3-512.1, 4-431.1	Sopris Ranger District Alternative G offers fewer route of travel which in turn provides a greater benefit for wildlife. Alternative G will increase certain types of routes, such as motorcycle and bicycle will increase. Because of this increased activity, seasonal closures will need to be implemented on certain routes. Gunnison National Forest has closure dates on FS Rd 701 from Hubbard Park to Windy Point. All spurs roads are closed during elk calving (personal communication DWM Madariaga). Closures dates would be in the spring from May 1st thru June 30th as needed. ----- In Alt G the following roads are listed as open for licensed vehicles only. The CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends they be open to licensed and unlicensed vehicle. Eagle-Thomasville 3 - 400.2, Spring Creek 3- 519.1, Jakeman 3- 512.1, Powerline-Crooked Creek 4-431.1.	The status and future implementation of the Forest Service's Mixed-Use Study is being considered at this time. This is a safety determination that affects travel on the forest, but is not solely a travel management decision to be made in this plan.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	99	3-n151.1	N151.1 "Sugar Bowls"/Aspen RD This connector between the top of the Buttermilk Ski Area and the Government Trail should be retained as a mountain bike route in this intensively used recreation area. Appropriate seasonal closure of this and all other trails between Buttermilk and Snowmass must be in place to accommodate elk migrations and calving periods.	It is the decision of the FS to include this non-system historic trail in its final TMP and will retain the current elk-calving closure for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
472	2	3-N1937W.5, 3-1937W.1, 3-1911.1, 3-524.1A, 3-524.1B, 3-524.1, 3-1909.1	Mountain Bike Use: For mountain bike use, please keep the following trails open: 3-N1937W.5, 3-1937W.1, 3-1911.1, 3-524.1A, 3-524.1B, 3-524.1, and 3-1909.1.	These trails in the Basalt Mtn. Area will remain open to mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	26	3-N1957W.3A, 3-N1957W.3B, 3-N1957W.3C	3-N1957W.3A, 3-N1957W.3B, 3-N1957W.3C, Hay Park East and spur route. This route is a jug handle loop to the east and north (and downhill) from the popular Hay Park Trail. This route is an existing loop ride accessed from the Dinkle lake area. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	Trails have been discussed with RFMBA and not likely to be included as system trails at this time.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	27	3-N1957W.3D, 3-N1957W.3E	3-N1957W.3D, 3-N1957W.3E, Un-named trails. These routes provide a critical connection along the north side of Mt. Sopris between Hay Park Trail and Highway 133. This connection allows for a recreational loop ride from the town of Carbondale. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning these existing high value recreational routes, even if future easements will be required to link to Highway 133 properly.	This route was discussed with RFMBA and the FS can't verify their existence. There are also issues with crossing private property as the possible trail would connect to highway 133. At this time these routes will not become part of the system, though they will have low priority for decommissioning.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
356	28	3-N314.2	3-N314.2, Placita River Road. This historic route parallels Highway 133 and could potentially be used as a trail segment in the planned Crested Butte to Carbondale bike path. Portions of these segments may be considered County Easement and if so would be outside USFS purview to decommission. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	Parts of the non-system placita river road was decommissioned in 2008 due to wetland and riparian concerns. Any future trail through this area would likely utilize land closer to the highway alignment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	29	3-N537.2A	3-N537.2A, Kelly Lake Spur. This route connects Almost High Park and the Lake Christine State Wildlife Area. In part, this route provides a connection between the riding areas north of Basalt Mountain (Forest Route 524) the Lake Christine State Wildlife Area. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	This route will not be decommissioned physically though it will not be shown as a system trail down to Kelly Lake, though this could change in the future should CDOW alter its travel policy on their property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	81	3-1953.1	FST 1953.1 Dexter Park/Sopris RD It has become clear from our analysis of the proposed travel management plan that numerous trails throughout the forest have been grand fathered in from pre-existing route inventories as "mountain bike" trails without any apparent analysis of their suitability for, or their sustainability under, the long-term impacts of knobby-tired travel. Dexter Park is an example in point. While much of the trail may be suitable for bike travel, the northern end includes a section with a 30% slope that is more than 1/3 mile long right down Dexter Creek. This is well beyond the pitch that can be maintained as a viable trail in this environment without a large investment in hardened construction and erosion control – investments that neither the Forest Service nor the local trail advocacy groups are in a position to make. Unless the agency can make a clear and credible commitment to this level of construction and maintenance, We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] cannot support the designation of trails such as this one for mountain bike use.	This route is retained in part for mountain bikes and decommissioned in part.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	82	3-1953w.2	FST 1953W.2/Sopris RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] oppose the addition of this non-system trail to the system on technical grounds: while in theory it would make part of a nice mountain bike loop between Coal Basin and the South Fork of Middle Thompson Creek, in reality it is too steep. At a 20% grade it makes for a horrendously difficult – if not impossible – climb, and as a fall line trail down a natural drainage, an ecologically unsustainable route when repeatedly ridden with brakes on.	Through re-examination of this route and interest the district felt it was an important route to add for mountain bikes and will maintain the route to standard.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	106	3-510.1a, 3-1909.1, 3-510.1a, 3-1909.1	Sopris Ranger District Basalt Mountain/ Red Table Mountain 3-510.1A Taylor Creek, 3-1909.1 Cattle Creek Routes 510.1A and 1909.1 are proposed bicycle routes in ALT G. The CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] supports the change of route 510.1A from a licensed/non-licensed to a bicycle route. There are some concerns with the change. Seasonal closures should be place on route 510.1a and 1909.1 during elk calving periods, May 1st thru June 30th. The closures would reduce human activity in these areas during this time.	The district decided to reclassify for the final TMP road 310.1A as closed to full-size vehicles but allow ATV's, motorcycles and mountain bicycles as it is a popular spur for hunting access in the fall. Both the Basalt Mtn. roads and the Red Table Roads are closed in the spring for road protection reasons until mid-June. Elk calving closures in this area were not presented in previous draft alternatives.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	1	alt	RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] does not prefer to see many hundreds of miles of trails needlessly decommissioned. Alternative F, which proposes to decommission fewer miles of routes than Alternative G, would meet our goals in this respect. However, Alternative G is officially the WRNF's Preferred alternative. RFMBA respects the WRNF's multitude of decisions in coming to this preferred alternative, and we will commit to working with the WRNF to revise this preferred plan. It is with these thoughts in mind that we submit comments based on the revision of Alternative G, rather than the simple, yet perhaps unrealistic, support of Alt. F.	The goal of the WRNF TMP is to solidify a logical and maintainable travel system. There will be many miles of high-quality roads and trails open to mountain bikes in the Final TMP while at the same time the FS must close unnecessary routes.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
480	25	arbany-kittle, holland hills	Aspen Ranger District: Winter Use The west end of Arbaney-Kittle is accessed from the Holland Hills trail which leads up through open space and BLM property. This is a heavily used trail year long. Most big game winter range use is east of where the trail tops out on the ridge. The trail should be closed at the USFS/BLM boundary Dec. 1 – April 30 to all human use to protect important winter range values.	Area in question is listed as M.A. 5.41 Deer and Elk Winter Range. The Forest Plan recommends a winter closure as a Guideline rather than a Standard. The FS has met with DOW officers to look at long-term closure possibilities in this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	24	arbany-kittle, triangle park	Aspen Ranger District: Winter Use Alt. G winter use map shows the Arbaney-Kittle area 3-2186.2 and Triangle Peak areas as "restricted motorized routes only" during the winter season with the pink coloration on the map. Both of these areas contain important winter range for mule deer and elk. There are no designated winter routes on the winter use map in these areas. The map coding should be changed to yellow coloration indicating motorized use prohibited.	Comment is correct in noting that this area is M.A. 5.41 Deer and Elk Winter Range. The pink map code for Alt. G displays no motorized route in this area so it is effectively closed to winter use. The FS will look into suitability of changing the designation to Closed Motorized though this change could limit any future possibility of a specific motorized route should it become available.	Designation of Lands

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
131	5	aspen, crested butte	I and my family would be devastated if the trail was closed to motorized use: Aspen/Crested Butte Area.	Upon reading the letter, no specific trails were listed, only general areas, some of which are not open to motorized use currently but are being ridden illegally. However, there are numerous comments contained herein related to creating a sustainable motorcycle trail system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
220	4	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	I feel, by making these trails legal now, it would only make the disrespect for this forest ground worse by motocross. It would also make it difficult to explain to our children who know right from wrong, why motocross riders are now legally ruining our hunting grounds.	See Comment below. In addition, the FS is in the difficult task of providing recreation opportunities for a wide constituency with often conflicting goals. It should be noted that there are many many acres of land available for hunting in a non-motorized area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
221	2	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	I think Proposed Alternative G should be posted with time for everyone, resident and non- resident to see in the map/poster boxes located at the base of Basalt and Red Table Mountains. There is one group of hunters that I know that come out every year from Minnesota with 8-10 men in this camp. They spend \$5,000.00 - \$8,000.00 annually for hunting tags alone. They also stimulate the local economy tremendously. I ask, what do the motocross riders give back? These 8-10 men have no idea of this change otherwise; all of their letters would be right beside mine because I know they have had major problems with motocross as well. There are also a lot of hikers, bikers and other outdoor enthusiasts that probably have no idea either.	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Public Involvement Process
221	1	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	I would like to express my concern about motocross on Preferred Alternative G. Trails # 3-1913-W.1B, 3-N1913W.1H, 3-1913W.1E describe the loop of trails between Basalt Mountain (3-524.1), Cattle Creek (3-509.1) and Red Table Mountain. (3-514.1) These Motocross Riders have been causing numerous problems in this area for some time. They already have one trail between Fenders Cow Camp Road or lower Cattle Creek Road, and Red Table Mountain Road. This trail leads over the top of Baldy Mountain. (3-1913.2) They don't even stay on what they are restricted to now. I have seen where they have knocked down Forest Service Fences and tear up creek beds and vegetation miles from their trail. There is nothing more frustrating than to hike 2-3 miles to have good hunting and have motocross riders in groups ride in front of myself and family miles from where they're suppose to be. We have tried to tell them they are not on the correct trail. Only to have them cuss and flip us off while driving away. This is why I don't understand giving them more country to ride. So in a couple more years we can give in again and let them have more country? I feel this should be very closely looked at because it is already a problem.	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Designation of Lands
220	2	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	If I may also suggest my opinion on a possible compromise, by keeping trail # 3-1913.2 on Alternative F and adding trail # 464W.2N on Alternative G which begins on Red Table Mountain Road #3-514.1 and continues on trail # 3-464.1. Then add, # 464W.2N connecting to # 4-430.6. This would offer motocross riders a very large loop by connecting Via Cottonwood Pass Road back to Red Table Mountain Road to use trail #3-1913.2 and return back to #3-509.1 (Cattle Creek Road) They could also continue down Cottonwood Pass Road heading towards El Jebel and returning to Cattle Creek Road (#3-509.1) by traveling Basalt Mountain Road. (# 9-509.1). This compromise would leave many trails of different skill levels for them. It would also leave the roadless area I and others have been able to enjoy in past years.	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Designation of Lands
220	5	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	If White River National Forest decides to add these Motocross trails, perhaps you would consider a seasonal closure? (August-December).	Seasonal closures will be based on Forest Plan allocations for habitat.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
220	3	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	My understanding is that the Colorado Division of Wildlife is now authorized or just more active in being able to patrol and ticket violators using OHV's. My hope is this could ease some burden of White River National Forest employees/officers who are very understandably short handed. My family and I have always abided by all laws and we have children who would also like to be able to enjoy this part of the National Forest, the way we remember it as children. The plain and simple fact is, these trails were created illegally by people who could obviously care less about the country we live in and the interests of others using it!	Yes, the Division of Wildlife Officers are now authorized by the state of Colorado to enforce off-highway vehicle travel regulations on federal land and points against a hunter's license can be assessed in some cases.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
221	3	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	The Sopris Ranger District urged my brother and I at the open house we attended, to try and suggest other alternatives for motocross riders and compromise. I am sorry. I have none. They couldn't follow the rules before. Why give them more? I feel if anything turn what's there into wilderness area and give the wildlife back their habitat. I would love to be able to show my children what I've been able to see before the motocross riders intruded.	The FS recognizes that many miles of bandit trail continue to be ridden illegally by motorcycle riders, though the FS also recognizes the need to provide some miles of trail for this user group since other areas have been closed since 2002 based on new Forest Plan M.A.'s. See related comments below.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
220	1	basalt mtn, cattle cr, red table	<p>Trails # 3-1913 W.1B, 3-N1913 W.1H, 3-1913 W.1E describe the network of trails between Basalt Mountain (3-524.1), Cattle Creek (3-509.1) and Red Table Mountain (3-514.1) in White River National Forest (Preferred Alternative G) designated for single track motocross trails.</p> <p>I was born and raised in Glenwood Springs and have enjoyed numerous recreational activities in this small horse/foot accessible area. I have been fortunate to harvest some beautiful Elk and Deer in this area until approximately 6-8 years ago when, renegade motocross enthusiast had chosen this area to violate with aggressive tires, loud motors, and very little to no respect for others. After many reports/complaints to White River National Forest, I am very disappointed to learn of the preferred solution to this issue. These motocross riders couldn't stay on the one trail they did legally have. (Reference 3-1913.2 Alternative F). According to Rangers and Motocross Riders, the trail has become too difficult for many riders. Therefore, their reason behind the new trails, they have illegally created, by rutting up and running down the vegetation on very common game trails.</p> <p>I would ask White River National Forests, Sopris Ranger District/Aspen District who ultimately has the final decision to please reconsider your Preferred Alternative G trail system for the listed trails. As when these trails become too rough to ride or boring to motocross enthusiast. Whose back yard is next? Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p>	<p>The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
119	4	basalt mtn, red table	<p>- Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) this is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop those ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) this trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>- Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both north and south of Red Table road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of motorcycle riding for most people.</p> <p>I and my family would be devastated if the trail was closed to motorized use:</p> <p>Basalt Mtn Area.</p>	<p>The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
131	2	basalt mtn, red table	<p>The sum of the above trails both north and south of Red Table road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of motorcycle riding for most people.</p> <p>I and my family would be devastated if the trail was closed to motorized use:</p> <p>Basalt Mtn Area.</p>	<p>The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
14	2	basalt mtn, red table	<p>I ask you to enact the following recommendations, with my personal emphasis on Sloan Peak/Lenado:</p> <p>- Alt. G is my preferred alternative, and needs the following to make more complete systems and offer a complete day of motorcycle riding not just a few hours.</p> <p>Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p> <p>- Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) This is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop that ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>- Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) This trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both north and south of Red Table road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of</p>	<p>The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.</p>	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
6	2	basalt mtn, red table	<p>Please do not close the single-track listed below to motorized vehicles in the White River National Forest. These trails are great for enthusiasts,</p> <p>Basalt Mountain/ Red Table</p> <p>About 50% of single track that is currently being used would be closed to motorized use. Currently only the North Fork Cattle Cr.Trail is open to motorized travel.</p>	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
566	1	basalt mtn, red table	<p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p> <p>-Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) this is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop those ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) this trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both North and South of Red Table Road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of motorcycle riding for many people.</p>	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	14	basalt, red table	<p>Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative.</p> <p>The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation. Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p> <p>-Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) this is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop those ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) this trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both North and South of Red Table Road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area:</p>	The North Fork Trail 1913 will likely be closed due to aquatic resource concerns along this trail and motorized use adopted to the west in the Bowers Gulch area up to Red Table Road. The FS is analyzing what will be a suitable loop system, though not all trails will be included due to the number of illegal bandit trails being created here.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
474	3	basalt, red table	<p>Just through the gate near the intersection of 3-1911.1 and 3-1909.1 are another set of "large boulders" placed in the trail I guess in an attempt to keep ATV or other vehicles from passing in the summer which also present the same winter hazard as previous comment. There are other means available to prevent unauthorized use of the trail in the summer that will not cause undue harm to those using the trail in the winter.</p>	Comment Noted. The FS is working on preliminary plans to improve this area for stream health and better passage for motorcycles and mountain bikes in the summer.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
474	2	basalt, red table	<p>Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area:</p> <p>The boulders now blocking the road between 3-524.1 and 3-1911.1 near the intersection with 3-1909.1 are a serious hazard during winter use due to their large size. When the snow conditions are anything less than "epic" depth many snow-machines including my own have suffered serious damage when encountering the boulders just below the surface. Please remove these for an enhanced winter experience.</p>	Comment Noted. This refers to the gate at the start of the Basalt Mtn. Trail 1911.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
474	5	basalt, red table	<p>Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area:</p> <p>The Midvalley Snowmobile Club submitted an application for a special use permit for winter trails just prior to the start of the Revision Plan. We have been patiently been working through the process as part of the White River Forest Alliance as well as several other motorized and non motorized groups all working to promote an improved "Shared Experience" in the area. We hope we will finally see this become a reality.</p>	The district is aware of the past comments and desire of the mid-valley snowmobile club and after the plan is finalized can work with interest groups is assisting the FS with maintenance issues.	Specialty Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
474	1	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: Trail #3-1911.1 We [Midvalley Snowmobile Club] supports opening this trail to all motorized vehicles so that it connects to 3-524.1 completing a loop that provides a very nice usable loop trail around the top of the mountain. Even opening this area up to and including ATV use would be a great improvement to the current situation.	This is the Basalt Mtn. Trail. This trail is in a non-motorized R.O.S. prescription for summer travel.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
474	4	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: We [Midvalley Snowmobile Club] support Trail # 3-1909.1 which then changes over to 3-510.1A leading from Basalt Mountain to the main Red Table Road #3-514.1 be a mixed use trail allowing at least motorcycles and or even ATV's so that a major "loop trail system" would be formed enabling people to start at the Basalt Mountain parking lot travel up an across Basalt Mountain to the Red Tables then back to Cottonwood Pass Road or back to the Basalt Mtn parking lot via the numerous trails in the Bowers Gulch Area, 3-N1913W.1H, 3-1913W.1B, 3.1913W.1E and 3-N1937W.5 bringing the riders to 3-509.1. This would be an incredible riding experience for all, Motorcycles, ATV'S and Mountain Bikes if hardy enough. At this time almost no mountain bikers riding up Basalt Mountain venture past trail 3-1909.1 leading them on a great downhill back down into the Cattle Creek drainage and to the Basalt Mountain parking lot. The Bowers Gulch area winter and summer regardless what decision is made in respect to the balance of the connecting trails. The Bowers Gulch trails provide snowmobile enthusiasts with a very good loop system connecting the Red Table Mountain area with the Basalt Mountain Trailhead as well as the Cotton wood Pass trailhead in the winter.	As mentioned above, Trail 1909 is located in a non-motorized R.O.S. prescription so motorized use cannot be permitted during the summer. The FS is analyzing the potential loop opportunities for motorized single-track trails in the Bowers Gulch area between Roads 509 and 514 as well as off of 514.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
487	3	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: Just through the gate near the intersection of 3-1911.1 and 3-1909.1 are another set of "large boulders" placed in the trail I guess in an attempt to keep ATV or other vehicles from passing in the summer which also present the same winter hazard as previous comment. There are other means available to prevent unauthorized use of the trail in the summer that will not cause undue harm to those using the trail in the winter.	The boulders were put in place to prevent access to the trail by ATV's and jeeps, probably without consideration to the few snowmobiles that use this trail in the winter. The FS is looking at some improvements to this area and will consider modifications.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
487	5	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: Needless to say we fully support the above mentioned trails in the Bowers Gulch area winter and summer regardless what decision is made in respect to the balance of the connecting trails. The Bowers Gulch trails provide snowmobile enthusiasts with a very good loop system connecting the Red Table Mountain area with the Basalt Mountain Trailhead as well as the Cottonwood Pass trailhead in the winter.	Comment noted and considered.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
487	2	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: The boulders now blocking the road between 3-524.1 and 3-1911.1 near the intersection with 3-1909.1 are a serious hazard during winter use due to their large size. When the snow conditions are anything less than "epic" depth many snow machines including my own have suffered serious damage when encountering the boulders just below the surface. Please remove these for an enhanced winter experience.	The boulders were put in place to prevent access to the trail by ATV's and jeeps, probably without consideration to the few snowmobiles that use this trail in the winter. The FS is looking at some improvements to this area and will consider modifications.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
487	6	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: The Midvalley Snowmobile Club submitted an application for a special use permit for winter trails just prior to the start of the Revision Plan. We have been patiently working through the process as part of the White River Forest Alliance as well as several other motorized and non-motorized groups all working to promote an improved "Shared Experience" in the area. We hope we will finally see this become a reality.	The district is aware of the past comments and desire of the mid-valley snowmobile club and after the plan is finalized can work with interest groups is assisting the FS with maintenance issues.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
487	1	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: Trail #3-1911.1 we support opening this trail to all motorized vehicles so that it connects to 3-524.1 completing a loop that provides a very nice usable loop trail around the top of the mountain. Even opening this area up to and including ATV use would be a great improvement to the current situation.	Basalt Mtn. Trail 1911 is located in a summer non-motorized R.O.S. prescription.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
487	4	basalt, red table	Basalt Mountain / Red Table Mountain Area: We support Trail # 3-1909.1 which then changes over to 3-510.1A leading from Basalt Mountain to the main Red Table Road #3-514.1 be a mixed use trail allowing at least motorcycles and or even ATV's so that a major "LOOP TRAIL SYSTEM" would be formed enabling people to start at the Basalt Mountain parking lot travel up an across Basalt Mountain to the Red Tables then back to Cottonwood Pass Road or back to the Basalt Mtn. parking lot via the numerous trails in the Bowers Gulch Area, 3-N1913W.1H, 3-1913W.1B, 3.1913W.1E and 3-N1937W.5 bringing the riders to 3-509.1. This would be an incredible riding experience for all, Motorcycles, ATV'S and Mountain Bikes if hardy enough. At this time almost no mountain bikers riding up Basalt Mountain venture past trail 3-1909.1 leading them on a great downhill back down into the Cattle Creek drainage and to the Basalt Mountain parking lot.	As mentioned above, Trail 1909 is located in a non-motorized R.O.S. prescription so motorized use cannot be permitted during the summer. The FS is analyzing the potential loop opportunities for motorized single-track trails in the Bowers Gulch area between Roads 509 and 514 as well as off of 514.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
301	33	basalt, red table	<p>Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p> <p>-Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) this is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop those ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) this trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both North and South of Red Table Road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of motorcycle riding for many people.</p>	<p>The district decided to keep the proposed closure on the North Fork Trail due to aquatic issues in North Fork Creek such as the presence of cutthroat trout and beaver activity altering the streamflow. The trail is also rough and seldom ridden. The district is instead looking at creating a motorcycle loop opportunity in the adjacent Bower's Gulch Area as well as a route connecting from road 464 down to motorized routes on the 430 road.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
502	5	basalt, red table	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Basalt Mtn/ Red Table Area</p> <p>-Trail FS # 3-1913.2 (North Fork Cattle Creek Trail) this is the original North Fork Cattle Creek Trail reopened and maintained by local motorcycle club in the 80s. This trail was the original route from Cattle Creek to Red Table Mtn. This trail makes for a loop those ties in with the Bowers Gulch Trail. This trail could be considered for one way travel due to the steep portions of the trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913.1 (Old Cattle Creek Road) This trail is a good connector between Bowers Gulch Trail and North Fork Cattle Creek Trail. It keeps motorcycle traffic off of FS road.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1913W.1A (Bowers Gulch Trail) This is the lower part of Bowers Gulch trail and needs to connect to the upper Bowers Gulch trail (which is on Alt G) to make a complete loop with North Fork Cattle Cr Trail.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N6046.1 (Green Gate Trail) this trail runs on north side of Red Table Rd. This trail allows a loop to the north which consists of the next 2 trails below.</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-464W.3</p> <p>-Trail FS# 4-N204.1</p> <p>The sum of the above trails both North and South of Red Table Road constitutes a system loop of about 50 miles which would be an adequate day of motorcycle riding for many people.</p>	<p>The district decided to keep the proposed closure on the North Fork Trail due to aquatic issues in North Fork Creek such as the presence of cutthroat trout and beaver activity altering the streamflow. The trail is also rough and seldom ridden. The district is instead looking at creating a motorcycle loop opportunity in the adjacent Bower's Gulch Area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
489	9	benedict	<p>Benedict 100 Trail (Aspen to Vail)</p> <p>As a Summit Huts Association past President and Board of Directors member I have had the opportunity to ski the Benedict 100 on four occasions. The Benedict 100 commemorates the 10th Mountain Division High Route from Aspen to Vail. The trip utilizes 10th Mountain Division Huts and Summit Huts Association backcountry huts during the week long ski trip. Reviewing the WRNF Travel Management Plan for the Benedict 100 route, I am alarmed at the trail conflicts with the Green-Unrestricted Motorized Use and the Pink-Restricted-Motorized Routes Only. The Benedict 100 trail starts at Hunter Creek in Aspen and goes to the following huts: Margy's Hut or McNamara hut, Betty Bear Huts or Skinner Hut, 10th Mountain or Uncle Bud's huts, Jackal hut, Shrine Mountain Inn and finishes on the Commando Run to Vail. The Benedict 100 deserves special consideration due to the historical significance and future potential for non-motorized users. I urge the WRNF to reconsider the following areas: Hunter Creek motorized designated route; Road 505 to Betty Bear hut trailhead; Hagerman Pass motorized routes 105 and 527 to the pass summit; Resolution Creek to Ptarmigan Pass Green-Open Motorized Area; and Ptarmigan Pass to Shrine Mountain Inn mixed designation will have potential conflict areas.</p>	<p>The Benedict 100 "Trail" or Route does not have any formal recognition at this time from the FS. The FS and Pitkin County do not allow motorized use in the Hunter Creek area in the winter except by permit, which is to access the communication site. The area around Betty Bear Hut and Ivanhoe Lake will be closed to winter motorized for lynx corridor protection. The 105 Road is a county road so is not under FS jurisdiction to close to winter motorized use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	28	benedict	<p>Benedict Huts. We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] recommend that Smuggler Mountain (FDR 131) be closed to snowmobiles because of the reasons indicated above and because snowmobile use is inconsistent with the surrounding management prescriptions of 1.31 (Backcountry Recreation Non-Motorized), 1.2 (Recommended Wilderness) and 2.1 (Special Interest Area).</p>	<p>Smuggler Mountain Road is a Pitkin County road. This suggestion is outside the scope of this plan though the FS has noted some mapping corrections to be made in the vicinity of this road to limit snowmobiles.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	27	Benedict, McNamara, Margy's and Betty Bear Huts	<p>10th Mountain believes that Alternative G does a poor job of providing a balanced recreational experience in the four areas around the Benedict, McNamara, Margy's and Betty Bear Huts and urges the USFS to modify these prescriptions. Alternative G prescribes routes to these huts as open to snowmobiles and we hold that this would significantly diminish the value of the human-powered backcountry hut experience and would not represent a sustainable balance of recreational use of public lands.</p> <p>All four of these designations seem unwise because there are no clear topographic or vegetative closure points/boundaries, little or no enforcement, and the appeal of large expanses of powder (immediately adjacent to designated corridors but off-limits to snowmobiles) will invite rampant non-compliance and user conflicts. In addition, snowmobiles are inconsistent with surrounding management prescriptions and current winter recreation use. Finally, none of these routes provide especially valuable snowmobile experiences because there are no designated play areas and no loop opportunities, but these routes are important to hut visitors and other backcountry human-powered visitors. Hut-specific information follows.</p>	<p>See answers above. The district has also decided, to assist with the backcountry ski experience around Margy's Hut, to close the 526 road to snowmobiles at the junction with the 103 Road thus insuring Mt. Porphyry and Mt. Yeckel as non-motorized in the winter, since these areas off of road 526 are in a winter non-motorized ROS.</p>	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
481	31	betty bear	Betty Bear Hut. We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] recommend that snowmobiles not be allowed on FDR 527 past the ridge between the Ivanhoe and Lily Pad Lakes (located approximately 1½ miles past Ivanhoe Lake), for the reasons indicated above. We understand that there would be visual benefits to bringing snowmobiles around the ridge overlooking Lily Pad Lake but it seems the likelihood of non-compliance would outweigh the possible visual benefits. Again, it is important to note that numerous large snowmobile play areas in the same general vicinity would remain open to snowmobiles including Lake Ivanhoe, Hagerman Pass, Cunningham Pass, Sellar Park, Lime Park, Twin Meadows, Chapman Gulch, and South Fork.	Comment noted and see answer above explaining why the FS agrees with the 527 closure.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	18	boundary	Consistency in Regulations: Pitkin County includes not only portions of the WRNF, but a considerable amount of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"). Recently the BLM made changes in its trails signage program that aligned it more closely with that of the USFS. We compliment the agency for this effort. To the extent possible, we encourage the USFS and the BLM to continue to look for ways to make the agencies' respective rules and regulations consistent and compatible - for the public.	The FS and BLM communicate regularly about joint management issues and the comment is appreciated and understood.	General (e.g., democracy/gen welfare/public good)
455	28	coal basin	Area 6 – Coal Basin/Coal Creek/Porcupine Creek areas: These are popular snowmobiling areas and must remain designated as "Open" to winter motorized use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The FS does not recognize these as popular snowmobiling areas due to access issues, including private land. However, the M.A. 3.1 that encompasses the Porcupine Creek will allow winter motorized use and the FS is considering this.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
310	2	coal basin	Coal Basin Mine Roads: There are several abandoned mine roads in upper Coal Basin that go to the various old mine entrances. Most of these are not shown on the Sopris Ranger District map in the draft TMP. Some of these mine roads have been reclaimed and are now currently used as single-track bicycle/pedestrian/equestrian trails. Others still remain as a full-width roadway, but are blocked from motorized vehicle travel. A part of one such road is shown on the Alternative A map, but all should all be added to the Alternative G TMP map and included as non-motorized bicycle/pedestrian trails in summer and snow machine routes in winter.	The FS recognizes that many of these reclaimed routes receive foot, horse and bicycle use, but are not system routes at this time. If they remain as non-system routes, foot and horse travel would still be permitted. Winter Use is being analyzed as well.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
542	1	coal basin	I am writing this letter because of the changes to the White River Travel Management Plan. I really feel like this is an arbitrary attempt to cut off usage of the Forest Service Land to specific land owners. I think that the Forest Service should review this attempt to cut off private land owners. The specific area I am talking about is located in Coal Basin, near Redstone, Colorado. I would encourage you to go back and review these plans so that it is fair to everyone involved.	There are many restricted areas of the district where private inholdings exist in conflict with the surrounding management prescription. Regulations require the FS to grant reasonable access to landowners through a road use permit.	Private Property
540	2	coal basin	My specific concerns are in the Sopris District, in an area west of the town of Redstone referred to as Coal Creek. Your favored plan of Alternate G changes the existing use of many of the trails and uses of open forest land in this particular creek drainage. Most of my concern lies within the changes to the Winter Strategy. If we are not careful the squeeze on the land owners in this area (the original conservation and caretakers of the private and government owned land) become Huffman's management practices which backfired in the Gobbo and Mantle families as history has illustrated. The past management plans for this area labeled the majority of Coal Creek as "Open Motorized Areas". The proposed Alternate G Winter Strategy changes the majority of the land South of Coal Creek to a Restricted-Motorized Routes only, and expands on this area to include forest service lands around a private in-holding on the North side of Coal Creek. The perimeter of this area on the North side of the Creek is based on some extremely arbitrary boundaries. See attached Map. Normally these boundaries follow geographic lines. Many times a creek, ridge line or some other natural line. The boundary formulated in your Alternate G winter travel management follows no such boundaries.	The district has decided to realign the winter motorized boundary to include much of the land north of Coal Creek as the letter suggests. However, this area is restricted by limited to no parking for trailers in the winter and the road is used heavily by snowshoers and skiers up to the private land gate.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
541	2	coal basin	My specific concerns are in the Sopris District, in an area west of the town of Redstone referred to as Coal Creek. Your favored plan of Alternate G changes the existing use of many of the trails and uses of open forest land in this particular creek drainage. Most of my concern lies within the changes to the Winter Strategy. The past management plans for this area labeled the majority of Coal Creek as "Open Motorized Areas". The proposed Alternate G Winter Strategy changes the majority of the land South of Coal Creek to a Restricted – Motorized Routes only, and expands on this area to include forest service lands around a private in-holding on the North side of Coal Creek. The perimeter of this area on the North side of the Creek is based on some extremely arbitrary boundaries. See attached map. As an owner of this property, I can not help but feel as though someone has specifically targeted our land with this change in your travel management plan. In speaking with many of the forest service personnel on how boundaries are developed for specific management areas, we have discovered that normally these boundaries follow geographic lines. Many times a creek, ridge line or some other natural line. The boundary formulated in your Alternate G winter travel management follows no such boundaries. It simply surrounds our property. The proposed designation of areas as "Restricted – Motorized Routes Only" is an obscene gesture when there are no routes designated on your map. When the Coal Creek drainage is looked at for management purposes, it is divided into 5 management area 5.12 and area 3.1. Area 5.12 is to be managed as "Resource Production – Range Vegetation Emphasis". Area 3.1 is to be managed as a "Special Interest Area – Emphasis on use". (Map attached).	The district has decided to realign the winter motorized boundary to include much of the land north of Coal Creek as the letter suggests. However, this area is restricted by limited to no parking for trailers in the winter and the road is used heavily by snowshoers and skiers up to the private land gate.	Private Property
501	8	coal basin, coal cr, porcupine	Coal Basin/Coal Creek/Porcupine Creek areas: These are popular snowmobiling areas and must remain designated as "Open" to winter motorized use.	The district has decided to realign the winter motorized boundary to include much of the land north of Coal Creek as the letter suggests. However, this area is restricted by limited to no parking for trailers in the winter and the road is used heavily by snowshoers and skiers up to the private land gate.	Designation of Lands

letter number	comment number	category	comment	Response	action
235	30	coal basin, porcupine cr	Area 6 – Coal Basin/Coal Creek/Porcupine Creek areas: These are popular snowmobiling areas and must remain designated as 'Open' to winter motorized use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The district has decided to realign the winter motorized boundary to include much of the land north of Coal Creek as the letter suggests. However, this area is restricted by limited to no parking for trailers in the winter and the road is used heavily by snowshoers and skiers up to the private land gate.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
86	2	coal creek	<p>My specific concerns are in the Sopris District, in an area west of the town of Redstone referred to as Coal Creek.</p> <p>Your favored plan of Alternate G changes the existing use of many of the trails and uses of open forest land in this particular creek drainage. Most of my concern lies within the changes to the Winter Strategy. The past management plans for this area labeled the majority of Coal Creek as "Open Motorized Areas". The proposed Alternate G Winter Strategy changes the majority of the land South of Coal Creek to a Restricted - Motorized Routes only, and expands on this area to include forest service lands around a private in-holding on the North side of Coal Creek. The perimeter of this area on the North side of the Creek is based on some extremely arbitrary boundaries. See attached map. As an owner of this property, I can not help but feel as though someone has specifically targeted our land with this change in your travel management plan. In speaking with many of the forest service personnel on how boundaries are developed for specific management areas, we have discovered that normally these boundaries follow geographic lines. Many times a creek, ridge line or some other natural line. The boundary formulated in your Alternate G winter travel management follows no such boundaries. It simply surrounds our property. The proposed designation of areas as "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" is an obscene gesture when there are no routes designated on your map.</p>	<p>The district has decided to realign the winter motorized boundary to include much of the land north of Coal Creek as the letter suggests. However, this area is restricted by limited to no parking for trailers in the winter and the road is used heavily by snowshoers and skiers up to the private land gate.</p>	Private Property
467	16	county roads	<p>When the Coal Creek drainage is looked at for management purposes, it is divided into 5 management areas. Our property is located on the border of management area 5.12 and area 3.1. Area 5.12 is to be managed as "Resource Production - Range Vegetation Emphasis". Area 3.1 is to be managed as a Opening Certain Pitkin County Roads to Non-Highway Legal (Unlicensed) Vehicle Use: The USFS has indicated that it desires to:</p> <p>Work with the various state, county and local agencies to determine where non-highway vehicles may be legally used on routes under the control of those entities. Decisions in the final travel management plan will reflect the legality and practicality of non-highway motor vehicles to access areas of the forest. The practicality analysis will include factors such as the availability of adequate trailhead parking, need, and whether other legal options exist. SDEIS at pg. 16.</p> <p>Pitkin County continues to support cooperative planning where County roads provide access to WRNF land. The County recognizes that illegal unlicensed vehicular traffic is already occurring on some County roads as people travel to and from recreational opportunities on the WRNF.</p> <p>The USFS has had a number of discussions with County staff about this issue and has requested that the County declare the following roads open to unlicensed vehicle use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Richmond Ridge Rd; - Little Annie Rd. (starting above the subdivision); - Midnight Mine Rd; - Pearl Pass Rd; - Express Creek Rd; - Hagerman Pass Rd; - Hunter Valley Rds. (during hunting season); and - Possibly, Lincoln Creek Rd. <p>Pitkin County believes that it is appropriate to consider these roads for legal use by unlicensed vehicles. There may be additional roads that should be added to this list.</p>	<p>Pitkin County and the FS have a positive working relationship and have communicated extensively on joint management concerns and issues. It is believed that the authorizing of unlicensed use on these roads, which has been occurring for years, will be good for the public and the FS.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
310	1	crystal river	<p>Authorization of motorized mix use requires that both safety and road engineering considerations be analyzed in detail. County staff will present a final list of County roads proposed to be opened to unlicensed vehicle use for review by the Pitkin County Board of County Commissioners in the next few weeks. We Crystal River Trail: A major regional bike/pedestrian trail is proposed to go from Carbondale to Crested Butte. This trail, and its proposed alternate routes, have been reviewed and approved by numerous governmental entities on its route(s) between the above connecting cities. Since segments of this trail cross Forest Service land it should be included in its entirety in the TMP for Alternative G. We have two specific comments on the Crystal River trail outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the portion of the trail from Carbondale to Redstone, the various segments of this trail largely follow the old railroad grade and are shown in Alternative A as 3-308.1A, 3-308.1B, 3-1954W.1, 3-310W.1F and 3-313.1A. Seasonal closures may be required on some of these segments and motorized travel should not be allowed. We request that these trail segments be added to Alternate G. -In the portion of the Trail from Redstone to the top of McClure Pass, segments of the trail shown in Alternative A are designated as 3-1966W.3 and 3-1966W.2. The latter trail segment from Placida to the top of McClure Pass follows the old abandoned vehicle road and is very popular for both summer and winter use. Motorized travel should not be allowed. We request that these trail segments be added to Alternate G. 	<p>See comments regarding Crystal River trail corridor. Trail 1913 (North Fork Trail) will be decommissioned due to aquatic concerns by district staff. Trail 1915.1W is the non-system trail that connects Eagle Lake to Strawberry Lakes in the Holy Cross Wilderness. This trail will not be added to the system and will not be maintained.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
416	3	crystal river	<p>I also urge permanent closure and decommissioning of the following routes adjacent to streams:</p> <p>Segment□□Stream</p> <p>3-1966W.3□□Crystal River</p> <p>3-310W.1F□□Crystal River□</p> <p>3-1954W.1□□Crystal River</p> <p>3-313W.1A□□Crystal River</p> <p>3-133W.1B□□Crystal River</p> <p>3-1913.1□□Cattle Creek</p> <p>3-1915W.1□□Lime Creek</p>	See comments regarding Crystal River trail corridor. Trail 1913 (North Fork Trail) will be decommissioned due to aquatic concerns by district staff. Trail 1915.1W is the non-system trail that connects Eagle Lake to Strawberry Lakes in the Holy Cross Wilderness. This trail will not be added to the system and will not be maintained.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
416	1	crystal river	<p>I am an ecologist and on the emeritus faculty at Colorado School of Mines, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering. I have spent over thirty years involved in research and education regarding western river and riparian issues. During the past four years I have worked with the Roaring Fork Stream Health Initiative on the assessment of in-stream and riparian health in the Roaring Fork watershed. I started this Initiative with Delia Malone, primarily because I have personally witnessed during the last three decades a steady deterioration of the quality of our riparian lands in the watershed due to urban and suburban development, as well as increasing recreational use of areas on and adjacent to our rivers, with little or no management and regard for wildlife impacts.</p> <p>I am especially concerned about the potential increase of recreational activity along the Crystal River corridor, primarily because of the high wildlife value of the area along the east side of the river. Areas such as Filoha Meadows, Placita, and Janeway have been spared a great deal of human disturbance because of the natural buffer that the river provides. I oppose increasing access to these areas over lands managed by the USFS, particularly since recreational access in the valley is already provided along the existing Colorado Highway 133 transportation corridor.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
388	1	crystal river	<p>I am writing to you to object to the change in use and designation of those sections of the old Carbondale to Marble railroad grade. Much of this grade on Forest Service land is on the east side of the Crystal River and has not been used by the public and provides a good deal of security and habitat to existing populations of deer, elk and big horn sheep. The designation and use of this trail by the ever increasing number of hikers and bikers would significantly decrease the value of this area for wildlife. Wildlife continue to be squeezed by increasing development of all the private land in this narrow valley, federal land is crucial to the survival of wildlife in its current state. These lower elevations are extremely limited in this valley and are therefore additionally important.</p> <p>I would urge you to consider limiting access on Forest Service land in this corridor and giving native animals and habitats priority over recreation. It is time to protect the resources not the mechanized interests of never satisfied thrill seekers. There is adequate room for the bike path adjacent to the already impacted highway alignment.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
416	2	crystal river	<p>I support Alternative G because I believe it will afford the best protection to our stream and riparian areas. I urge the Forest Service to not construct any new roads or trails adjacent to perennial streams, unless specific studies indicate no detrimental impacts to stream or riparian habitat or wildlife.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
428	3	crystal river	<p>In our [West Elk Loop Scenic and Historic Byway/Gunnison County Trails Commission] 2006 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Travel Management Plan we identified several trails/ways in the existing conditions report that were within a proposed alignment for the CBTC Trail, including 3-1954W.1, 3-1966W.1 (not designated as part of the CBTC Trail, but could complement it), 3-1966W.2, 3-1966W.3, and 3-310W.1F. We requested that these trails/ways remain in the existing network of trails and ways to accommodate the future development of the CBTC Trail.</p> <p>The proposed trail would enter the White River National Forest at McClure Pass (see the map on page 4). It is essential in this area to keep hikers, bikers, and equestrian users off the highway surface and shoulder, for the safety of Byway travelers and trail users, and to enhance the trail experience. A more detailed explanation is provided on page 29 of the CBTC Trail Feasibility Study (2004):</p> <p>"This segment travels from McClure Pass to Redstone and is approximately 6.5 miles. Elevation gain/loss: 1,600-feet.</p> <p>Only one feasible option exists along this segment of the trail. Beginning at McClure Pass, the trail continues along the north side of the highway on National Forest land. The trail is located 150 – 300-feet from the road in this area in order to avoid two nearly vertical road cuts. The trail rejoins the highway right-of-way just east of the McClure Pass summit and then follows the old McClure Pass road cut through a series of switchbacks down to the floor of the Crystal River valley near the Placita townsite. A social shooting range is located at the base of the switchbacks that will need to be addressed when the trail is constructed. The existing Highway 133 grade down the east side of McClure Pass is not considered as a feasible alignment because of the narrowness of the road platform and the unstable nature of the uphill road cut in this area. In addition, the existing highway prism would carry the trail approximately 2-miles to the south in the opposite direction from the trail terminus at Carbondale. A spur trail to access the upper Crystal River valley within Gunnison County can be accomplished at the bottom of the switchbacks. This spur trail would cross Highway 133 at Placita and then turn south at the Crystal River connecting to the Marble Road.</p> <p>From the Placita townsite the trail alignment follows immediately to the west of the highway within the state right-of-way until reaching another portion of the old McClure Pass Road, known locally as the Bear Creek trail. This old roadbed is followed by the trail for approximately 1.5-miles until it rejoins the highway right-of-way just south of Hayes Creek. From here the trail follows along the west side of the highway right-of-way to Redstone, passing through two curves with rock-cliff hillsides that will require the trail to be in very close proximity to the road surface for about 900-feet.</p> <p>The trail alignment offers stunning views of Chair and Treasury Mountain from McClure Pass. As the trail moves into the bottom of the Crystal River valley, aspen trees give way to mature spruce against brilliant red hillsides and cliffs. The historic Redstone Castle is also very visible from the trail alignment as it Summer Travel:</p>	<p>The proposal for a multi-use trail along the Crystal River will be a lengthy and separate NEPA process.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
467	2	crystal river	<p>The Crystal Valley Trail System: In Pitkin County's 2006 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Travel Management Plan we [Pitkin County] noted several trails in the existing conditions, report that were within a proposed alignment for the Carbondale to Crested Butte Trail (the "CB-CD Trail") - specifically, FS Trails 3-1954W.1, 3-1966W.1 (not designated as part of the CB-CD Trail, but could complement the CB-CD Trail), 3-1966W.2, 3-1966W.3, and 3-31 OW.1F). We recommended that all of the aforementioned alignments remain open to all non-motorized recreational uses. Further, we recommended that any sections currently designated as a "way", be designated as a "trail." Our previous comments also noted the surveys recorded in the Official Records of Pitkin County on 9/17/1885, at Plat Book 1, Page 18, and on 11/9/1888, at Plat Book 1, Page 27 showing a County wagon road that predated the creation of the White River National Forest ("WRNF"). We also noted that there were small stretches of land on the WRNF occurring along Highway 133 between parcels of private land and/or Pitkin County Open Space and Trails property that were not designated in the proposed Travel Management Plan, but were within possible alignments for the CB-CD Trail. Most follow the former Crystal Railroad grade and/or wagon road.</p> <p>The USFS provided only a rote response to Pitkin County's comments related to the CB-CD Trail:</p> <p>An Environmental Analysis for the Crystal River Trail must be conducted and implemented to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives (solutions) that address the purpose and need, key issues and is responsive to the needs of the community prior to allowing use for a proposed trail in this river corridor. This travel management planning process considers if this railroad/trail prism could be incorporated into the system in the future and is not the final decision for this trail proposal.</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
564	1	crystal river	<p>The Carbondale Trails Committee and the West Elk Loop Scenic and Historic Byway Steering Committee have alerted the Carbondale Trustees that there is a possibility that vital trail alignments along Highway 133 of the Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail (CBTC) are in consideration to be decommissioned from the transportation system and rehabilitated. The Carbondale Trustees would only favor a Travel Management Plan that maintains public access limited to pedestrian and bicycle usage in the following areas referenced in the "West Elk Historic and Scenic Byway Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Feasibility Study (Scenic Byway 2004):"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The railroad grade between the Nettle Creek Bridge and the Crystal River Country Estates Bridge (.92) mile). See Panel 10 and 11 Crystal River Trail Draft Map. - The old wagon road through Janeway and the railroad grade between the closed Janeway Campground and Filoha Meadows (1.3 miles). Seasonal Wildlife closures are required. See Panel 9 and 10 Crystal River Trail Draft Map. - The old McClure Wagon Road between Placita and McClure Pass (1.6 miles). See Panel 6 Crystal River Trail Draft Map. <p>These three grades have been in existence for over a hundred years. It is our observation that a major generator of habitat loss occurs with the consolidation of drainages that road building presents. These lands have already accommodated those deteriorations. Much of those right-of- ways currently experience</p>	<p>Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
428	2	crystal river	The Crested Butte-to-Carbondale (CBTC) Trail is supported by the Byway Committee, Trails Commission, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails, and Carbondale Trails Committee. The 2004 Trail Feasibility Study completed by Newland Resources in 2004 was done in coordination with several entities and agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service. Once completed, it has the potential to become one of the finest routes within Colorado. The trail would connect Crested Butte to Carbondale, and in Carbondale would link to an even larger trail system that would connect Aspen and Glenwood Springs.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
428	4	crystal river	The Preferred Alternative fails to acknowledge the collaborative effort involving communities, counties, and agencies in support of a non-motorized CBTC Trail. We recommend that this effort be acknowledged in the final document.	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
456	3	crystal river, cattle cr, lime cr	<p>Because the following listed streams and rivers are especially critical and vulnerable to degradation I suggest that the following ways and routes located adjacent to streams in the Roaring Fork Watershed be permanently closed and decommissioned.</p> <p>Segment Number - Stream 3-1966W.3 - Crystal River 3-1954W.1 - Crystal River 3-310W.1F - Crystal River 3-313W.1A - Crystal River 3-133W.1B - Crystal River 3-1913.1 - Cattle Creek 3-1915W.1 - Lime Creek</p>	Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails. These are not system routes nor will they be shown as system routes in the Final TMP as the entire system including necessary easements are not ripe for decision. Decommissioning of these routes would be more toward signing and blocking entrances, because of the historic value the trails themselves most would be left alone save any necessary resource protection measures if necessary. This will allow for future planning to occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
445	3	deadman, miller cr, frying pan, thomasville	<p>All roads, trails and routes across USFS lands in the Deadman Creek and Miller Creek drainage should be established by Special Use Permits and/or other designations that clarify need or right and parameters for use.</p> <p>In addition to being adjacent to the Hunter Frying Pan Wilderness, there are many compelling grounds for a more predictable access and use plan for this area: the existence of private property (fee and mining in-holdings); the dynamics between historic use and increased impact from population growth and motorized access; the proximity to the town of Thomasville and to the recreational area surrounding Reudi Reservoir...to name a few. A comprehensive plan should consider the access needs for public service (fire and emergency response, law enforcement, and resource management), the access needs of private property owners, and the access needs of the Public (local and visitor). It should anticipate trail/road management and costs; seasonal use and concerns; and, parking and trail heads. It should consider historic routes as well as wildlife trails and "rogue" roads.</p> <p>I am prepared to seek a Special Use Permit from the USFS to access my lands in the Upper Deadman Creek and Upper Miller Creek drainage. I am prepared to provide appropriate public access across my properties as part of such a comprehensive approach. I am also prepared to help assist with</p>	The FS believes roads 520, 521 and 522 are historic access roads and provide dispersed use for OHV's and mountain bikes and that these routes should remain open. The FS is proposing that Road 522 be closed to full-size vehicles but open to OHV's to reduce road damage and maintenance costs. The FS will also close the spur road N521.1B as it is a dead-end route ending on private property.	Specialty Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
445	2	deadman, miller cr, frying pan, thomasville	<p>Increase areas designated as "Restricted – Motorized Routes Only" to include the Deadman Creek drainage, the Miller Creek drainage, and the Frying Pan drainage upstream of Thomasville including the South Fork and Chapman Gulch.</p> <p>Unrestricted motorized access to these sensitive areas adjacent to the Hunter Frying Pan Wilderness areas is inappropriate and inconsistent with local, county and federal policies and directives. It also invites trespass to private property and causes damage to trails and roads.</p>	Comment noted. It is unknown how much winter motorized use occurs in this area.	Designation of Lands
480	26	dry wood creek	<p>Aspen Ranger District: Winter Use</p> <p>The winter use map shows a very short designated motorized route at the head of Dry Woody Creek in section 34 and 35. This motorized route leads from an "open area" into important elk winter range and dead-ends within an area designated as restricted motorized route only. This will only encourage using motorized vehicles off any route. This route should be eliminated at the boundary of the open area.</p>	This correction is noted and will be made.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	17	four mile	<p>Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative.</p> <p>The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation.</p> <p>Four Mile Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) these trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop -Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) -Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) -Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) -Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) -Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system)</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
119	7	four mile	<p>Four Mile Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) these trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop - Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) - Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) - Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) - Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) - Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system).</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
301	36	four mile	<p>Four Mile Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) these trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop. -Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) -Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) -Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) -Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) -Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system)</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
14	5	four mile	<p>I ask you to enact the following recommendations, with my personal emphasis on Sloan Peak/Lenado:</p> <p>- Alt. G is my preferred alternative, and needs the following to make more complete systems and offer a complete day of motorcycle riding not just a few hours.</p> <p>Four Mile Area Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) These trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop; –Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) –Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) –Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) –Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) –Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail</p> <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system).</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
566	4	four mile	<p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Four Mile Area –Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) these trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop –Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) –Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) –Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) –Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) –Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail</p> <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system).</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
502	8	four mile	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Four Mile Area –Trail FS# 3-2091.2 and FS# 3-2091.1 (Road Gulch trail) these trails start a 50+ mile loop that starts in Four Mile Park SW of Sunlight Ski Area. The below trails make up the loop –Trail FS# 8-804.2 (Trail Gulch Trail) –Trail FS# 3-N6003.1 (Hoffy Trail) –Trail FS# 3-300.1P (Baylor Park) –Trail FS# 3-2090.7W (Beaver Creek) –Trail FS# 9-300.1P Pipeline Trail</p> <p>This trail system uses the same trails that are currently used for winter motorized use (Sunlight/Powderhorn trail system).</p>	Due to Forest Plan Management Areas and Summer ROS prescription this area is not a candidate for a motorized trail system, nor is it one now. There are also private land easement conflicts with motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
14	6	four mile, thompson, sloane, lenado, basalt	<p>Most of these [Four Mile, Thompson, Sloane Peak/Lenado, Basalt] areas don't have much hiking, horsing, or biking traffic because there are thousands of miles of other trails in the area that are open to those activities, so there shouldn't be much conflict between uses. Please find a way to accommodate motorized users in the area, rather than forcing us all to expend the time, energy, and resources driving long distances to recreate.</p>	The recreation niche for the district does not include being a motorized destination, though the district is trying to maintain and enhance motorize opportunities where allowed, such as the Basalt Mountain/Red Table area and the Kobey Park area, with limitations. This area also has several active cattle grazing allotments which is not always compatible with motorized uses, and these areas are also in a non-motorized ROS prescription.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
467	15	government trail	<p>Seasonal Trail Closures: We [Pitkin County] understand that the USFS is still debating whether or not to include periodic closures of routes in the final Travel Management Plan. Pitkin County supports the use of seasonal trail closures (e.g., closing the Government Trail to horses during the summer, but allowing horses during hunting season) and their incorporation in the Travel Management Plan.</p>	Comment noted, though the district is reluctant to enact more closures that will challenge our already meager enforcement capabilities, especially where conflicts have been minimal.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
482	1	hagerman pass	<p>Hagerman Pass Area: Winter Use</p> <p>In the A/F Alternative there are only two small motorized areas between the end of the paved Frying Pan Road and the Hagerman Pass. Sellar Meadow and a very small area near Ivanhoe Res. and the power lines adjacent to the summer road is shown as motorized. This leaves no access to and from any play areas except from the "Elk Wallow Area" We support including areas off the road down into the drainage area as well as the Hagerman Pass Road itself as a motorized route accessing this area. We have a fairly large group of members that currently live in the Upper Frying Pan Valley and ride this area as well as the Burnt Mountain Area.</p> <p>In the G Alternative The only motorized area is the Sellar Meadow area. We support riding area the same as the previous comment. This area has historically been used as winter snowmobiling.</p>	<p>Much of this area is M.A. 5.5 (Landscape Linkages) as well as areas that are designated Wilderness or Recommended Wilderness so in the Final Plan motorized use will likely be restricted to motorized routes to Ivanhoe and Hagerman Pass. The Lime Park area off the 506 Road will remain a viable snowmobile play area.</p>	Designation of Lands
310	3	huntsman ridge	<p>Huntsman Ridge 4WD road: This road, designated as 3-517.1 in Alternative A, goes west from the top of McClure Pass to the two easterly summits on Huntsman Ridge. This road has been completely removed on the Alternate G map. We strongly agree with this closure for motorized travel. However it is a very popular cross country ski and snowshoe route in the winter and we request that it remain open for these seasonal activities.</p> <p>Decades of abuse and compounding erosion have made this 4WD road an environmental disaster. The lower part is a very steep mud-based road that is environmentally unsustainable without major engineering changes. It suffers from severe erosion damage that in places has caused erosion cuts as much as 2+ feet deep. Because of the steep grade and mud base, motorized travel in spring or when wet, results in severe and compounding environmental damage. Also, because of its deteriorated condition and permanent bog areas, 4WD traffic has created numerous drive-around spider roads that are similarly deteriorated. Work done on this road in the summer of 2007 did little to address any of these problems.</p>	<p>The FS installed a gate at the start of road 517 that can be closed in the spring runoff period. Although closed in Alt. G the FS will keep this road open to OHV's but closed to full-size vehicles to reduce maintenance costs and protect resources. It provides popular hunting access in the fall. Winter use will remain non-motorized per Forest Plan management.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	19	ivanhoe	<p>10th Mountain supports efforts to designate the area around Ivanhoe Lake as a snowmobile play area because there are good play areas, good access, and it serves as a valuable connection between the other play areas located in the Frying Pan (via Cunningham) and Leadville.</p>	<p>In Alternative G this area is a motorized restricted area and thus no play area are permitted though Alternative F proposed such an area. It is unlikely that this will be a designated play area in the Final Plan due to wildlife corridor concerns.</p>	Designation of Lands
95	3	jakeman	<p>The following item or improvement should be considered as beneficial for the general public:</p> <p>FS 519 to 512 Connector</p> <p>In previous correspondences, we have asked for an approved "short-cut" between FS Roads 512 and 519. One old road was closed and another old road is presently being used. The area is part of an impending Timber Sale. We understand that a condition of the Timber Sale is to leave one of the access roads as a connector after the Timber Sale. Please verify that this is indeed true, and included in the Timber Sale Agreement.</p>	<p>Upon improvement of this connector for the upcoming timber sale in this area the FS has agreed to have this road left in place as open motorized.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
95	2	jakeman	<p>The following item or improvement should be considered as beneficial for the general public:</p> <p>FS Road 512 Completion</p> <p>This road commonly called "Jakeman Road", en in a cluster of 5 dead end turn-arounds. The vistas from the various roads are exceptional; the access for hunters, bikers and snowmobiler's is popular. The congestion caused by the dead ends at times of heavy traffic is unfortunate. Please connect the dead-ends so the traffic can circle in completed loops, or pull off along the side of the road in new designated areas. It appears that the original road construction crews left just before completing the job. The crew that completes the job can also clean up the monster water bars on the road on the way home.</p>	<p>This area will remain closed until completion of the timber sale in this location. FS staff during pre-sale and post-sale road improvements will work with timber staff and timber permittee to possibly improve and create a loop here while closing unnecessary dead end spurs. FS staff will also keep in touch with adjacent homeowners who have a stake in this project.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
227	1	johnson cr, larkspoe mtn, porifhry mtn	<p>Johnson Creek, Larkspoe Mountain, and Porifhry Mountain areas including the main roads should be permitted continued snowmobile, snowboarding, and powder skiing uses as these uses have been ongoing and occurring since the early 1970's.</p> <p>These areas are windblown, slabbed, have low slide potential, and no sign of Wildlife in the winter months, which makes it ideal for the aforementioned uses.</p>	<p>The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area and thus will not be a snowmobile route. The FS will close Porphy Mountain to motorized use but will keep open a motorized loop around Larkspur Mtn. utilizing roads 526 and 103. The adjacent Kobey Park area will remain an open snowmobile area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
7	1	kobey	<p>I am writing to express my concern on the proposed closing of Rocky Fork Rd in the Kobey Park area of the Aspen Sopris District. Also of the closing to motorized vehicles in the upper Frying pan area. Closing the road would take away a much needed access to the trailhead, basically shutting down the trail. We need more hunting access not less! I disagree with allowing ATV's and not motor vehicles in the upper Frying pan area. Allow either both or neither!</p>	<p>It is believed the letter is referring to road 528 that the FS proposes closing in Alt. G to all motorized use in order for resource protection and maintenance costs. Comment noted.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	19	kobey park	<p>[ATT 1]: Map of Kobey Park Area</p>	<p>See answer below.</p>	See Attachment

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
467	12	kobey park	<p>Kobey Park:</p> <p>County In-Holding: Pitkin County, through its Open Space and Trails program, currently owns mining claims comprising a 65-acre in-holding in the Kobey Park area. The County is also under contract to obtain an additional 300+ acres in mining claims in the same vicinity. The Winter Management Plan for Alternative G has much of these County lands bordering or entirely within its "Open Motorized Access" zones. The Pitkin County Code prohibits motorized uses on its Open Space and Trails properties. Such inconsistencies in management of public lands in the backcountry would obviously create confusion among users and would be difficult to enforce.</p> <p>Adjusting the boundaries for the proposed winter travel areas so that the County-owned in-holdings are removed from proximity to the "Open Motorized Areas" and located within either the "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" or Motorized Prohibited Areas" would resolve this problem. The specific locations of these in-holdings lend themselves to making such adjustments, as they are located in areas adjacent to either specified travel routes for Alternative G, or in areas that see little, if any, winter travel. The map included as Attachment 1 depicts how the boundary for "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" areas could be shifted to the west to alleviate this conflict. We [Pitkin County] request the USFS to make this boundary adjustment.</p>	<p>The FS will work with the County to resolve these issues where appropriate. It is true that in the winter the 528 Road receives little to now snowmobile traffic. The County may have to do some signage on their properties as well.</p>	Designation of Lands
467	11	kobey park	<p>Kobey Park:</p> <p>Woody Creek Road through Lenado: The County and the USFS are in accord with respect to the continued use of Kobey Park for snowmobiles. However, we are concerned about the current access point.</p> <p>Woody Creek Road through Lenado to the USFS Bridge is experiencing significantly more truck and trailer combination traffic than in years past. Several area residents have expressed concern about the safety of such a high level of recreational vehicle use on this narrow road during the winter months. The County has no plans to improve the road. Thus, we believe that the USFS needs to take a hard look at this situation. Have other access points (including Hannon Creek access) been fully-considered as an alternative?</p>	<p>The FS has met with the county on this matter and explained at current the road through Lenado is the only viable and reasonable access for snowmobiles and skiers to access the Kobey Park area and Margy's Hut. The FS will continue to work cooperatively with county on these types of issues.</p>	Restoration/reclamation/bonding
445	1	land-rightofway	<p>I own approximately 1000 acres in the Upper Frying Pan entirely within Pitkin County. I purchased the 566 acre Bessie Park Ranch from the Nichols Family, et al (Cap K Ranch) in March 2006. In May 2007 I purchased approximately 435 acres in the Upper Deadman Creek and Upper Miller Creek, just above Bessie Park and marketed as the "Laughing Elk Retreat". By purchasing the "Laughing Elk" properties I also consolidated ownership of a private easement along the Bessie Park Ranch road granted to the "Laughing Elk" in October 2001 (Recorded in Pitkin Co. Records - Reception No. 459753) by the Cap K Ranch. There is no other recorded easement or right-of-way across the Bessie Park Ranch or along the Ranch road benefiting the Public or a private entity. There is also no recorded public easement or right-of-way across the "Laughing Elk" properties.</p>	<p>See comment for #167</p>	Other (Non-NEPA) Processes (e.g., leasing, permitting, acquisition, ROW)
445	4	land-rightofway	<p>Until such a comprehensive plan can be developed and considered and in order to preserve my Property rights and my ability to address the development of the Travel Management Plan and how it affects my ownership of these lands, I must request, for purposes of these comments under 36 CFR 215.6, that those roads that cross my property (3-520.1, parts of 3-105.4S and 3-521.1) not be designated on USFS maps or documents in a way that indicates public ownership or right.</p>	<p>See comment for #167</p>	Mapping, GIS
482	2	lincoln creek	<p>Lincoln Creek Area off Highway 82</p> <p>Winter Use:</p> <p>In Alternative G</p> <p>Off road access to all meadow riding areas along the length of Lincoln Creek Road is restricted. These areas have always been accessible for winter snowmobile use and provide a very enjoyable riding experience. A person would be hard pressed to stay on the approved summer road in the winter anyway without the Forest Service providing markers along side the road. Once in the open the road is indistinguishable with snow cover. We fully support the use of these open meadow play areas once into the valley far enough to where things open up. We support Alt G in this Area.</p> <p>In Alternative A/F</p> <p>We Fully support the open motorized winter play areas throughout the length of the valley off of Lincoln Creek Road and limited private areas near the Town of Ruby, Anderson Lake. Two of our members have a cabins on numerous mining claims at the Ruby Townsite and near Anderson Lake. Several of us use this area during the season.</p> <p>□</p>	<p>The FS plans to restrict snowmobile use to the county road due to ongoing wilderness trespass as well as to motorized use into Anderson/Petroleum Lakes which is in a non-motorized Forest Plan Management Area. There is some limited off-road snowmobile riding in the immediate Ruby area that will remain. The FS does plan to install markers along the Lincoln Creek road.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	35	Lollipop trail	<p>Lollipop Trail. This is a popular route in the Hunter Creek - Smuggler Mountain area which is not recorded in the TMP documents. Further, the area that this trail is located on is labeled as the Iowa Shaft Trail. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] field research shows that the Iowa Shaft Trail is in fact located adjacent, but further downhill, in a different location. RFMBA GIS mapping data will be shared with the WRNF to correct these errors, with the hopes of making this popular route an official part of the Forest system. RFMBA will prepare an email for Bruce Davidson that will include the actual, existing alignments of routes in this area, via GIS data.</p>	<p>The FS looks forward to seeing additional information that may correct mapping errors, but from on the ground survey by the FS our map of this area is fairly accurate with the exception of the Iowa Shaft Trail and Grand Turk. It should be noted that it is too late in the process to add new trails. The lollipop trail is a recently constructed bandit trail.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
455	29	lost man	Area 7 – Lost Man Reservoir to Independence Pass vicinity: The open areas along this route provide popular snowmobiling play areas and must remain Open for motorized access. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The FS is discouraged by the amount of Wilderness Trespass in this area by snowmobiles and that restricting snowmobiles to highway 82 will still provide access to scenery viewing and backcountry skiing but that the opportunities for open play areas exist elsewhere on the district.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	9	lost man, independence	Lost Man Reservoir to Independence Pass vicinity: The open areas along this route provide popular snowmobiling play areas and must remain Open for motorized access.	The FS is discouraged by the amount of Wilderness Trespass in this area by snowmobiles and that restricting snowmobiles to highway 82 will still provide access to scenery viewing and backcountry skiing. Opportunities for open play areas exist elsewhere on the district.	Designation of Lands
235	31	lostman res to indep	Area 7 – Lost Man Reservoir to Independence Pass vicinity: The open areas along this route provide popular snowmobiling play areas and must remain Open for motorized access. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The FS is discouraged by the amount of Wilderness Trespass in this area by snowmobiles and that restricting snowmobiles to highway 82 will still provide access to scenery viewing and backcountry skiing. Opportunities for open play areas exist elsewhere on the district.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	29	margy's	Margy's Hut. We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] suggest that the section of FDR 103 known as the Christmas Tree Road (to the east of FDR 508) and most of FDR 526 be closed to snowmobiles for the reasons indicated above. We think it will be virtually impossible to enforce a snowmobile closure point that is located (as Alternative G designates) in an open area below Mt. Porphyry, a snow-covered gentle bowl. It is important to note that numerous large snowmobile play areas in the same general vicinity would remain open (including the Koby Park area and the road to Koby Park) and would provide valuable loop opportunities, extensive play areas, and singular use. Modifying the prescriptions as suggested would create a shared route until motorized and non-motorized would go their separate ways to their respective good play areas – easy to understand, relatively easy to enforce, and sustainable. We understand that snowmobiles would be permitted to use approximately ½ mile of FDR 526 to access private land.	The FS has decided to maintain a snowmobile loop on the roads that circumnavigate Larkspur Mtn. (103/526) but create a closure at the junction toward Margy's Hut and Porphy Mtn, which should create a quiet non-motorized envelope near the hut.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	30	mcnamara	McNamara Hut. We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] recommend that the Hunter Creek area be closed to snowmobiles for the reasons indicated above and because there is no permitted parking for snowmobile trailers. The area subject to encroachment would be Van Horn Park, a large open area virtually impossible to mark as off-limits to snowmobiles, and used extensively by human-powered hut visitors and day users.	The Hunter Creek area is closed to snowmobiles by the county ordinance on the main access road. The FS allows snowmobiles by permit only for accessing the Red Mtn. Communication site.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	17	parking areas	Parking Areas: While the creation of new parking areas is not within the scope of the USFS's travel management planning process, Pitkin County would like to stress the continuing need for more parking generally at nodes with County roads: Furthermore, we suggest that it would be appropriate for the USFS to modify its process in the future to require that the identification of suitable parking areas (including realistic sources of financing for their creation) be part of the travel management planning process. The current process does not offer solutions to existing problems and may in fact create new unmet demands for parking. A more comprehensive planning process is needed.	The FS agrees with need to improve parking areas where suitable and will work with affected counties when possible.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
227	2	porifhry mtn	Porifhry Mountain is a safer and better access to the Frying Pan Areas and visa versa than the access shown on your plan in Rocky Fork which is steep and in a high potential slide area.	Comment refers to winter use of the Kobey Park area around Larkspur Mtn. and Porphy Mtn. for snowmobiles. Rocky Fork is closed to snowmobiles and Porphy would be in Alt. G.	Designation of Lands
481	20	rec-motorized	10th Mountain supports efforts to develop long, varied, loop snowmobile opportunities on the WRNF. There are not many opportunities like this in Colorado and having more would improve the experience for all users.	The FS has met with 10th Mtn. Hut Association on a variety of suggestions related to their comments.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
480	15	rec-motorized	Aspen Ranger District: Alt. G reduces the amount of motorized/mechanized and bandit trails across the forest which is beneficial to wildlife. However, it becomes problematic for sportsmen access during the fall hunting seasons where traditional motorized roads/trails are closed to mixed use (licensed and unlicensed). Some of these roads are under county jurisdiction (Lincoln Creek, Kobey Park Road, etc) which lead to USFS trails/roads. Most of these are 4WD roads or away from primary traveled roads. USFS should work with the county to remove the licensed only restriction. These roads need to remain open to mixed use, at least during the hunting seasons.	The FS has worked closely with Pitkin County on management of many of its 4WD roads that bisect the National Forest and has made suggestions on which roads it would like to see legally declared open for unlicensed motor vehicle use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	16	rec-motorized	Aspen Ranger District: The following roads should remain open for mixed use (licensed/unlicensed), at a minimum during the fall hunting seasons: Pearl Pass/Montezuma Basin, Express Creek Road, Taylor Pass to Columbia Basin, Richmond Hill including Little Annie/Midnight Mine Roads, Lincoln Creek, Hunter Valley (during hunting seasons as per current agreement), Kobey Park road from Woody Creek bridge, Smuggler Mountain to Warren Lakes as per current agreements.	The FS has worked closely with Pitkin County on management of many of its 4WD roads that bisect the National Forest and has made suggestions on which roads it would like to see legally declared open for unlicensed motor vehicle use. There are no current agreements.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
84	2	rec-motorized	I have been an avid hunter and some of the smaller roads are of no use and could be closed. It is clear that some should be. The rest of the roads are being closed for other reasons and I do not agree with this. I.e. political near Vail ski area and other private areas. Just remember the wildlife and hunters were here before all others. It is a part of our heritage that will be lost if we allow these to be closed. We have wilderness areas for that reason for those who do not want to be around vehicles.	Comment noted.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
84	1	rec-motorized	It has been a family tradition to have access into the National forest service via all types. We continue to tighten that access to accommodate others who want no access. I feel that the cost of maintaining access is a poor excuse to close roads. I and many like me would be happy to pay larger fees for vehicle access i.e. 4 wheelers, snowmobile, motorcycles, mountain bikes jeeps etc. I feel a simple annual fee for all types would give funds enough to keep up on all aspects. I do not think a double increase and make all who use it pays would be out of the questions.	Comment noted. Letter does not address any specific roads or trails.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
84	3	rec-motorized	Most of the roads [National Forests] have never had maintenance for 20 years I have been here and therefore why are they a problem? They have not changed year to year in a big way. My questions to you is why close them?	Comment noted. Explanations for why certain roads may be closed or changed in use classification can be found in the draft SDEIS. In this letter no specific roads or trails are referenced.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
83	1	rec-nonmotorized	My comment for the new plan is to reduce ATV access prior to and during the elk seasons, as the general hunting experience is greatly reduced in areas where ATVs are allowed. Elk quickly abandon public areas when ATVs enter and often move to private land where access is severely limited. I come to Colorado for a wilderness experience and the areas infiltrated with ATVs would not prompt me to buy the expensive nonresident tag. However, I'll continue to come year after year if there are areas preserved for the wilderness experience and hunting is still good on public land.	Comment noted. The FS tries to provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities. It should be noted that the Division of Wildlife recommended ATV access be maintained in many areas due to hunter demographics. The district does provide many, many areas of wilderness and roadless areas for non-motorized hunting.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
313	3	rec-see letter	[ATT 1:] Letter about WRTMP from Tom & Linda Willison's son, Sandy Willison on December 18, 2008	The district is considering various options and proposals for Coal Basin as well as parking issues related to our decisions. At this time it is believed that the district will show the M.A. 3.1 as open motorized for winter use.	See Attachment
313	2	rec-see letter	Please ensure our lands are protected for the good of the people instead of from the people	Comment Noted. See answer below related to same letter.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
313	1	rec-see letter	We are not exactly sure why or how you came up with WTMP in our area, or any other area that has been targeted on your maps. We have been through all of this material and there weren't any comments supporting this drastic change. I also attended a TMP meeting in El Jebel and not a single Forest Service employee could come up with a justifiable answer for pushing this concept in our area. We feel that we are being targeted. We fully support the enclosed letter 100%. Please come up with a better alternative that is more suitable to the landowners and the general public.	Letter refers to the Coal Basin area. This area is in a summer ROS that is semi-primitive non-motorized, though the winter prescription can allow motorized use. The FS has looked at this area north of porcupine creek and agrees to extend the winter motorized envelope.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
235	35	rec-winter motorized	CSA [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] supports all motorized routes in their entirety as have been proposed by Alternative G.	Comment noted.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
213	6	red table	I would like to see changes to the preferred Alternative G. Access to the Red Table Mtn area, including the continuity of "loops" that minimize road travel is very important to my family. There is great full day riding opportunities in this area.	Comment must refer to motorcycle single track trails that have proliferated without approval in this area. The FS is hoping to designate a few legitimate routes that can be used for this purpose and to decommission many excess and undesigned bandit trails.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
479	1	red table, basalt mtn	Motorcycle use: Basically, in the Red Table and Basalt Mountain area, we would like to see the Alternative A trails marked as proposed closed to be open for motorcycle use. According to the Alternative A Southeast map, this is the area between the marks on the PDF document of 1B, 412, and 10A (they also have a closed parenthesis') in the middle of the names). Here is another way of examining the area: Looking at the ALT A SE map and going clockwise, the area we're talking about includes the trails within the following labels on the map: 9-590.1 to 4-N259.1 to 4-1863.1 to 3-514W.2A to 3-509.1 and back to 9-509.1. Specific trails we'd like to remain open include 3-1913.1, 3-1913W.1A, 3-1913W.1B, 3-N1913W.1G, and 3-1913W.1H. (The 3.1913.2 trail is poorly maintained and in my mind a dangerous trail.) On the north side of Red Table road, it is very important to keep 4-N6046.1 open to connect the clockwise loop back to 3-464.1 via option 4-N204.1 or option 4-464W.3 or 4-464W.2N.	Currently, none of these routes are open to motorcycle use with the exception of the North Fork Trail 1913, which the FS proposes to close. The FS also proposes to add some of these trails into a viable loop option. There continues to be a big misconception by the motorcycle riders that many of these bandit trails are system trails.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
472	1	red table, basalt mtn	Motorcycle use: Basically, in the Red Table and Basalt Mountain area, I would like to see the Alternative A trails marked as proposed closed to be open for motorcycle use. According to the Alternative A Southeast map, this is the area between the marks on the PDF document of 1B, 412, and 10A (they also have a closed parenthesis ')' in the middle of the names). Here is another way of examining the area: Looking at the ALT A SE map and going clockwise, the area I'm talking about includes the trails within the following labels on the map: 9-590.1 to 4-N259.1 to 4-1863.1 to 3-514W.2A to 3-509.1 and back to 9-509.1. Specific trails I'd like to remain open include 3-1913.1, 3-1913W.1A, 3-1913W.1B, 3-N1913W.1G, 3-N1913W.1H. (The 3.1913.2 trail is poorly maintained and in my mind a dangerous trail.) On the north side of Red Table road, it is very important to keep 4-N6046.1 open to connect the clockwise loop back to 3-464.1 via option 4-N204.1 or option 4-464W.3 or 4-464W.2N.	Currently, none of these routes are open to motorcycle use with the exception of the North Fork Trail 1913, which the FS proposes to close. The FS also proposes to add some of these trails into a viable loop option. There continues to be a big misconception by the motorcycle riders that many of these bandit trails are system trails.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
479	2	red table, basalt mtn	Mountain Bike Use: For mountain bike use, please keep the following trails open: 3-N1937W.5, 3-1937W.1, 3-1911.1, 3-524.1A, 3-24.1B, 3-524.1, and 3-1909.1.	These trails in the Basalt Mtn. Area will remain open to mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
508	5	richmond ridge	[Summary Page 1] According to the SDEIS, action is needed to identify an official designated travel system. We believe its poor representation to the public and a bad decision to not acknowledge on USFS maps the over-snow roads that are used on an almost daily basis in the winter.	Comment noted and understood.	Mapping, GIS
467	10	richmond ridge	[Winter Travel] Overnight Parking at the Top of the Gondola: The USFS has stated that it would like to see overnight parking at the top of the gondola on Aspen Skiing Company property discontinued. Pitkin County recommends that this parking be retained at the present time. Illegal parking in the County right-of-way on Little Annie, Midnight Mine and Express Creek Roads will be exacerbated if overnight parking of snowmobiles is prohibited at the "marina". Indeed the County would like to investigate opportunities for USFS assistance with enforcement of parking restrictions on County roads in these areas. Fuel being carried up on the gondola by members of the public is clearly a safety/security issue. However, we [Pitkin County] have been informed by the Aspen Skiing Company that its staff would not allow someone to board the gondola if they observed them carrying fuel. We have also been told by the Aspen Skiing Company that they are unaware of any fuel spills at the "marina." Certainly it would be expected that reporting (as necessary) and site remediation would be handled by the responsible party pursuant to state and federal law if a fuel spill occurred - the same as anywhere else on the mountain. If overnight parking continues, it may be appropriate to create a fuel containment area for the "marina".	Neither of these comments refers to specific travel management issues but general management issues. The FS will continue to work with Pitkin County on joint management issues of concern.	Traffic Control and Safety
405	1	richmond ridge	Allowing exclusive use of the backside of Aspen Mountain to powder tours directly contradicts the Forest Service mission to work for the public. The backside of Aspen Mountain should be open and available to the public.	The FS Mission is "Caring for the Land and Serving the Public." The backside of Aspen Mountain has been a hotly debated area for 25+ years and will continue to be regardless of the outcome of this plan.	Designation of Lands
455	32	richmond ridge	Area 10 – McFarlane Creek area of Richmond Ridge: While this area has been controversial, we [Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition] believe it should remain designated as Open to winter motorized use as allowed by the Forest Plan. If not designated Open, then a motorized route should be established through McFarlane's Gulch to accommodate hybrid snowmobile/skier use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The phrase "Remain Open to..." assumes that it is currently open to public motorized use. This is a misconception that has persisted. The comment is noted and understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
235	34	richmond ridge	Area 10 – McFarlane Creek area of Richmond Ridge: While this area has been controversial, we believe it should remain designated as Open to winter motorized use as allowed by the Forest Plan. If not designated Open, then a motorized route should be established through McFarlane's Gulch to accommodate hybrid snowmobile/skier use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The phrase "Remain Open to..." assumes that it is currently open to public motorized use. This is a misconception that has persisted. The comment is noted and understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
450	1	richmond ridge	As a 50 year old backcountry veteran, I am writing to ask that you please allow shared snowmobile access to Powder skiing on Richmond Ridge above Aspen. Having paid substantial federal taxes over the past 30+ years, it seems wrong to bar hard working citizens such as myself from accessing their public land in a responsible manner. To consider allowing a profit oriented corporation such as "Powder Tours" sole access to our land seems repugnant, adding insult to injury. It just seems wrong to contemplate barring the owners of our shared natural resources in favor of the few. Such policy would also make our wonderful Forest Service look suspicious in the eyes of the public. Please allow public land to be shared among its owners - the taxpayers of our great country.	The backside of Aspen Mountain has been a hotly debated area for 25+ years and will continue to be regardless of the outcome of this plan. The National Forest land on the backside is not closed to the public at this time, only motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
506	6	richmond ridge	As a frequent backcountry traveler on Richmond Ridge, I find that continued permitted access by the public to be in the best interest of the public. No one organization should be entitled to sole motorized usage rights. The area under question is vast and the impact of motorized vehicles on over-snow roads would be minimal at best. The Forest Service and the lobbying arm of the Aspen Skiing Company cannot convincingly suggest that the impact of the Powder Tours operation is any less of a threat to the natural environment than individuals traveling on personally-owned snowmobiles. If the Forest Service intends to ban public motorized use then it must not hold a double-standard and also revoke the operating permit for Powder Tours. If it intends to continue to let Powder Tours operate snowcats and support snowmobiles then it must also recognize the public's right to operate personal motorized equipment.	The backside of Aspen Mountain has been a hotly debated area for 25+ years and will continue to be regardless of the outcome of this plan. The National Forest land on the backside is not closed to the public at this time, only motorized use.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
82	1	richmond ridge	As a twenty year resident in the Aspen area I am writing to urge you to recommend the continuation of the current status of use and regulation in the Aspen Mountain Powder Tour permit area that limits motorized activity to the special use permit holder and unlimited access to non-motorized users.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
495	1	richmond ridge	Based on years of personal involvement in the issue and strong public support, I urge the Forest Service to designate one or more of the over-snow roads on the east side of Richmond Ridge behind Aspen Mountain as open to the public for motorized use.	The backside of Aspen Mountain has been a hotly debated area for 25+ years and will continue to be regardless of the outcome of this plan. The National Forest land on the backside is not closed to the public at this time, only motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
508	10	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: On page [13], All action alternatives adhere to the concepts of multiple use and ecosystem management. We respectfully disagree that multiple use is adhered to in the Richmond Ridge 7.1 Intermix Area, in that it excludes yo-yo skiers and snowboarders.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
508	9	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: Pg. 13: Two of the stated goals of the TMP refer to the public: multiple benefits to people and effective public service. Excluding motorized public travel while allowing increased commercial motorized travel goes against this broad public goal. On the same page, one of the key objectives is to provide for multiple uses. The TMP should recognize and allow snowmobile skiing as an increasingly popular use in the Richmond Ridge area.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Goals and Objectives
508	11	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: Pg. 14: The travel rule requires each national forest and grassland to designate those roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle use. It appears from this directive that the over-snow roads ought to be designated. Further on that page and onto page 15, it says the rule says that motor vehicle use shall be designated by vehicle class, and if appropriate, by time of year (emphasis added), further adding weight to this argument.	The WRNF in winter travel management shows where areas are open, restricted and in the restricted areas where routes that are open to motorized are, and where motorized use is prohibited. This covers all possibilities.	Designation of Lands
508	12	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: Pg. 17: Under Winter Motorized Use, it states that the WRNF has chosen to produce winter motor vehicle use maps to show where motorized winter use is allowed, restricted, or prohibited. In the SDEIS, maps did not show the over-snow roads. If they are designated in the final TMP, it will be without full public disclosure in other words, the public will not have had the ability to properly comment on them.	The WRNF in winter travel management shows where areas are open, restricted and in the restricted areas where routes that are open to motorized are, and where motorized use is prohibited. This covers all possibilities. This was consistent through-out the process and the public was invited (and has) commented on winter recreation uses.	Public Involvement Process
508	7	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: Pg. 8: Management must be consistent with the overall direction in the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, 2002 Revision The prescription of the area, in the adopted Plan referenced here, allows motorized use.	The TMP is consistent with the Forest Plan including allowed uses for each management area. A designation can be more restrictive than the FP if necessary. Most prescriptions that allow motorized activities also have areas that promote non-motorized activities as well, in otherwords is allowed by prescription.	Federal Constitution, laws, acts, EOs, rules, regulations, plans
508	8	richmond ridge	Chapter 1: Pg. 9: One of the bolded Needs is to identify user-created roads, but the SDEIS states that the TMP process will consider such roads for designation or elimination only in the summer. The Richmond Ridge over-snow roads are definitely user-created and should be shown on winter-use maps, because they are very well defined historical access roads, in use on an almost daily basis. Furthermore, it would seem that natural resources might be better monitored and protected if the routes used by frequent commercial traffic (up to three snowcats per day in recent years) were identified to the Forest Service and the public.	The routes in Richmond Ridge that will be open to the public for motorized use have been identified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
508	15	richmond ridge	Chapter 2: Alternatives On page [38], the final key consideration says: Presentation of where motorized over-snow travel is authorized, restricted, and prohibited during the winter season. Includes presentation of over-snow motorized designated routes in restricted motorized areas. It is our belief that an error was made in not following this consideration, and it contributed to public confusion about the directive for the Richmond Ridge area over-snow roads.	The routes identified in the restrictive areas were identified. If there are no routes identified then, there is no motorized travel. We believe this was clear and the public based on comments understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
508	13	richmond ridge	Chapter 2: Alternatives Pg. 31: The DEIS is incorporated into the SDEIS. And: The SDEIS has been developed in response to the comments received on the DEIS. Given that the majority of site-specific public comments on the DEIS for winter use of the Richmond Ridge area favored public access of over-snow roads (not open motorized), we disagree that that is reflected in any of the alternatives in the SDEIS.	First comments are weighed equally, not a vote. That being said, we received numerous comments both favoring and not favoring motorized winter activity in Richmond Ridge.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
508	14	richmond ridge	Chapter 2: Alternatives Pg. 38: The description of the theme of Alternative G refers to balancing the public transportation needs, including recreation uses, with natural resource protection and enhancement. And: The alternative was designed to best meet the public desire to access and recreate on the national forest in a natural setting. We believe references to the public should include independent public motorized travel, not just private or commercial operations and non-motorized travel. Note that for-profit commercial interests are not mentioned in this theme.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
508	16	richmond ridge	Chapter 3: Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences General comment: It is our position that allowing independent public motorized travel on a portion of the over-snow roads in the Richmond Ridge area will not negatively impact the environment. The area already has already seen significant increased motorized use in terms of more snowcats operating more days over the years (and without a public process to determine the capacity of the area). It has historically been used by motorized travel with most of the roads disappearing in the summer (although it should be noted that one of the roads is present in the summer).	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
485	1	richmond ridge	Here is a simple Plan with the solution to the Problem: Open Loucian's road. Starting from Mcfarlin's Gulch, following the original road east to the connection to to Richmond Ridge road. There would need to be some clearing of downed trees on the original road through the dense forest, but the integrity of the old road is very much intact. This would be about an eight to ten mile connection to a loop including Richmond ridge road with some of the most beautiful wilderness around. This loop would open up a recreation area for use by skiers, snowmobilers, and snowboarders, cross country skiers, snowshoers and sight seers.	This is not a viable option due to an easement needing to be obtained through the Loushin private property. This old route also enters into the Collegiate Peaks Wilderness and the FS cannot allow such a route to be used or maintained.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
495	3	richmond ridge	I acknowledge the need to manage the area [Richmond Ridge] with respect to capacity and private property issues. That is why I support the idea of designating just one or two roads for public use, with access over public lands and not private property. McFarlane's road would be the preferred public road in terms of what local skiers would like to retain, although Wine Tree road is the most directly accessible via public land from Richmond Ridge Road. Either one or both roads should be formally open to public use and acknowledged on area maps.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
92	1	richmond ridge	I am a back country user. I have a snow machine and like to use it to access back country snowboard terrain. Last season, some of my best runs were off the east side of Richmond ridge. Now with the current situation, I am unable to enjoy those areas. I pay taxes in Pitkin County and the State of Colorado. The public lands we are currently discriminated from, should be available for all users, with or without motors. Please consider that what you are doing with Ski Co. can be set as a precedent to future restrictions on other public lands through agreements with corporations for privatized profits. It's not fair, it's not American and it's just dirty. Then again, maybe you should just kick Ski Co out too and then it's fair for everybody.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. Writer should acknowledge federal taxes as well.	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
17	1	richmond ridge	I am an investor in Castle Creek Investors, Inc., which owns property in several areas on the back side of Aspen Mountain. I would like to endorse the Forest Services' recommendation that snowmobiles and motorized vehicles be restricted to designated roads only and kept off of the Forest Service and CIC property on the back side of Aspen Mountain. There is no direct road access on the back side of Aspen Mountain that is not privately owned or owned by the Forest Service. Without a lease to access to Forest Service land, they should be prohibited from trespassing. I strongly endorse your support to protecting this area being used primarily by the Aspen Ski Company.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
91	1	richmond ridge	I am building a house off of the Midnight Mine Road. I have a USFS permit from the road into the property. The main reason I bought the property five years ago and started building the house three years ago was the winter recreational opportunities in the Richmond Ridge area. The house is a speculative project and it is being marketed as a year-round recreational retreat. Skiing, snowmobile skiing and snow boarding are all listed activities. We have a snowcat and routinely transport people back and forth from the SkiCo Sundeck. We also tour out the many snow roads off the Ridge. This is all part of the package our project is offering. Concerning the SkiCo, we seem to enjoy a mutual respect for each other's activities. We avoid the powder operations but have been there to help some of their people on occasion. And, just recently, they came to our rescue when we got our snowcat stuck. My point in writing you is the entire area should remain open to the public. Not just the Midnight and Little Annie's and a road or two to the top, but the entire "Intermix Area". This includes Wine Tree, McFarlane's, Ptarmigan, etc. This is the way it has always been. It has always been a multi-use area and should remain that way. The users of the area don't get in each other's way and in fact we respect the other and in particular the stewardship of the land. Don't take I am contacting both of you to comment on the possibility of opening the Powder Tour permit area in Aspen to motorized vehicles. I just experienced the best day of skiing in my life in that wonderful place. We all recognize that these folks need places to recreate also but this would be a travesty to allow that use in this incredible area. Please leave this special place just that – special.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
76	1	richmond ridge	I am contacting both of you to comment on the possibility of opening the Powder Tour permit area in Aspen to motorized vehicles. I just experienced the best day of skiing in my life in that wonderful place. We all recognize that these folks need places to recreate also but this would be a travesty to allow that use in this incredible area. Please leave this special place just that – special.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
200	1	richmond ridge	I am in agreement with the proposition that access to Richmond Hill powder skiing on the back of Aspen Mountain should be shared with non-commercial interests. While I respect the Aspen Skiing Companies arguments, the Ski Company is not charged with protecting public access to the forest or keeping skiing affordable on these lands or any others.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
75	1	richmond ridge	I am opposed to the Forest Service's recommendation to open the Powder Tour permit area in Aspen, Colorado to unlimited motorized access.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
234	1	richmond ridge	I am writing in response to the new management plan for the Richmond ridge zone. I am an avid backcountry skier who often uses a snowmobile to access terrain. I am not a snowmobiler, I have no interest in tracking up good ski terrain with the sled, and I understand this is a tricky distinction. I fully support regulations keeping sleds on the roads and out of the powder skiing terrain, but I think it is sad that the public is being shut out of public lands. I do believe it is wrong to choose to allow a private company access to public lands while shutting out the public. I understand that the forest service is desperate for revenue in these hard economic times but I think it sets a dangerous precedent when the aspen ski co through their powder tours operation can effectively use a valuable public backcountry ski area for its own profits and the forest service turns a blind eye to the injustice because of its need for funds. I'm sure you have heard this and every other argument on the topic but I did not want to let this comment period end with out attempting to voice my opinion on the matter.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
326	6	richmond ridge	I am writing in the hopes that the ban on individuals having the right to snowmobile in parts of the backside of Ajax Mountain be lifted. The fact that a company has the sole permit rights to this area, thus prohibiting the local enthusiasts who have grown up enjoying the beauty of the public land that drew them to the area, is really an oversight that should be looked at again. I am sure you will do what is right.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
500	1	richmond ridge	<p>I am writing to show my support for public winter access to the backcountry areas that are accessed over-snow roads on the east side of Richmond Ridge - McFarlane's, Wine Tree, Ptarmigan and WOFTTR.</p> <p>These areas need to remain open for public motorized use; it is not acceptable to give priority access to an extremely expensive private company like Aspen Powder Tours. The people of the community should have the right to enjoy the terrain while respecting the wildlife and hazards that are obviously evident in the winter season.</p> <p>I hope this email helps the powers that be within the US Forest Service make the right decision regarding this issue and keep the motorized access available to the greater public.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
343	1	richmond ridge	I am writing to voice concerns with the upcoming travel management plan that is being formulated for Richmond Ridge area near Aspen. I see no reason why these "over snow roads" should restrict public use. Many people have enjoyed these roads in the winters for decades with minimal problems. This land should not be set aside for high priced snowcat tours. Please consider that restricting these roads to commercial permits will for the most part eliminate the average person's ability to enjoy our backcountry.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
77	1	richmond ridge	<p>I am writing to you regarding the reviewing the road and travel map for the area currently used by Aspen Powder Tours.</p> <p>Please don't allow unregulated motorized access. Right now the area is a special place where people from the whole world can enjoy powder skiing in a serene setting. The area that Aspen Powder Tours use is a great draw card for the valley. The pace is unhurried, the skiing is relaxing.</p> <p>If the area gets opened up to unregulated snowmobile use, all of the above will be destroyed. Please keep the area as it currently is.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
260	2	richmond ridge	I am writing to you today because I support the United States Forest Service's travel management plan to restrict motorized vehicles to the designated roads on the back side of Aspen Mountain, particularly the Richmond Ridge area. The snowmobiles are numerous and very disruptive and I think need to be restricted to the roads.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
63	1	richmond ridge	I am writing you, the stewards of our Nation's publicly owned lands, in regards to the ongoing issue of the use of Aspen Mountain's Richmond area, and the backcountry ski zones that are accessed in and through it. I will first state that I neither own a snowmobile nor utilize any snowmobiles, I am however an active backcountry skier and hiker who access's and uses these areas under my own power, via skis and hiking. That said, I strongly support an agreement being struck that either extends the historical use of public snowmobiles in this area, or one that allows a mutually beneficial relationship for the Aspen Mountain Powder Tours and public snowmobiles to utilize this area in harmony.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
63	4	richmond ridge	I beg and implore you to allow snowmobiles to utilize the roads in and around the Richmond Ridge areas.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support
161	1	richmond ridge	I believe that the Motorized access to Richmond Ridge to the general public should continue to into the distant future. All people should be allowed to enjoy this access.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support
63	2	richmond ridge	I believe the Aspen Skiing Company's powder snowcat operation intends to have a monopoly on this area and its contents, by now allowing snowmobile traffic. In truth, neither I nor anyone I personally know has ever used this snowcat operation. That is due to one factor... the incredible cost! This service is only available to a finite and elite clientele who can afford \$400 per day snowcat tours. Meanwhile the Powder Tours operation tries to block and reject anyone who can't afford their services from accessing thousands of acres of our publicly owned lands that they somehow seem to consider their private "turf".	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics
200	2	richmond ridge	I believe the proposal by Powder for the People offers a reasonable framework for a compromise that will not harm either the commercial interests, forest or private landowners.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
239	1	richmond ridge	I believe you have to limit snowmobiles on Richmond Ridge, there are just too many idiots back there getting into trouble.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
568	6	richmond ridge	I do not believe there should be an exclusive use permitted by the Aspen Ski Company, which would deny the snowmobile (any OTS) access to the general public. OTS usage should either be completely removed for all users or opened up for all users, but at no instance should there be an exclusive arrangement for the Aspen Skiing Company be authorized as the sole source for any type of use. This would be unfair, and un-American	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
81	4	richmond ridge	I encourage you to preserve the current status of use and regulation in the Powder Tour permit area limiting motorized activity to the special use permit holder and unlimited access to non-motorized users.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
332	7	richmond ridge	I endorse and agree with everything stated below by Mike Sladdin and Powder to the People. You must represent every individual voice and stand up to the lobby of big business as they try to steal the use of public lands for profit at the cost of a tax payer's fun.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Public Involvement Process
311	2	richmond ridge	<p>I feel that opening up the Richmond Ridge area to all over the snow vehicles would be a mistake. To increase over the snow vehicular access in this area would be contrary to recent National Park Service and National Forest Service trends to decrease motor access on public lands. Let us learn from the research and experiences from these areas and limit, not expand, snow machine use on Richmond Ridge.</p> <p>Richmond Ridge has long been a "close in" back country area for a quality ski experience. Increased motorized traffic would decrease that experience for all. Opening the area to snow machines would not just give additional access to a "few more powder skiers", but would allow high marketing and machine tracks all over good ski terrain. Snowmobile enthusiasts have many other areas (including the county roads in Little Annie's Basin) to practice their sport. Please retain Richmond Ridge as it is.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
272	1	richmond ridge	I fully support everything that Powder to the People is trying to do for our Backcountry skiing!	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support
80	1	richmond ridge	<p>I have been a skier on Aspen Mountain and other mountain in the area for over twenty-five years. I have had the pleasure to experience the back country skiing with the ski company. I have found the experience to be one total safety and trust. Back country skiing can be with multiple life treating hazards. I am in favor of one company as the Aspen Powder Tours to be in charge of the back country.</p> <p>Skiing in the back country is not just going down the hill. Questions are who is going to make and maintain the road. Who is going to control the safety of all skiers?</p> <p>In recent years the Forest Service had taken away Vail's permit the same way to only return the permit to Vail Associates.</p> <p>I was recently on one trip with the Powder Tours. We were on a road permitted to the ski company. A snow mobile rider was on the permitted road when he came upon the Powder tours. The driver stopped then starts and speed up and ran directly over a skiers skis. The driver of the snow mobile didn't even look back. This could have be[en] a serious accident.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
267	2	richmond ridge	I look back over the past years and think about how many avalanches have been set off. How many individuals have died in the backcountry because of I have been made aware of the situation regarding unwarranted snowmobile use in the back of the Aspen Mountain Richmond Ridge area. While I am supportive of many various outdoor recreational opportunities in the great state of Colorado, I feel the use of snowmobiles in un-designated areas is a violation of private property owner's individual rights.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Private Property

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
259	2	richmond ridge	I support the U.S. Forest Service Travel Management Plan to restrict motorized vehicle to designated roads on the back of Aspen Mountain Richmond Ridge area. This is an area that clearly needs to be controlled since snowmobiles have thoughtlessly ruined the use by others such as skiers, creating a nuisance. We have spent time enjoying the quiet and amenities that this area close to Aspen provides when we have visited Aspen.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
258	2	richmond ridge	I support the U.S. Forest Service Travel Management Plan to restrict motorized vehicle to designated roads on the back of Aspen Mountain Richmond Ridge area. Without this plan snowmobilers will disregard private property and continue to tear up the terrain.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Private Property
264	1	richmond ridge	I support the U.S. Forest Service Travel Management Plan to restrict motorized vehicles to designated roads on the back of the Aspen Mountain Richmond Ridge area.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support
79	1	richmond ridge	I understand that the US Forest Service is currently reviewing the road and travel map which regulates use in the Powder Tour permit area. I also understand that you are considering opening that area completely too unregulated motorized access. This would clearly change this area from a powder tour skiing paradise into a snowmobile play area jeopardizing the future of the powder tours and will greatly damage this pristine area, interfere with wildlife and add plenty more pollution, increase noise, accidents etc. As a long time local residents I strongly urge you to use your prerogative to reconsider your stand on this issue.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
78	3	richmond ridge	I urge the service to continue the status quo, which allows snowmobilers and skiers to share the land that is supported by all taxpayers.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
257	1	richmond ridge	I urge you to institute the Travel Management Plan on the backside of Aspen Mountain to restrict snowmobiles to the designated roads on the back of Aspen Mountain.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
311	1	richmond ridge	I wish to commend you on your decision regarding Richmond Ridge and the use of snowmobiles. I believe you are making a good and reasonable recommendation.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Support
243	1	richmond ridge	<p>I would like to express my strong support to equal motorized access to the Richmond Ridge area. In a local area overwhelmed with exclusivity, Richmond Ridge has provided for decades and decades what national lands were intended to do – keep our natural treasures open to use by all.</p> <p>This area has been shared for generations of recreationalist and commercial interests. Equal motorized public access to over snow roads like McFarlane's, Wine Tree, Ptarmigan and WOFTR from all entry points is strongly encouraged. If limitations are required for safety or preservation reasons it is most logical to codify the gentleman's agreement of the past to access the area by motorized vehicle via Wine Tree.</p> <p>While it would make no one happy, I would prefer to see no motorized winter access to anyone, rather than further expand the exclusivity and privilege of one group over the other. That is not the intention of our public lands.</p> <p>Please keep this area open and keep a level playing field between private recreationalists and commercial interests.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
81	2	richmond ridge	<p>I would like to express my support for preserving the Powder Tour permit area for powder skiing [because]:</p> <p>Powder Tours is confined to a limited area relative to that permitted to snowmobiles in both the local area and throughout the nation.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
81	3	richmond ridge	<p>I would like to express my support for preserving the Powder Tour permit area for powder skiing [because]:</p> <p>Unlimited and unregulated motorized activity in the Powder Tour permit area will ruin the experience for powder skiers and will increase noise, traffic, pollution accidents and degradation of the environment.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
81	1	richmond ridge	<p>I would like to express my support for preserving the Powder Tour permit area for powder skiing [because]:</p> <p>Powder Tours makes the overall Aspen experience special and differentiates Aspen from competitive ski resorts.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
273	1	richmond ridge	I would like to voice my request that the public lands on Richmond Hill be open to the public. The exclusive use of this public land by a private group is not fair and should be amended to allow public access. The mechanized use [to] be one group should not take precedence over another. The Forest Service should allow many users to enjoy this land and not exclude people who may not be able to afford a high dollar tour. I am handicapped and wish to ski this area from my snowmobile and should be allowed to do so. These lands are public and should be open to all.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
304	5	richmond ridge	If this [access to McFarlanes Road] is not resolved as the commissioners are apparently trying to do by restoring the gentleman's agreement, then I think there will be conflict and litigation in Federal Court that will sow enmity and drive expenses for all those involved. We need to get consensus and self-regulate and live as a community, not cordon off pristine national forest behind a velvet rope.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics
304	3	richmond ridge	If we, the public taxpayers, are already sharing the county roads with this "for-profit" entity then it only seems fair to have a bit of access to terrain on the other side of the ridge.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
64	2	richmond ridge	It goes against the Forest Service's mission to give access to public lands to a commercial permit over the interests of the general public. Please do not let this happen on the historical skiing areas on the east side of Richmond Ridge.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. It should also be noted that the land in question is open to everyone using non-motorized means.	Goals and Objectives
307	1	richmond ridge	It goes against the Forest Service's mission to give access to public lands to a commercial permit over the interests of the general public. Please do not let this happen on the historical skiing areas on the east side of Richmond Ridge.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. It should also be noted that the land in question is open to everyone using non-motorized means.	Specialty Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
454	4	richmond ridge	It goes against the Forest Service's mission to give access to public lands to a commercial permit over the interests of the general public. Please do not let this happen on the historical skiing areas on the east side of Richmond Ridge.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. It should also be noted that the land in question is open to everyone using non-motorized means.	Specialty Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
58	1	richmond ridge	It is clear you are firmly aligned with Aspen Powder Tours pocket book. Somehow it's not surprising given our current administration. Regardless, neither your actions nor the ski company pocket book will win you this war. If you can't understand the simple truth that it is our land and that it simply boils down to either we all walk or we all ride. This is a big old can of worms you just pulled the lid off and you are pissing off a lot of people. You can tell Aspen Powder Tours that I'm happy to hike it. I'll be hiking all over the place before they are even out of bed. I'll Zorro "Wine Tree". I'll Zorro Ptarmigan. And when I'm skinning along our public road it will be right down the middle. When that stinking ass big yellow cat pulls up they will have to go around me. And when they leave the designated road I'll will report them to you and expect you to act accordingly. And when they cry about people playing dirty you just have to remind them that they started it. In the end it just won't be worth it for them. See you on the back side.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
501	12	richmond ridge	McFarlane Creek area of Richmond Ridge: While this area has been controversial, we [Buena Vista Snowmobile Club] believe it should remain designated as Open to winter motorized use as allowed by the Forest Plan. If not designated Open, then a motorized route should be established through McFarlane's Gulch to accommodate hybrid snowmobile/skier use.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
454	2	richmond ridge	McFarlane's, Wine Tree and Ptarmigan over-the-snow-roads can be accessed directly via county road, Richmond Hill Rd., through public "ways". The Wine Tree public access would be the preferred entry point so not to cross private land to gain access to McFarlane's as worked out in the revoked gentleman's agreement.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
454	1	richmond ridge	One or more of the over-snow roads and its spurs on the east side of Richmond Ridge - McFarlane's, Wine Tree, Ptarmigan and WOFTR - should be recognized as over-the-snow-roads and open to public motorized winter use.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
508	1	richmond ridge	<p>Our [Powder to the People] comments will focus on winter motorized travel in the Aspen-Sopris Ranger District, where most of our membership is based, and particularly in the Richmond Ridge 7.1 Intermix area outside the ski area boundary.</p> <p>The White River National Forest provides many opportunities for winter recreation, motorized and non-motorized. But while snowmobiling has become an accepted use in the National Forest, with multiple designated snowmobile areas, snowmobile-skiing (or yo-yo or hybrid skiing, where snowmobiles tow skiers, usually staying within a track, access powder ski runs) has not heretofore been widely recognized in travel planning. As an example, winter only over-snow-the-snow roads are not even recognized on any maps. With more and more skiers and snowboarders using snowmobiles and snowcats and other motorized vehicles to access backcountry runs, we urge your team to acknowledge that reality and consider that some non-pristine areas, with existing infrastructure (over-the-snow roads), are appropriate for public motorized skiing and snowboarding, and should be designated as such, along with proper signage to inform multi-users. We feel the best example of that is the Richmond Ridge 7.1 Intermix Area, which currently has a single exclusive commercial permit holder who uses a mix of motorized vehicles (snowcats, grooming snowcats, and snowmobiles) to access and maintain the area and their daily operations.</p> <p>This area is accessible most conveniently via one or more of the three popular county roads (Little Annie, Midnight Mine and Richmond Hill roads), is acknowledged as non-pristine, is surrounded by areas with multiple uses (ski area, county roads popular with snowmobilers, skiable sidecountry terrain), and has historically been used for motorized and non-motorized skiing and snowboarding. Rather than prohibit public motorized traffic on the four over-snow roads (McFarlanes, Wine Tree, Ptarmigan and WOFTR), designating one or more of the roads and its spurs for public motorized use, via public way, would be beneficial to the Forest Service and users alike, for the following reasons:</p> <p>It would acknowledge the historical multiple uses of the area.</p> <p>Along with signage, it would give snowmobile skiers a readily accessible, logical place to recreate, rather than forcing them to go further out and then off the road into more pristine areas, or be tempted to poach the forbidden terrain.</p>	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
304	4	richmond ridge	Our usage of McFarlanes contributes to the safety of the snowpack on those aspects given the significant skier compaction evident in repeated skiing of the eastern terrain.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
304	1	richmond ridge	Part of the reason I am happy to have you read this is for that reason: friendships. Aspen is a small town and the power play by the ski co. to keep people like me out of terrain I've been skiing for twenty years is that alienation and bitterness that it will breed among friends. Therefore, I urge you to help us solve this problem in a win-win manner and restore the "gentleman's agreement", as supported by our county commissioners, whereby we retain access to McFarlanes Road.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	8	richmond ridge	Pitkin County would like to make the following additional recommendations (outside of the travel management planning process) concerning resolution of the Richmond Ridge access issue on WRNF lands: Actively enforce limitations on over-the-snow vehicular use of WRNF land in the Richmond Hill area by USFS snowmobile patrols.	The FS has stepped up patrols in this area beginning with the 2008-09 winter season and is patrolling it on average one day a week. Funding mechanism to allow this patrolling should continue.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
467	6	richmond ridge	Pitkin County would like to make the following additional recommendations (outside of the travel management planning process) concerning resolution of the Richmond Ridge access issue on WRNF lands: As the holder of a Special Use Permit, we [Pitkin County] recognize that Aspen Skiing Company must comply with certain terms and conditions governing its commercial operations on WRNF land and that it may have legitimate business reasons for objecting to modifications to its special use authorization. However, we feel that there is a need to retain the public access to the McFarlane's Gulch section of Richmond Ridge which has been utilized under a "gentlemen's agreement" with Aspen Skiing Company. Thus, we believe it is worthwhile for the USFS to continue to engage in this discussion for a limited period of additional time.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
467	9	richmond ridge	Pitkin County would like to make the following additional recommendations (outside of the travel management planning process) concerning resolution of the Richmond Ridge access issue on WRNF lands: Continue to work with Pitkin County staff to improve-the signage in the Richmond Hill area.	Regardless of the outcome of this plan, the FS understands the strong need and desire by all parties to improve safety, directional and regulatory signage in this area. State Parks funds from snowmobile registration dollars may offer some funds or material for this end.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
467	5	richmond ridge	Pitkin County would like to make the following additional recommendations (outside of the travel management planning process) concerning resolution of the Richmond Ridge access issue on WRNF lands: During the time period leading up to adoption of the Travel Management Plan, initiate and engage in an active discussion with the Aspen Skiing Company and members of, the interested public (including representatives from Powder to the People) to assess the possibility of amending the Aspen Skiing Company special use authorization to permit general public access solely to the snowcat route for McFarlanes Gulch established by Powder Tours.	The decision to change use in the area in which Powder Tours operates is a FS decision outside the scope of Powder Tour's permit. Their permit is for outfitting and guiding on NF land and does not authorize or limit use by the public.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
467	7	richmond ridge	Pitkin County would like to make the following additional recommendations (outside of the travel management planning process) concerning resolution of the Richmond Ridge access issue on WRNF lands: Pitkin County recommends that any amendment to the Aspen Skiing Company special use authorization that would allow general public access to the McFarlane's Gulch area be formally implemented on a trial basis (the time period to be determined by the USFS and Aspen Skiing Company). It is important to the County that access is restricted to this single route. If there are substantial and continuing problems with unauthorized snowmobile use on WRNF lands and/or trespass on private lands directly associated with general public access, then we would advocate revocation of any amendment to the special use authorization at the conclusion of the trial period.	The decision to change use in the area in which Powder Tours operates is a FS decision outside the scope of Powder Tour's permit. Their permit is for outfitting and guiding on NF land and does not authorize or limit use by the public.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
400	1	richmond ridge	Please allow travel by all on the historical roads on the east of Richmond Ridge during the winter Access to forests and recreation should not be limited to commercial interests.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
307	2	richmond ridge	Please consider allowing public motorized access to all over-snow roads. The area in discussion is prescribed as a 7.1 Intermix area, completely outside the Aspen Mountain ski area boundary. The prescription of the area, in the adopted Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision, allows motorized use.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
278	7	richmond ridge	Please give the use of Richmond Ridge etc. back to the people that deserve it. Do the right thing for once please.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
369	1	richmond ridge	Please leave the backside of Aspen Mountain free and open to snowmobiles, not just profit making powder tours. Since the 1960's snowmobiles had free access. It does not seem fair that commercial entities should have priority over the private citizen. After all, the land belongs to all of us.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
331	1	richmond ridge	Please note my preference for no snowmobile access whatsoever on Richmond Ridge. Most snowmobiles do not acknowledge ski touring. People who walk on skis are much happier with one concentrated group of skiers instead of dozens of snowmobilers who can easily access other powder stashes.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
224	3	richmond ridge	Please support the Alternative G, which would designate motorized routes in the Forest, but do not support the application of Alternative G in the Richmond Ridge area where it's necessary to allow motorized use of over-the-snow-roads and clearly designate them. The solutions provided by Powder To The People of a combination of Alternatives G and A,F would be wonderful.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
224	1	richmond ridge	Please take into consideration the back country skier and traveler when forming the new Travel Management Plan. I consider National Forest Service land to belong to the American public and should be able to be utilized in a rational and fair manner for the benefit of all users, not just commercial interests.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
401	6	richmond ridge	Powder to the People.org supports the concept of Alternative G, which would designate motorized routes in the Forest. However, we do not support the application of Alternative G in the Richmond Ridge area as explained by forest staff; that is, limiting public motorized traffic to the county roads. We believe it's appropriate – and increasingly necessary – to show winter-only over-the-snow-roads on Forest travel maps, and to allow public motorized use, via public way, on an appropriate portion of those routes. Thus, we support a solution in between Alternatives G and A, F.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. It is noted that the FS has not adequately mapped or shown the winter "snow-roads" on the east side of Richmond Ridge.	Alternatives (add, change, delete)
82	2	richmond ridge	Powder Tours is a unique recreational opportunity that greatly enhances the overall Aspen experience for locals and visitors alike.	The purpose of outfitter guides operating under permit on National Forest land is to provide a quality recreation experience where there is a public need and benefit.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
82	3	richmond ridge	Powder Tours is confined to a relatively limited permit area, while snowmobiles are allowed to operate in a much larger area of the US Forest Service land.	The Powder Tour permit area comprises approximately 600-700 acres of National Forest Land. Obviously snowmobiles have access to a much larger acreage forest-wide.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
508	2	richmond ridge	PowderToThePeople.org will not support Alternative G, closed to motorized in relation to the 7.1 intermix areas of Richmond Ridge. This would be a 180 degree reversal of its current and historical prescription of the area, also to mention, what was approved in the final revision of the forest plan in 2002. We do however agree with an element of Alternative G which is paramount and that is designating over-the-snow-roads, motorized routes in the Forest. Again, we believe it's appropriate in the 7.1 intermix area outside the Aspen Mountain Ski Area boundary and increasingly necessary to show, accept, designate, mark and sign winter-only over-the-snow roads on forest travel maps, and to allow public motorized use, via public way, on an appropriate portion of those routes. Thus, we support a solution that would keep the area designated as Open-to- Motorize. This prescription would give the motorized public the opportunity to recreate in the area, where Alternative Gs Closed-to-Motorized prescription would be the game over scenario, no public motorized access. With the open to motorized designation, the public would have the possibility to access its public lands via motorized vehicle. Note that USFS has its tools to restrict access to just the over-the-snow roads within the prescription if desired.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
495	5	richmond ridge	Richmond Ridge can be shared by the motorized public, non-motorized public and a commercial operator as long as we can agree on a few ground rules: public access to a limited portion of the over-snow roads, good signage, and some level of education and safety awareness (which can led by a nonprofit group such as Powder to the People). To make this area an exclusive playground for those wealthy enough to afford a powder tour is wrong, especially when the Aspen Skiing Co. already has thousands of acres leased from the Forest Service nearby. Please consider allowing some motorized public access to McFarlane's, Wine Tree, Ptarmigan and/or WOFTR over-snow roads.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
278	6	richmond ridge	Richmond Ridge has always been a local's playground, if anything at all is to change it would be to stop the paid private powder tours on public land that would be my recommendation based on the history of the place because the powder tours have not tried to work with the locals but run them off.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
495	4	richmond ridge	Snowmobile skiers and snowboarders are just as interested in preserving the powder for skiing as Powder Tours is, and would be a partner in managing the area as such. Although I would hate to see the area be open motorized for fear of snowmobilers tearing up the powder fields, I would prefer that it be open to public motorized use rather than completely closed to public motorized use, if those are the only two options. If public motorized use on the over-snow roads ever became unsustainable or difficult to handle, a fee system or some other management could be put in place. This is a key recreation area and the Forest Service should take some responsibility in accommodating and managing all the user groups.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
508	6	richmond ridge	<p>Summary, page 2: Alternatives for the travel management plan are based on thematic applications of issues generated by public comment. (Emphasis added.) With all due respect, 56 unique public comments did not appear to be reflected in maps of the winter alternatives for the SDEIS, nor is there any specific mention of the Richmond Ridge area winter only over-snow roads anywhere in the SDEIS. We are relying on what Forest Service managers told us is preferred for the Richmond Ridge, but the general public has no way of knowing the site-specific management options by merely reading the SDEIS. It is unfair to give the public such limited information and expect them to make informed comments.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	<p>Use of Public Comment (vote, majority opinion, etc.)</p>
454	5	richmond ridge	<p>The area in discussion is prescribed as a 7.1 Intermix area, completely outside the Aspen Mountain ski area boundary. The prescription of the area, in the adopted Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision, allows motorized use.</p>	<p>Yes, Intermix 7.1 allows motorized use but by no means mandates it. It is defined mostly by Guidelines in the Forest Plan, such as coordinating with affected landowners.</p>	<p>Designation of Lands</p>
304	2	richmond ridge	<p>The bottom line is that the powder tours has transformed during the past decade of hyper wealth-creation among Aspen's elite second homeowners (I manage money for some so I am by no means attacking them). The tours have essentially become monopolized by a small cadre of wealthy locals and second homeowners, including the crowns, which I suppose benefits the small group of folks who cater to them. This is no way to manage the terrain on Richmond Ridge, especially because the powder tours rely heavily on the usage of the public side (west side/Little Annies Basin, etc.) for their terrain (i.e. yesterday 1/4/09 when conditions would warrant caution on eastern aspects.</p> <p>If you want exclusivity in Aspen, there are ample opportunities to obtain it, but making a long-time local ski area off limits to the people who actually live and work in Aspen would be a travesty!</p> <p>I hope that this note finds sympathetic ears and makes a difference.</p>	<p>The FS understands the feeling of exclusivity that exists with this permit but the FS does not control who may book a tour with the permittee. It should be noted that most of the West Side of the Ridge in Little Annie Basin is private land that Powder Tours leases, though shares with the public.</p>	<p>Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)</p>
64	1	richmond ridge	<p>The east side of Richmond Ridge has been shared by the general public (skiers, snowmobilers and snowcats) and commercial interests since the 1960s, and should be shared recreationally in the future on designated over-snow roads.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	<p>Activities on Public Lands (General)</p>
454	3	richmond ridge	<p>The east side of Richmond Ridge has been shared by the general public (skiers, snowmobilers and snowcats) and commercial interests since the 1960s, and should be shared recreationally in the future on designated over-snow roads.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
93	1	richmond ridge	<p>The Little Annie Homeowners Association LHA is comprised of the homeowners who live at the bottom of Little Annie Road within approximately the first mile of Castle Creek Road. Little Annie Road is the safest access to Richmond Ridge because it has less avalanche danger. Consequently, many snowmobilers and other winter users park on or at the bottom of Little Annie Road.</p> <p>The Forest Service should include the development of a parking area in the Travel Management Plan to accommodate recreational users. There is a lot of Forest Service land located at the bottom of the Road. A parking area could be designed and developed.</p> <p>The LHA requests that any parking area be located so it is not visible from the Battaglia and Pagels houses located on Little Annie Road. These two houses overlook the Little Annie/Castle Creek Road intersection. We believe it is possible to design and develop a small parking area to serve Richmond Hill recreational users. Please include the parking area in the plan.</p>	<p>This proposal, though it has merit and could be considered in the future, is outside the scope of this process.</p>	<p>Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)</p>

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
495	2	richmond ridge	<p>The over-snow roads in the Richmond Ridge area have been shared by commercial interests and the general public for decades now, and it is a logical and accessible area for snowmobile skiers and snowboarders, who are currently not really acknowledged in forest travel planning.</p> <p>It seems wrong that Aspen Mountain Powder Tours has been allowed to significantly increase its use of the area (three snowcats per day in recent years and thousands of customers) without going through any public process, while at the same time the motorized public is being squeezed out. It is, after all, public land, and the Forest Service should give preference to public use over exclusive commercial use. (The commercial use is exclusive because only a tiny percentage of the public can afford a \$300-plus day of snowcat skiing.)</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. Though \$300 per day is expensive, so is owning a snowmobile and trailer to go with it.</p>	Multiple Use Emphasis
498	5	richmond ridge	<p>The problem with the [public involvement] process is: I had to rely on extensive conversations with forest officials to understand the nuances of this plan and what was being proposed for Richmond Ridge, and I am a trained journalist. There is no way an average citizen can read the plan, look at the map and know what is being suggested for a specific area like Richmond Ridge. They must inquire further with an official or get their information from groups that take the time to study the issue. That does not seem right.</p>	<p>The FS understands the complexity of the issues, which is one reason this current 2008 Draft has been simplified as much as possible compared to the 2006 Draft.</p>	Outreach/Education
498	6	richmond ridge	<p>The problem with the [public involvement] process is: It is unclear what happened to the comments and alternatives from the 2006 draft EIS. I was told that those are all still being considered, but have no way of knowing if that's true or not. I was told and have read that comments from the last round in 2006 were incorporated into the current alternatives, yet I don't see any reflection of the dozens of public comments supporting snowmobile skiing on over-snow roads in the Richmond Ridge area, nor do I see any reference to those over-snow roads on maps or in documents.</p>		Previous NEPA Related to the Project
498	3	richmond ridge	<p>The problem with the [public involvement] process is: The maps are confusing and/or incomplete, at least in terms of my area of interest, which is Richmond Ridge. One of the hottest-button issues in the whole forest, from what I was told, is this area, and the over-the-snow roads such as McFarlane's and Wine Tree are not even shown on the map to comment on!</p>	<p>The FS understands the frustration many members of the public feel to not have the over-snow roads shown on the Draft and is a regrettable omission.</p>	Mapping, GIS
78	1	richmond ridge	<p>The purpose of this message is to urge the US Forest Service not to open the Powder Tour permit area to unregulated motorized access. To do so would have the following adverse effect upon the environment and the public's use and enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>The powder skiing experience of local residents and tourists from all over the world will be severely degraded and possibly eliminated. Skiers do not adversely affect snowmobilers, but the latter can destroy skiing. Since skiers far out number snowmobilers, it seems unfair to rule in favor of the latter.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
78	2	richmond ridge	<p>The purpose of this message is to urge the US Forest Service not to open the Powder Tour permit area to unregulated motorized access. To do so would have the following adverse effect upon the environment and the public's use and enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>The snowmobile fumes are detrimental to the environment. A special interest group should not be allowed to contribute to the environmental problems that may deny everyone the full use and enjoyment of public lands.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics
332	6	richmond ridge	<p>The Ski Corp. has no more rights to these roads and routes than I do. I have been skiing there [Richman Ridge/Little Annie Basin] much longer and have a continual history of recreating there, that should not be taken away with political power for profit.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase. It should be noted that the roads are put in and maintained by Powder Tours at their expense.</p>	Influence of Interest Groups and Politics
498	7	richmond ridge	<p>There are minor issues with the travel planning process from a layperson's perspective. It is disappointing and distressing that what is meant to be a public process is so difficult to wade through and understand for the average citizen. I hope you do consider public comments extensively, based on common sense, even if some might not be technically correct. I also hope you do consider comments made two years ago even if they don't fit with the alternatives you released in this go-around. I would hate to see the issue with Richmond Ridge, as well as other recreation areas important to so many people, decided by a handful of bureaucrats in a systematically bureaucratic way.</p>	<p>The FS does indeed listen to and consider public comment, and tries to balance public desire with other factors. It should be noted that although the number of respondents on a particular topic may be high, such as Richmond Ridge, it does not necessarily mean the decision is based solely on this number.</p>	Public Involvement Process

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
485	2	richmond ridge	There is plenty of room for all. It would be a shame to only allow exclusive ski company access for the privileged to enjoy this great landscape. I have enjoyed a lifetime of experiences on Richmond Ridge in Winter and Summer. Please let it continue.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
224	2	richmond ridge	These areas should remain open for public motorized winter use as they have been since the 1960's. There is no reason to let the privileged access these areas and not the commoners of our valley.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
66	7	richmond ridge	These routes [east side of Richmond Ridge] have been used by snowmobilers for years and will continue to be used by the Aspen Snowcat Tours even if snowmobiles are not allowed. So the preferred alternative is not creating a non-motorized area, but instead is restricting the public's use of snowmobiles while allowing a private tour company to operate snowcats. □	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
461	1	richmond ridge	This area is zoned rural and remote and it should have no motorized uses, commercial or otherwise. We have many problems with trespass, particularly snowmobilers. If the Forest Service is going to allow motorized uses (including commercial uses), which we believe degrades the area and is inconsistent with the zoning, then we favor allowing the snowmobilers access to the east side of Richmond Ridge because otherwise they will use our land and other adjacent private lands. Said another way, if the Forest Service is unconcerned regarding the Aspen Skiing Company's commercial use of public lands outside of the ski area and isn't bothered by the incursion of such uses into "rural and remote" lands, then why not just open the area up to all the motor-loving yahoos (the rich ones who can afford the ride on the snowcat and the less affluent who are relegated to their snowmobiles)?	Rural and Remote refers to a Pitkin County Land Use designation. The FS tries to work closely with the County and affected land owners.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
508	4	richmond ridge	This travel management plan (TMP) and supporting environmental impact statement (EIS) will develop a travel system across the entire White River National Forest to accommodate and balance the transportation needs of the public and to provide adequate access for forest and resource management, while still allowing for protection of natural resources. Note the public is emphasized in this statement; no mention of private or commercial interests.	The private interest in this case provides services to the public. The public consists of many different user groups and perspectives.	General (e.g., democracy/gen welfare/public good)
82	4	richmond ridge	Unlimited and unregulated motorized activity in the Powder Tour permit area will severely degrade or eliminate the powder skiing experience for all.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
82	5	richmond ridge	Unlimited and unregulated motorized activity in the Powder Tour permit area will increase noise, traffic, pollution, accidents, and the incursion of bordering designated wilderness.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
481	18	richmond ridge	We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] support the recent USFS decision to restrict snowmobile use to designated corridors and play areas on the west side of Richmond Ridge in the Aspen area. This decision enables all users – including snowmobilers, hybrid users, skiers, snowshoers, and outfitter/guide cat skiing clients - to have positive, rewarding, recreational experiences in that area. Allowing snowmobiles to travel unrestricted on Richmond Ridge would greatly diminish the experience for many of the users of the area and would require eventual implementation of stringent, costly, and objectionable regulations similar to Vail Pass Winter Recreation Area. This decision by the USFS is timely and sustainable.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Designation of Lands
508	3	richmond ridge	We [Powder to the People] would like to note that for four years we have been attempting to reach a solution acceptable for all stakeholders through communication and collaboration. Although the road wasn't always smooth, we felt we were close to such a solution/compromise in January 2008 when we understood that the Aspen Skiing Company agreed to produce the documentation/legalese to insert into the TMP (then to be released in early Spring 2008) reflecting the gentleman's agreement. That did not happen, talks ended despite repeated efforts to revive them.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
66	6	richmond ridge	We are not asking for free reign of the area [Wine Tree], but instead to be allowed to snowmobile on existing over-snow roads. This represents an extremely small part of the area in question.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
75	3	richmond ridge	We don't need more noise and impact to adversely impact this pristine environment.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
254	2	richmond ridge	We lease our land to the Aspen Ski Company for powder skiing. The abusive snowmobiles are threatening our lease and our income from the lease. We believe for good management of all of the land both public and private.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
75	2	richmond ridge	While I understand your concerns about ability to police these areas [Powder Tour Area], it seems to me it is more important to leave them off limits to motorized vehicles as with the current policy and let it continue to be a self-policing situation as it has been in the past.	The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
63	3	richmond ridge	<p>Why do I support snowmobiles using this area when I in fact don't snowmobile? For many reasons, including my deep rooted belief that this will force snowmobilers into other, much more pristine and delicate areas. You see, Richmond Ridge has always been a hub of snowmobile activity in an area which already sees a lot of human traffic by many methods, where everyone has historically gotten along well until the Powder Tours has tried to shut it off to anyone but them. Shutting this area off to snowmobilers will force them into other areas that are crucial to wildlife, and which are some of the few remaining places where nature thrives and the impact of humans is low to non-existent. I would like to see those areas stay that way, not changed and altered by an influx of castaway snowmobilers. Also, Richmond Ridge is one of the few areas around where snowmobilers do their sport in relative safety. The majority of alternatives would put them in areas of valleys which are severely exposed to regular, large avalanches. Forcing them into these areas would ultimately impact us all, with what I fear would be many avalanche deaths, and put our rescue resources in harm's way and extend them beyond their foreseeable budgets.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	Designation of Lands
467	4	richmond ridge	<p>Winter Travel:</p> <p>Additional Motorized Public Access (Modification of the Aspen Skiing Company Powder Tours Special Use Permit): Pitkin County feels very strongly that there should be no increase in motorized recreational use of the Richmond Ridge area beyond recent levels. The County is cognizant of the concerns of private property owners in the area and believes that the trespass issues on private land and County roads should not be allowed to continue. We [Pitkin County] are also mindful of the fact that the noise from snowmobiles (as opposed to snow cats) is an issue for some property owners.</p> <p>Recognizing that: (i) County roads passing through the Richmond Ridge area are already open to the public for snowmobile use, (ii) these County roads already provide good backcountry access, and (iii) Aspen Skiing Company has obtained Special Use Permit to operate its Powder Tours in the Richmond Ridge area, we support adoption of Alternative G, which reflects current USFS policy and closes all WRNF land in the Richmond Ridge area to snowmobile use (thereby limiting snowmobiles to County roads passing through the area) and includes an open motorized area to the west of Richmond Ridge Rd., just past Barnard Hut.</p>	<p>The FS will continue to work with Pitkin County where applicable on Richmond Ridge regardless of what the final decision is for this area. The FS does have consistent use data for Richmond Ridge that can be used to establish baseline use numbers, though it would be difficult to have much control over how many people decide to use the area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
467	3	richmond ridge	<p>Winter Travel:</p> <p>Richmond Ridge: Pitkin County fully appreciates how long, difficult and contentious the Richmond Ridge winter access issue has been, and continues to be for the USFS. While the ultimate resolution of the access issue may not satisfy all stakeholders - clearly it is time to make a decision in connection with adoption of the Travel Management Plan and to devote WRNF Resources to other issues.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
503	1	richmond ridge	<p>WRNF folks, as a concerned skier and snowmobiler, I would like to voice my opinion on the access to area on the east side of Richmond Ridge. I use this area with friends and family for skiing and snowmobiling, day hiking and just to get away from the crowds on the front side. The over-the-snow-roads especially the Wine Tree area and the Watch Out For The Road (WOFTR) areas very special and unique and should be available for use by all. Snowmobiles can and have used this area for decades and should be allowed to continue. Allowing a commercial operation -Powder Cats the monopoly on this valuable resource is unfair to the public.</p>	<p>The management of Richmond Ridge has been a controversial issue for over 30 years. The east side of the ridge has been closed to motorized use except by permit since at least 1992. Regardless of the final decision for this area, collaboration and cooperation among the County, private landowners, interest groups and the FS will need to continue and possibly increase.</p>	Multiple Use Emphasis
14	1	roaring fork	<p>Almost daily, I hike, bike, horse, or dirt bike in the Roaring Fork Valley area. There are thousands of miles of trails available to me for hiking, and horsing, partly because there is already so much designated wilderness in the area. However, because of the wilderness and the overall lack of single-track trails on public land, there are limited options for mountain biking, and severely limited options for dirt biking. Accordingly, I strongly urge you to consider increasing the amount of trails available to bikes, particularly dirt bikes. From the Aspen/Snowmass area, our only option to find single-track other than sloane Peak/Lenado involves either a long drive down valley or a long ride over Taylor Pass, which is closed most of the year by snow, or susceptible to lightning storms.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Sloane Peak trail is not a motorized trail currently but is proposed to be open in Alt. G. Due to many Forest Plan M.A.'s there are not many places to designate motorized trails. There is a wide network of mountain bike trails currently.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
355	3	roaring fork	<p>I suggest that the following ways and routes located adjacent to streams in the Roaring Fork Watershed be permanently closed and decommissioned.</p> <p>Segment Number: 3-1966W.3 – Stream: Crystal River Segment Number: 3-1954W.1 – Stream: Crystal River Segment Number: 3-310W.1F – Stream: Crystal River Segment Number: 3-313W.1A – Stream: Crystal River Segment Number: 3-133W.1B – Stream: Crystal River Segment Number: 3-1913.1 – Stream: Cattle Creek Segment Number: 3-1915W.1 – Stream: Lime Creek Segment Number: 1-N179.1 – Stream: Castle Creek Segment Number: 1-N157.1 – Stream: Castle Creek</p>	<p>Comment noted. Many comments have been received regarding the possible future analysis of the Crystal River trail. At this time the FS will not add any segments of trail along this corridor as system trails but will also not decommission any segments understanding future analysis may occur.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
355	2	roaring fork	I support a travel management plan for the White River National Forest that protects all riparian areas. In the Roaring Fork Watershed, Alternative G decreases the miles of roads from 104 miles under the no action alternative to 70 miles and the number of stream crossings from 348 to 229. I do not support any new road/trail construction next to perennial streams unless site specific analysis shows there are no detrimental impacts to stream or riparian health and existing roads and trails should be maintained to standards that maintain or improve riparian and stream health.	This Plan does not propose any new or additional "construction" of roads or trails.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
467	20	seller park	[ATT 2]: Map of Sellars Park Area		See Attachment
467	13	seller park	Sellars Park: Pitkin County, through its Open Space and Trails program, owns land within the WRNF in the Sellars Park area. This County-owned 160-acre parcel is bordered by State Wildlife lands to the north, with WRNF at the rest of its boundaries. The Winter Travel Management Map for Alternative G designates the WRNF land to the west and south as "Open Motorized Areas", and to the east as "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only", with an identified "Motorized Route" on the USFS's Fryingpan Road up to the County property.	The FS will make this correction upon review of the map referenced.	Designation of Lands
			The boundary for these travel areas should be adjusted so that the County property lies entirely within the "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" area. This will alleviate the conflicts in management presented by Alternative G, as proposed. The map included as Attachment 2 depicts how the boundary for "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" areas could be shifted to the west to alleviate this conflict. We [Pitkin County] request the USFS to make this boundary adjustment.		
235	32	sheep mtn, sheep gulch, elk ridge, searle	Area 8 – Sheep Mountain/Sheep Gulch/Elk Ridge/Searle Gulch areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]		Road and Trail Classification/Management
14	3	sloan, lenado	I ask you to enact the following recommendations, with my personal emphasis on Sloan Peak/Lenado: - Alt. G is my preferred alternative, and needs the following to make more complete systems and offer a complete day of motorcycle riding not just a few hours. Sloane Peak/Lenado Area - Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. - Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail) This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass the FS road 103 on a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. - Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is printed on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (west section) it starts at the top of FS road 508 just west of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 At west end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues west to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. From trail 1-N121.1 west the trail system is included in Alt G. - Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork) this trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. - Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail)	The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area. The FS hopes to designate an official and sustainable motorized loop system between Triangle Peak and Kobey Park.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
455	15	sloane peak, lenado	Alt G has the trails west of the above already in place. The above trails would finish a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to start. Total miles for complete system are about 60. Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative. The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation. Sloane Peak/Lenado Area -Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail) This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass FS road 103 with a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is currently depicted on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (West section). It starts at the top of FS road 508 just West of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 -At the West end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues westward to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. -From trail 1-N121.1 West--the trail system is currently included in Alt G. -Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork) This trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. -Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail)	The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area. The FS hopes to designate an official and sustainable motorized loop system between Triangle Peak and Kobey Park.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
131	3	sloane peak, lenado	Alt G has the trails west of the above trails already in place. The above trails would create a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to the starting point. The distance included in this complete loop system is approximately 60 miles. I and my family would be devastated if the trail was closed to motorized use: Sloane Peak/Lenado Area.	This specific trail is currently not open to motorized use beyond the end of Road 534 or the end of 508 or 523.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
119	5	sloane peak, lenado	<p>Sloane Peak/Lenado Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. - Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail) This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass the FS road 103 on a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. - Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is printed on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (west section) it starts at the top of FS road 508 just west of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 At west end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues west to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. From trail 1-N121.1 west the trail system is included in Alt G. - Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork) This trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. - Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail) 	The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area. The FS hopes to designate an official and sustainable motorized loop system between Triangle Peak and Kobey Park. The Rocky Fork and Miller Creek Trail are in non-motorized management areas and cannot be considered for motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
566	2	sloane peak/lenado	<p>Alt G has the trails west of the above already in place. The above trails would finish a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to start. Total miles for complete system are about 60.</p> <p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Sloane Peak/Lenado Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail) This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass FS road 103 with a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is currently depicted on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (West section). It starts at the top of FS road 508 just West of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 -At the West end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues westward to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. -From trail 1-N121.1 West--the trail system is currently included in Alt G. -Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork) This trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. -Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail) 	The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area. The FS hopes to designate an official and sustainable motorized loop system between Triangle Peak and Kobey Park. The Rocky Fork and Miller Creek Trail are in non-motorized management areas and cannot be considered for motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
502	6	sloane pk, lenado	<p>Alt G has the trails west of the above trails already in place. The above trails would create a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to the starting point. The distance included in this complete loop system is approximately 60 miles.</p> <p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Sloane Peak/Lenado Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail) This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass FS road 103 with a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is currently depicted on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (West section). It starts at the top of FS road 508 just West of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 -At the West end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues westward to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. -From trail 1-N121.1 West--the trail system is currently included in Alt G. -Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork) This trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. -Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail) <p>Alt G has the trails west of the above trails already in place. The above trails would create a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to the starting point. The distance included in this complete loop system is approximately 60 miles.</p>	The Johnson Creek Trail crosses land owned by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails land that is closed to motorized use. It is also in a restricted motorized area. The FS hopes to designate an official and sustainable motorized loop system between Triangle Peak and Kobey Park. The Rocky Fork and Miller Creek Trail are in non-motorized management areas and cannot be considered for motorized use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
301	34	sloane, lenado	Sloane Peak/Lenado Area -Trail FS# 1-103W2X, 1-103W2Y and 1-103W2Z. These three sections allow for single track trails on the old route between the town of Lenado and Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# 1-2184-1 (Johnson Cr Trail). This trail has been used for years by ATV and motorcycle riders to bypass FS road 103 with a trail that goes to the top of Larkspur Mtn. -Trail FS# N145.1 This trail was established with help from Aspen Ranger Office in the 1980s. As this trail is currently depicted on FS map it is not shown in its entirety. The second half is missing (West section). It starts at the top of FS road 508 just West of Larkspur Mtn. This trail weaves through Kobey Park for about 9 miles then crosses FS road 508 and continues on Trail FS# 1-N121.1 -At the West end of 1-N121.1 the trail system continues westward to Sloane Peak and then down to Lower River Rd by way of Red Rim Rd. -From trail 1-N121.1 West--the trail system is currently included in Alt G. -Trail FS# 3-1931.1 (Rocky Fork). This trail and Miller Creek Trail allow northern access from Frying Pan drainage to Sloane Peak/ Lenado Area. -Trail FS# 3-1930.1 (Miller Creek Trail) Alt G has the trails west of the above trails already in place. The above trails would create a complete system and put trail users down Woody Creek and back to the starting point. The distance included in this complete loop system is approximately 60 miles. [ATT 1:] From Martha Kettle to Skip Harutun, dated December 18, 2003. [ATT 2:] Letter from Skip & Mary Harutun. Comments regarding the White River National Forest Travel Management Plan and DEIS, dated August 21, 2006.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
43	3	spring creek			See Attachment
43	4	spring creek			See Attachment
43	2	spring creek	I have been extremely involved with the entire White River reassessment process from the beginning – from deciding what uses the forest should have, then splitting off the travel management portion which now seems like a lifetime ago. In the fifteen years we have owned “Spring Creek”, we have called, met with and happily cooperated with Sonny La Salle, Martha Kettle, Mary Beth Gustafson, Kevin Riordan, Bill Westbrook, and Irene Davidson. The turn over in administration in the WRNF in 15 years has made continuity of communication and goals challenging to say the least and frustrating and maddening to say the most. Many meetings and phone calls have occurred over the years. I'll share only one enclosed letter of December 18, 2003, that reflected a meeting held prior to the 2006 DEIS. Martha Kettle and Bill Westbrook were very supportive of the issues she refers to in the letter. While I recognize no one wishes to go firmly on the record and make any commitments, Martha and Bill's feelings were expressed in the 2006 DEIS. At that time the Alternative D was presented as the USFS recommended option with the inclusions mentions in Martha Kettle's letter of December 18, 2003, so stipulated. I was pleased that some of our desires were included in Alternative D as can be seen in the enclosed letter I wrote in the Comment period of 2006. I then spoke with Bill Westbrook and Ms. Kettle inquiring as to any negative comments received in regard to these road issues and whether they felt they would make the final draft. I was told there were no negative concerns or comments issued, and that because if none were forthcoming they would continue to be in the Forest Service's recommended report. (Alternative D) It was a great feeling that the cooperation and communication everyone says they want actually worked. I would like to respond to the recent 2008 Supplemental DEIS. I have lived, worked, and played in the White River National Forest my whole life. I'm presently 59 years old. When I was young, we ran our cattle on a permit from Larkspur, Mt. to Sloan's Peak. When I was in high school and college, I worked cutting and skidding logs for Jack Flogaus up at Lenado. For the last 15 years, I have been lucky enough to own 120 acres of recreational property on Spring Creek above Thomasville. The reason I feel these facts are relevant is that over the years I have seen numerous personalities in charge of forest affairs from Forest Supervisors to District Rangers to Resource Managers. From a Local's perspective, their success or failure stemmed from 1) their longevity in their local post; 2) their willingness to become intimately familiar with the concerns and issues of the people “living” in the forest on a daily basis; and 3) their ability to govern locally as to site specific needs within each Ranger District. This has been a much more favorable approach with drastically higher success rates than a one size fits all solution dictated from Washington, Denver, or even painting the entire WRNF with a broad brush, since the forest The following item or improvement should be considered as beneficial for the general public:	The district has met with the proponent and plans to send a separate letter explaining our decisions in his area of interest. It should be noted for the record that in the 2006 Public Comment Period we did have one response in opposition to his proposals.	Public Involvement Process
43	1	spring creek	FS Road 519 Maintenance Improvements This road commonly called “Spring Creek Road”, accesses the 7 properties on Sprig Creek Ridge. The association maintains the road as required in the summer, but the hunters tear up the road every fall. We do not desire a change in the character of the road, only improvements that improve the ability of the road to accommodate the hunters without requiring major bulldozer work every year.	The district has met with the proponent and plans to send a separate letter explaining our decisions in his area of interest. It should be noted for the record that in the 2006 Public Comment Period we did have one response in opposition to his proposals.	Decisionmaking Philosophy
95	1	spring creek	FS Road 519 Maintenance Improvements This road commonly called “Spring Creek Road”, accesses the 7 properties on Sprig Creek Ridge. The association maintains the road as required in the summer, but the hunters tear up the road every fall. We do not desire a change in the character of the road, only improvements that improve the ability of the road to accommodate the hunters without requiring major bulldozer work every year.	The district has met with the proponent and plans to send a separate letter explaining our decisions in his area of interest. It should be noted for the record that in the 2006 Public Comment Period we did have one response in opposition to his proposals.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
455	16	thompson cr	Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative. The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation. Thompson Creek Area -Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails: -Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail) -Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail) Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long.	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
131	4	thompson cr	I and my family would be devastated if the trail was closed to motorized use: Thompson Creek Area.	Comment is not specific enough to reply to since Thompson Creek refers to a large area. See comment above as well.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
14	4	thompson cr	I ask you to enact the following recommendations, with my personal emphasis on Sloan Peak/Lenado: - Alt. G is my preferred alternative, and needs the following to make more complete systems and offer a complete day of motorcycle riding not just a few hours. Thompson Creek Area Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail) Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail) Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
6	4	thompson cr	Please do not close the single-track listed below to motorized vehicles in the White River National Forest. These trails are great for enthusiasts, Thompson Creek Area 100% of what is currently being used, single track and roads will be closed to motorized travel. Currently only Middle Thompson Trail is open to motorized travel.	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross. This is a summer non-motorized ROS and these trails are currently not open to motorcycles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
566	3	thompson cr	The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process. Thompson Creek Area -Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails: -Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail) -Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail) Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long.	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross. Not including these as open-motorized trails does comply with NEPA.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
119	6	thompson cr	Thompson Creek Area - Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails - Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail) - Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail) Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long.	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
301	35	thompson cr	Thompson Creek Area -Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails: -Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail) -Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail) Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long.	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
213	7	thompson cr, lenado, sloane	I would like to see changes to the preferred Alternative G. Other specific areas that provide half or full day riding opportunities include Thompson Creek area (i.e. Lake Ridge Trail) and Lenado/Sloane Peak area (i.e. Johnson Creek Trail). The main trails in these areas, along with the connector routes should stay open.	Currently none of these trails are open to motorized use, though the FS is hoping to designate a sustainable motorized loop system in the Kobey Park area. Johnson Creek cannot be considered due to crossing Pitkin County Open Space Land which does not allow motorized use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
502	7	thomson cr	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Thompson Creek Area</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1950.1 (Middle Thompson Creek Trail) This trail has been one of the few single track trails open to motorized travel in the valley until now. To make a loop you need to connect the 2 trails:</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-1951.1 (South Branch Thompson Creek Trail)</p> <p>-Trail FS# 3-2093.1 (Lake Ridge Trail)</p> <p>Alt G doesn't contain any of these trails. This loop would be about 30+ miles long.</p>	None of these trails may be considered for motorized use due to Management Area prescriptions and private land issues that some of the trails cross.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
6	3	triangle, sloane, lenado	<p>Please do not close the single-track listed below to motorized vehicles in the White River National Forest. These trails are great for enthusiasts,</p> <p>Triangle/ sloanes Peak/ Lenado area (Alternative G)</p> <p>About 50% of single track that is currently being used would be closed to motorized use. Currently there are only 2 single tracks open to motorized travel.</p>	Currently none of these trails are open to motorized use, though the FS is hoping to designate a sustainable motorized loop system in the Kobey Park area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
209	1	various user created	I am writing to express my support of the USFS mandate "to improve and protect the forest within [its] boundaries..." 14. 11 16 USC Section 1602 (5)(F, for alternative "G" of the proposed White River National Forest Travel Management plan, and minimizing and decommissioning existing roads and trails that impact Riparian areas and adjacent streams and rivers, specifically Segments Numbers in the Crystal River area 3-1966W.3, 3-1954W.1, 3-310W.1F, 3-313W.1A, 3-133w.1B, in Cattle Creek area 3-1913.1, and in Lime Creek area 3-1915W.1 I fully support the findings of the scientific community and, more recently, the Rudi Water & Power Authority, in Chapter 3, Section 3, with regard to the damaging impacts of roads and trails on riparian areas.	The FS is making a number of decisions in this plan based on aquatic resource protection while trying to balance public recreation need.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
372	3	west avalance, whitehorse	We are curious about the "decommission" of the West Avalanche trail and Whitehouse Mountain trails. Neither has been maintained for years and hardly see any use except by intrepid hikers and hunters. What specific actions will be taken to decommission these? Some folks would still like ramble those areas - will you actually rough up and re-seed the trails? We encourage you to not take that action, let time do it, and in the meantime some semblance of a trail will remain for those that are brave enough to use those routes (West Avalanche has several large avalanche debris paths to cross and is not particularly easy). Those routes are truly what make you feel that you are in wilderness but with the occasional and appreciated sections of easier walking e.g. old trail. Still show as de-commissioned, but take a passive approach at doing so.	The routes will not be shown as system routes but at the same time are not likely to receive decommissioning work by the FS unless there is a need to address an environmental issue. Foot and Horse traffic will still be allowed.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
488	1	white house mt, treasury ridge	<p>I would like to purpose a revision to the management plan, as it pertains to White House Mt / Treasury Ridge area.</p> <p>The current preferred alternative would exclude motorized use in the area southwest of Schoefield Town site/ Crystal Town site. From 1976 through 1985, Colorado First Tracks provided guided Helicopter Skiing in this area. The permit was allowed to lapse, but the potential still exist in this area for world class powder skiing in the high Mt. above Schoefield and Crystal. I would request that this area not be precluded from the possibility that someone might be willing to resume these activities in the future.</p>	Parts of this area are in or abut a Forest Plan Recommended Wilderness Area and are also located in a non-motorized area so nothing will change in our Travel Plan for this area. A proposal for helicopter skiing here would have to go through a separate and lengthy NEPA process.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
322	1	woody creek	I live in Woody Creek Colorado and hope that the Travel Management Plan you are considering will include a minimum of motorized access.	Comment noted.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
322	2	woody creek	I love top hike and mountain bike, both of which create no noise. I hate being at the top of a ridge and hearing the constant buzz of motor bikes and ATVs.	Comment noted.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Blanco Ranger District

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
2	480	38	2-1807.1, 2-1800.1, 2-1821.3P, 2-1832.1, 2-1836.1, 2-1835.1, 2-2825.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes general comments on horse routes proposed and in need of proposal under Alt. G:

CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] strongly supports these proposed horse routes: 2-1807.1 (Milk Creek to Horse Ridge), 2-1800.1 (2-299.1 at Sleepy Cat Peak to Salt Park), 2-1821.3P (Boulder Lake to Mirror Lake below Flat Tops rim), 2-1832.1 (Burro Mountain), 2-1836.1 (Prospect Draw), 2-1835.1 (E. Fk. N. Elk), and 2-2825.1 (W. Miller Creek). CDOW believes the creation and maintenance of these trails will enhance hunter's ability to access and retrieve animals from these areas.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We agree and will continue to maintain and include these trails in our maintenance schedule and work on plans to construct 2-1821.3P

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
3	480	36	2-1822.2a

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes already designated under the current travel management plan that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed:

2-1822.2A (Mary Loch Lake Trail) – This trail is not necessary as nearby foot access to Mary Loch Lake is already provided via the East Marvine horse/foot trail 2-1822.1. Increased access/pressure by maintenance of a horse trail could significantly impact the fishery resource at Mary Loch Lake.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The trail into Mary Loch Lake has not been maintained and kept open for horses for a number of years. The East Marvine Trail (2-1822) is approximately ¼ mile away from this lake. We will show this trail as open only to foot travel and not to horse travel.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
4	480	40	2-1824.1, 2-2248.1 connector

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes general comments on horse routes proposed and in need of proposal under Alt. G:

CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a proposed trail be created in WRNF from upper Ute Creek trail (2-1824.1) to the upper Papoose Creek trail (2-2248.1). Again, CDOW

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Blanco Ranger District

believes the creation and maintenance of this horse/foot only trail would enhance hunter's ability to access and retrieve animals from this remote area without significantly reducing effectiveness of this refuge area.

Response: Thank you for your comment. A trail in this area would be beneficial for hunting as access is difficult but not impossible. The cost of constructing and maintaining the proposed trail and the limited use of the proposed trail other than during the hunting seasons make it impractical on our limited maintenance and construction budgets.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
5	480	32	2-1837.1, 2-1831.1, 2-1820.1, 2-1820.1A, 2-1862.1, 2-1863.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

Existing foot and horse trails including: 2-1837.1 (E. Miller), 2-1831.1 (Cliff Lakes), 2-1820.1 and 2-1820.1A (Big Ridge), 2-1862.1 (Wild Cow Park), 2-1863.1 (Poison Patch) are proposed under Alt. G to be designated as Mechanized (Bicycles) trails. Should consider maintaining these trails as foot and horse (animal) only trails to reduce potential for increased disturbance/stress to deer, elk and other wildlife in these areas. Bicycle access is not needed/necessary in these areas.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We agree that all of the above trails with the exception of the East Miller Trail (2-1837.1 now 2-2202) are not good opportunities for mountain biking due to steep and difficult terrain. Wildlife biologists for the Forest Service agree that bicycle use on these trails may cause increased disturbance/stress to wildlife in the area again with the exception of the East Miller Trail. We will show on our updated map that 2-1831.1, 2-1820.1, 2-1820.1A, 1-1862.1 and 2-1863.1 will be closed to bicycles and open only to foot and horse traffic. East Miller 2-1837.1 (2-2202) will remain open to bicycles.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
6	480	35	2-1839.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes already designated under the current travel management plan that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed:

2-1839.1 (Middle Mountain OHV trail) – The existence of this road/trail has caused erosion and resource damage and has intensified use of Middle Mountain/Miller Creek area by OHV's and has caused elk and deer to move off of the forest onto nearby private lands. Closing this road would provide significant refuge habitat for elk and deer. This OHV trail is not needed, with 2-217.1 and 2-218.1 already providing vehicular access to this area. Also, CDOW strongly supports

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Blanco Ranger District

the closure of existing OHV trails 2-1839.1 (A, B, C) on Middle Mountain as proposed in Alt. G. Should consider redesignating trail 2-1839.1 on Middle Mountain as Foot and Horse (animal) trail to facilitate retrieval of game by hunters, etc.

Response: Thank you for your comment. This route provides for hunting access and game retrieval by ATV into areas that are difficult to access. It also provides for loop opportunities for ATV's and bicycles as well as foot and horse use during times other than hunting seasons. The trail is also used as a stock access to Middle Mountain. The trail has been maintained by dozer to install large waterbars to reduce erosion. This route will remain open to ATV traffic.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
7	480	30	2-2271.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-2271 (OHV trail cutting across the headwaters of Goff Creek from FR 250 to FR 280) - Increased OHV use in this area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer. Adequate vehicle access to this area already exists on roads 2-250.2 and 2-280.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. This trail has been open to ATV traffic since the area was closed to off road vehicular use. It was open area wide prior to that change. The trail offers opportunities for motorized access into remote hunting areas for hunting and game retrieval. It also provides for loop opportunities for ATV's and bicycles as well as foot and horse use during times other than hunting seasons.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
8	480	34	2-253.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes already designated under the current travel management plan that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed:

2-253.1 (Any vehicle route that parallels 2-250.2)-The existence of this road only intensifies road density issues in this area and is not necessary. Adequate any vehicle access currently exists off 2-252.1 and 2-254.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Road 2-253.1 is in a 5.13 Resource Production area for forest products. It is used for accessing areas for fuel wood, post and pole areas as well as dispersed camping and hunting access. It has been used in the past for commercial timber harvest. Closing this road would deny access for these important uses and for dispersed camping throughout the summer and through the hunting seasons.

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Blanco Ranger District

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
9	480	37	2-260.1, Cole Creek connector

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes not currently designated or proposed to be designated under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be opened:

Consider designation of OHV only route on existing “user created route” beginning on 2-260.1 (Sawmill Mountain Road) and running approximately due west adjacent to Cole Creek. The legal description for the route would be in T2N, R92W, sections: 25, 26, and 27. Then, CDOW recommends the route be terminated approximately one mile east of the Forest/private property boundary. This would enhance hunter access to the area and still minimize trespass issues that have occurred here historically.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We agree with your comment to reinstate this route for ATV use and access to the Coal Creek area. The access route will be shown as open to ATV, Motorcycle, foot and horse use and will terminate ¼ to ½ mile from the private land at the most logical point to physically close the trail.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
10	480	28	2-2823.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-2823 and road between 2-267 and 2-265 (OHV routes west of Sawmill Mountain) - Increased OHV use in this area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer and the result would be quicker movement to adjacent private lands. Adequate vehicle access to this area already exists on roads 2-267.1, 2-265.1, and 9-268.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We agree there is adequate motorized access in the area and this route 2-2823 will be closed on the map.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
11	328	1	2-289.1a

We own 40 of the acres in the Windy Bill in-holding in the Blanco Ranger District. In reviewing the travel management plan it appears that forest road 2-289.1a which is located on the Fawn Creek map does not accurately reflect the actual situation on the ground. The map indicates that that road ends at the border of Chuck Whiteman's property and it does not show the short spur on forest land that has been historically used to access our property. That spur branches off just before the road ends and has been in use for many years. I would like to have that fact reflected in the final plan. We have discussed this with Lynn Pettijohn of the Blanco Ranger District, who seemed to think it wouldn't be any problem.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The travel map incorrectly shows the road terminating prior to reaching the private land. This historical access will be shown correctly on the final map.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
12	40	1	2-289.1a

We own 40 of the acres in the Windy Bill in-holding in the Blanco ranger district. In reviewing the travel management plan it appears that forest road 2-289.1a which is located on the Fawn Creek map does not accurately reflect the actual situation on the ground. The map indicates that that road ends at the border of Chuck Whiteman's property and it does not show the short spur that has been historically used to access our property. That spur branches off just before the road ends and has been in use for many years. I would like to have that fact reflected in the final plan.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The travel map incorrectly shows the road terminating prior to reaching the private land. This historical access will be shown correctly on the final map.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
13	480	31	2-n105.1, 2-1838.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-N105.1 and 2-1838.1 (Two wheeled vehicles-motorcycles) – Increased use of Middle Miller Creek area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer. Adequate OHV and vehicle access to this area already exists on 2-217.1 and 2-218.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The trails in question provide for a variety of loop opportunities for motorcycles and bicycles as well as foot and horse traffic. These routes have been used for many years by motorcycles during the summer and fall seasons and will remain as marked on the map.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
14	480	27	2-n790.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-N790.1 (OHV route west/southwest of Aldrich Lakes)-Increased OHV use in this area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer and the result would be quicker

movement to adjacent private lands. Adequate vehicle access to this area already exists on roads 2-251 and 2-252.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We agree that this route will limit the refuge area for deer and elk. This user created route should have been closed during preliminary mapping and will be shown as closed on the final map.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
15	480	29	2-n7904.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-N7904.1 (OHV route from approximately the headwaters of the west fork of Fawn Creek to the Sleepy Cat Trail at the headwaters of Hahn Creek)-Increased OHV use in this area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer. Adequate vehicle access to this area already exists on roads 2-290.1, 2-2270.1, and 2-292.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The trail offers opportunities for motorized access into remote hunting areas for hunting and game retrieval. It also provides for loop opportunities for ATV's and bicycles as well as foot and horse use during times other than hunting seasons.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
16	480	33	2-N7905.2, 2-N7905.1

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes routes newly designated (marked) under Alt. G that CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would recommend be closed or re-classified in terms of designation:

2-N7905.2 and 2-N7905.1 (OHV routes in the vicinity of Cattle Creek)- Increased OHV use in this area would eliminate the effectiveness of refuge habitat for elk and deer and the result would be quicker movement to adjacent private lands. Adequate vehicle access to this area already exists on roads 2-250.2 and 2-235.1.

Response: Thank you for your comment. The trail offers opportunities for motorized access into remote hunting areas for hunting and game retrieval. It also provides for opportunities for ATV's and bicycles as well as foot and horse use during times other than hunting seasons.

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Blanco Ranger District

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
17	480	39	pagoda pk to cyclone

Blanco Ranger District:

The following list includes general comments on horse routes proposed and in need of proposal under Alt. G:

CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] recommends a proposed trail be created in conjunction with the Routt National forest from Pagoda Peak to Cyclone Park. Again, CDOW believes the creation and maintenance of this trail would enhance hunter's ability to access and retrieve animals from this area.

Response: Thank you for your comment. A trail in this area would be beneficial for hunting as access is difficult. Only a small portion of this trail would be on the White River National Forest and would not be useful if no trail was built onto the Routt. Access to the Route NF boundary is easily accomplished but the Rough Creek/Pagoda Creek to Cyclone park section on the Routt NF would be very difficult and costly. The cost of constructing and maintaining the proposed trail and the limited use of the proposed trail other than during the hunting seasons make it impractical on our limited maintenance and construction budgets.

	Letter Number	Comment Number	Category
18	509	102	ripple cr pass

Ripple Creek Pass Area/Blanco RD

Restrict snowmobile use to CR 8.1 and national forest land on the northwest side of the road in order to prevent motorized entry into the recommended wilderness area.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Your suggestion does present a boundary that is recognizable on the ground. It would be nice to use the road but there is a NRCS Sno-tel site, an air quality station and the only restroom facilities for miles on the proposed wilderness side of the road. With tracks going to all of these facilities it would be difficult if not impossible to keep others from following them and regulations to include some or all of these would be confusing. Snowmobile trespass onto the proposed wilderness has not been a problem as the southeast side of the road is mostly steep slopes and narrow canyons that make snowmobiling difficult. The excellent opportunities for snowmobiling on the northwest side also keep many from exploring the southeast side. The existing Flat Tops Wilderness along with the heavy timber and difficult terrain limit opportunities on the southeast side and although there have been occasional trespass into Wilderness along trail 2-1803 the number of violations have been few. Snowmobiles currently shortcut switchbacks on county road 8 but are out of the proposed wilderness. Trail 2-1803 will be signed as closed to snowmobile use and signs will be located where snowmobiles can access the southeast side of the road indicating where they can legally ride.

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	20	5-1001w.2a	Ten Mile Rainbow Lake/7th Street trail access (5-1001W.2A): Inaccurate line work – Route is not located on private property, rather starts at end of SCG open space at 7th St. Route connects with Peaks Trail (5+45.1) SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.	1001W.2A does begin at the Forest boundary and not on private land. The USFS will correct the mapping error.	Mapping, GIS
320	30	5-3.1b	Upper Blue South Barton-West (5-3.1B): Inaccurate line work: Map should show trail connection between 5-3.1B and 5-3.1C. SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.	The route in question was not included in the TMP inventory. It is included in the Breckenridge Nordic Center special use permit area and will be addressed in the plan of operations for the Nordic center.	Mapping, GIS
320	25	5-520w.3	Upper Blue Gilrose Back Door (5-520W.3): Inaccurate line work: Route terminates at private property. Remove from TMP.	520W.3 does terminate at private property and will be decommissioned.	Mapping, GIS
320	31	5-528.2	Upper Blue Route off Illinois Gulch Rd (5-528.2): Inaccurate line work: 5-528.2 should follow contour and connect with 5-559W.3. SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.	The Dillon RD will work with SCG to correct mapping errors.	Mapping, GIS
320	26	5-559w.2	Upper Blue Nightmare on Baldy (5-559W.2): Inaccurate line work: Route was realigned in 2008 to more sustainable grades. SCG staff will provide correct trail alignment data.	The Dillon RD will work with SCG to correct mapping errors.	Mapping, GIS
320	37	5-611w.2a	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Argentine Mountain 360 Trail (5-611W.2A) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Motorcycle – Recommendation: Reroute to address natural resource and sustainability issues.	The resource conditions of the Argentine Mountain 360 Trail (5-611W.2A) have not been thoroughly evaluated by the USFS and until a more detailed environmental analysis is completed the trail will be closed to all uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	36	5-751.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Breckenridge Ski Resort Road (5-751.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Managed under special use permit – Recommendation: Licensed and non-motorized use: Provides access to recreational opportunities outside of permit management area.	There is no legal access point for non-licensed vehicles. And there is no point on the ski area where a trailhead would be appropriate. It would be up to the county to designate a trailhead and make it legal per State law.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
373	6	1260w.2	Closure of 5-1260W.2, Upper Salt Lick Gulch Road to Mountain Bikers. Salt Lick Gulch Road is the center of the Salt Lick network of trails and should be open to the Eagles Nest Wilderness boundary. This network is adjacent to the busy Wilderndest neighborhood and offers one the few mountain biking areas in the heavily populated Silverthorne area. The Upper Salt Lick Gulch Road (shown as closed to mountain biking in Alt G), provides a challenging creek crossing and a couple of technical spots that make it an interesting trail for advanced beginner and intermediate riders. This terrain is perfectly suitable for mountain biking and is in great shape despite heavy use.	The upper portion of 1260W.2 enters the Eagles Nest Wilderndest Area which is closed to mountain bike use. The entire route is closed to mountain bike use to prevent unwanted trespass into the Wilderness.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
435	20	5-01452,5-01458	5-01452, 5-01458, THE SIBERIAN LOOP. There are two connections between these trails that are not reflected on the summer maps. One connects them in the middle, near the huts (Siberian Cutoff), and the other connects the northern ends via a trail called "Jeffrey's Biff." Jeffrey's Biff also exists as a summer route. We recommend that the mapping errors be corrected and the routes be identified for use. All of these routes are popular for the summer rider, runner and hiker. Portions of this road have revegetated to give it more of a single-track feel so please, do not allow future motorized use on this road in the summer.	These trails are within the Breckenridge Nordic Ski Area Permit boundary and are not inventoried on the summer maps, therefore are not considered in this analysis.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	48	5-1024.1w	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Snake River Basin Frey Gulch (5-1024.1W) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Motorcycle – Recommendation: Mechanized use: SCG holds non-motorized access easement for portion of trail through Caravelle subdivision.	Because of issues raised (noise, proximity to residences, and user conflicts), the final travel management plan will designate this route as open to non-motorized uses only (mountain biking, horseback riding, and hiking).	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
435	10	5-1029.1	5-1029.1, KEYSTONE AQUEDUCT TRAIL. Alternative G identifies this critical connection as closed to all users. This is a heavily used, sustainable, non-motorized trail that connects the Keystone Ranch area with Keystone via a contouring single-track. As with the Soda Creek Trail (5-316W.1B) mentioned above, this is a centerpiece to a functioning non-motorized network and should not be closed. This route also helps separate uses by taking the non-motorized use off of the Keystone Ranch Road. We recommend this trail be identified as open to all non-motorized uses.	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	47	5-1029.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Snake River Basin Soda Ridge (5-1029.1) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Mechanized use: Major connection between Summit Cove and Colorado Trail/Horseshoe Gulch.	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
446	8	5-1029.1	Soda Ridge Trail, 1029.1 - Keystone Ranch/Soda Creek: This is a trail very popular with mountain bikers and trail runners. It is a vital and popular link for residents of Keystone & Summit Cove to get to Keystone ranch without riding/walking or running on the paved road. It is mostly sustainable and only needs minor maintenance.	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	15	5-1029.1	Summer Routes; Upper Blue: 5-1029.1, Keystone Aqueduct Trail. Alternative G identifies this critical connection as closed to all users. This is a heavily used, sustainable, non-motorized trail that connects the Keystone Ranch area with Keystone via a contouring single-track. As with the Soda Creek Trail (5-3 16W. 1B) mentioned above, this is a centerpiece to a functioning non-motorized network and should not be closed. This route also helps separate uses by taking the non-motorized use off of the Keystone Ranch Road. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend this trail be identified as open to all non-motorized uses.	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
373	1	5-1029.1, 5-316w.1b	Closure of Trail 5-1029.1, Soda Ridge Trail, and a portion of Trail 5-316W-1B, Soda Creek Trail. The Summit Daily News stated some years back that if the neighborhoods in Summit Cove were incorporated, it would be the second largest city in the County. The Cove is densely populated since most homes are lived in full time by locals, mostly working families and a few retirees. Closure of these two trails completely isolates this large community from the trail network between Keystone Ranch and Tiger Road, which appears to be one of the favored areas for mountain biking in Alt G. Instead, residents must use the Keystone Ranch Road, a county paved road, and FS Road 5-N6031.1 to access the trail network behind the Ranch. FSR 5-N6031.1 is used by Keystone Ski Resort under a special use permit for hay and sleigh rides. Neither road has public parking. Under the preferred Alt D in the 2006 draft TMP, both of these trails were recommended for inclusion in the trail system. Closure would force residents to ride/walk roads when the existing trails provide a very pleasurable mountain biking and hiking experience. The 2008 DEIS Chapter 3, page 83, points out that roads are used mainly as access, not as part of the quality component of the activity itself. Page 108 states that Alt G considers adding routes that may be necessary for creating a quality user experience that were not previously legally available. We certainly think this applies in this case. These two trails make it possible to have a loop	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show these routes as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, they were erroneously identified as routes to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect these routes as designated as open to those uses as they are important non-motorized routes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
85	3	5-1029.1, 5-316w.1b, 5-n6031.1	<p>I support Alternative G, with the exception below, as the best balance between the interests of all users and wildlife and resource conservation.</p> <p>Closure of Trail 5-1029.1, Soda Ridge Trail, and a portion of Trail 5-316W-1B, Soda Creek Trail. The Summit Daily News stated some years back that if the neighborhoods in Summit Cove were incorporated, it would be the second largest city in the County. The Cove is densely populated since most homes are lived in full time by locals, mostly working families and a few retirees. Closure of these two trails completely isolates this large community from the trail network between Keystone Ranch and Tiger Road, which appears to be one of the favored areas for mountain biking in Alt G. Instead, residents must use the Keystone Ranch Road, a county paved road, and FS Road 5-N6031.1 to access the trail network behind the Ranch. FSR 5-N6031.1 is used by Keystone Ski Resort under a special use permit for hay and sleigh rides. Neither road has public parking. Under the preferred Alt D in the 2006 draft TMP, both of these trails were recommended for inclusion in the trail system.</p> <p>Closure would force residents to ride/walk roads when the existing trails provide a very pleasurable mountain biking and hiking experience. The 2008 DEIS Chapter 3, page 83, points out that roads are used mainly as access, not as part of the quality component of the activity itself. Page 108 states that Closure of a portion of Trails 5-120W.3 and 5-120W.3B. These two trails form one of three approved and improved access points to the trail system from Summit Cove on the west side of Keystone Ranch. When this part of Summit Cove was developed several years ago, the County worked very hard to assure access to the National Forest through easements and right of ways through private property. This is one of those access points. It is signed as a trailhead, has off road parking specifically for the trailhead, and the trail was even rerouted and rebuilt for sustainability when the parking area was built. Since it's right across the road from Summit Cove Elementary School, it's an ideal place for large groups such as ours to meet for rides in this area since the school provides overflow parking for the access point. Only one of the other access points has any parking; the second approved access point has no parking available.</p>	<p>The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show these routes as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, they were erroneously identified as routes to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect these routes as designated as open to those uses as they are important non-motorized routes.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
373	2	5-120w.3, 5-120w.3b	<p>Closure of a portion of Trails 5-120W.3 and 5-120W.3B. These two trails form one of three approved and improved access points to the trail system from Summit Cove on the west side of Keystone Ranch. When this part of Summit Cove was developed several years ago, the County worked very hard to assure access to the National Forest through easements and right of ways through private property. This is one of those access points. It is signed as a trailhead, has off road parking specifically for the trailhead, and the trail was even rerouted and rebuilt for sustainability when the parking area was built. Since it's right across the road from Summit Cove Elementary School, it's an ideal place for large groups such as ours to meet for rides in this area since the school provides overflow parking for the access point. Only one of the other access points has any parking; the second approved access point has no parking available.</p>	<p>120w.3 dead ends at private property and therefore will be closed. The trail from the trailhead in Summit Cove is 120w.5 which will be open to non-motorized uses. 120w.3b will also be open to non-motorized uses as part of that route.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
85	4	5-120w.3, 5-120w.3b	<p>I support Alternative G, with the exception below, as the best balance between the interests of all users and wildlife and resource conservation.</p> <p>Closure of a portion of Trails 5-120W.3 and 5-120W.3B. These two trails form one of three approved and improved access points to the trail system from Summit Cove on the west side of Keystone Ranch. When this part of Summit Cove was developed several years ago, the County worked very hard to assure access to the National Forest through easements and right of ways through private property. This is one of those access points. It is signed as a trailhead, has off road parking specifically for the trailhead, and the trail was even rerouted and rebuilt for sustainability when the parking area was built. Since its right across the road from Summit Cove Elementary School, it's an ideal place for large groups to meet for rides in this area since the school provides overflow parking for the access point. Only one of the other access points has any parking; the second approved access point has no parking available.</p>	<p>120w.3 dead ends at private property and therefore will be closed. The trail from the trailhead in Summit Cove is 120w.5 which will be open to non-motorized uses. 120w.3b will also be open to non-motorized uses as part of that route.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
446	7	5-120w.3, 5-120w.3b, 120w.4	<p>Soda Creek, 5-120W.3, 5-120W.3B, 120W.4 - Keystone Ranch/Soda Creek: Short dense trail system accessed by official Summit County Open Space (SCOS) trailheads with easements through private property. These provide short loop opportunities for Summit Cove residents for dog walking, etc as well as easy access to the wider Soda creek trail system. Some of these trails were improved by SCOS in the late 90s and early 2000s</p>	<p>120w.3 dead ends at private property and therefore will be closed. The trail from the trailhead in Summit Cove is 120w.5 which will be open to non-motorized uses. 120w.3b will also be open to non-motorized uses as part of that route. 120w.4 will also be part of that route, however, the southern end is a dead end route that will be closed.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/M anagement</p>
432	17	5-120w.3, 5-120w.3b, 120w.4	<p>Summit Cove: Trails 5-120W.3, 5-120W.3B and 120W.4 are very important in that they form parts of approved access points (along the west side of Keystone Ranch) from Summit Cove to the Soda Creek trail system. When this area of Summit Cove was developed, Summit County Government assured continued access from neighborhoods to this area via several access points, which connect to these trails. Volunteer projects and signage have occurred to reroute and designate these as official access points. These trails are a significant part of a small, dense and heavily used trail system just above a large neighborhood. This trail system is an excellent example of the value of having a higher than normal density of trails close to an urban area to better concentrate use, which helps immensely with effective management and resource protection. So, in addition to the access and connections these trails provide, they act as short, high quality recreation experiences for nearby residents.</p>	<p>120w.3 dead ends at private property and therefore will be closed. The trail from the trailhead in Summit Cove is 120w.5 which will be open to non-motorized uses. 120w.3b will also be open to non-motorized uses as part of that route. 120w.4 will also be part of that route, however, the southern end is a dead end route that will be closed.</p>	<p>Private Property</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	6	5-1260w.2	SALT LICK/UPPER RYAN GULCH (1260W.2 The Upper Salt Lick Trail is a great single-track through an open meadow that unfortunately enters wilderness for a very short section. Can we either move the wilderness boundary to exclude this miniscule section of trail, or can we make official the social trail which has developed which connects this trail over to the Middle Salt Creek region?	The upper portion of 1260W.2 enters the Eagles Nest Widernest Area which is closed to mountain bike use. The entire route is closed to mountain bike use to prevent unwanted trespass into the Wilderness Until an alternative route is proposed that will redirect mountain bike use outside of the Wilderness and connects to one of the adjacent trails that is open to bikes, the route will remain open only to hike and horse use .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
432	12	5-1260w.2	Silverthorne: I do not support the closure of 5-1260W.2 (Salt Lick Gulch Road) to mountain bikes and recommends that this route remain open to mountain bikes up to the Eagles Nest Wilderness Boundary. This route is the main artery within the Salt Lick trail system and it located right in the middle of the entire system. It is adjacent to the very dense Widernest neighborhood and all trails within this area should remain open to all non-motorized users for the following reason. Although, on a map, there appears to be too many trails within the relatively small area between the Widernest/Mesa Cortina neighborhood and the Wilderness boundary, there is great value to having an extensive trail network adjacent to an urban area. Close-in trails that provide satisfying recreational experiences (a variety of short loops, several options, etc) helps to concentrate heavy use. If close-in trails are closed, it only pushes the heavy use deeper into the backcountry, where the environment is often more sensitive. Dense trail systems near neighborhoods help to concentrate use, which facilitates more effective management and resource protection. If the rationale for closing the upper part of the Salt Lick trail to Upper Salt Lick Rd, 1260W.2 - Ryan Gulch: Upper Salt lick rd is a wonderful mountain biking trail that unfortunately for mountain bikers, enters the Eagles Nest Wilderness which has led to some problems of mountain bikers entering prohibited areas. The solution to this problem should be to keep the trail open to mountain bikes and built a connector trail to Middle Salt Creek trail1260W.2. This is a project that has been discussed between the SFTS and the Friends of the Eagles Nest that could be jointly built by those two organization pending approval by the USFS.	The upper portion of 1260W.2 enters the Eagles Nest Widernest Area which is closed to mountain bike use. The entire route is closed to mountain bike use to prevent unwanted trespass into the Wilderness Until an alternative route is proposed that will redirect mountain bike use outside of the Wilderness and connects to one of the adjacent trails that is open to bikes, the route will remain open only to hike and horse use .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	15	5-1260w.2	Upper Salt Lick Rd, 1260W.2 - Ryan Gulch: Upper Salt lick rd is a wonderful mountain biking trail that unfortunately for mountain bikers, enters the Eagles Nest Wilderness which has led to some problems of mountain bikers entering prohibited areas. The solution to this problem should be to keep the trial open to mountain bikes and built a connector trail to Middle Salt Creek trail1260W.2. This is a project that has been discussed between the SFTS and the Friends of the Eagles Nest that could be jointly built by those two organization pending approval by the USFS.	The upper portion of 1260W.2 enters the Eagles Nest Widernest Area which is closed to mountain bike use. The entire route is closed to mountain bike use to prevent unwanted trespass into the Wilderness Until an alternative route is proposed that will redirect mountain bike use outside of the Wilderness and connects to one of the adjacent trails that is open to bikes, the route will remain open only to hike and horse use .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	131	5-1350.1	Rock Creek Rd (1350) There is no winter motorized use allowed on this road, which skiers and snowshoers are thrilled to see. It never did get much snowmobile use, but it is one of the best and unique Nordic skis in the Gore range because it is a road and not that steep yet still offers incredible Gore Range scenery. Because it is so close to wilderness and such a short stretch, we agree that keeping this closed to motorized makes sense.	This comment agrees with the recommended TMP to allow non-motorized winter use on Rock Creek Road.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	59	5-2108.3 Colorado trail	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-2108.3, Colorado Trail. On the east side of the North Fork of the Swan River, there is a snowmobile route that is shown accessing a summer route that is indicated to be closed to the public. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend removing this short section of trail from a winter motorized use designation.</p>	<p>Route 354.1 is a winter route only managed in accordance the operation plan of Good Times Adventures. It is not open to public use in the summer.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	3	5-2257.1	<p>2257.1 (LENAWEE TRAIL) Thanks so much for leaving this open to mountain bikes. This trail isn't used much, but it does provide an incredible high alpine experience and it has managed to stay in good shape in the last twenty years that we've been riding it.</p>	Thanks for the comment.	General Support
436	121	5-275.1	<p>HUNKIDORI MINE ROAD (276.1) (new designation)</p> <p>Thrilled to see that this is now officially a non-motorized winter and summer route, which historically has been the type of use it received, although lately winter motorized were heading up this road. It is wonderful to have this option in Montezuma since so much of it is motorized.</p>	Thanks for the comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
163	1	5-275.1	<p>I am writing concerning a non-maintained forest service road that begins bordering our town. The road is known locally as Sts. John Road and is identified on your locality map as 5-275.1 in Summit County. It is a very popular road and is used though out the year by vehicle and pedestrian traffic in the summer and skiers/snowmobiles in the winter. For decades the junction of this road with our main street has been used by skiers and in the past few years' snowmobiles to access the abundant forest service lands beyond.</p> <p>In the past the county has obliged by plowing enough space for folks to park. The town is small and provides no snow maintenance at all. Recently many properties in that area of town have sold and are being developed. As they surveyed their lots we find the area being used for parking was on private lands. This has caused great difficulty in our town. There is no legal parking for that area.</p> <p>Recently we met with Jan Cutts, our new district ranger and Paul Semmer USFS who has worked with the town in the past, at our regular town meeting in September. John Minor, Summit County Sheriff and Ric Pocius, County Engineer also attended to discuss possible solutions.</p> <p>We all agreed the designated use for the road was correct and wish everyone to have access to public lands. We also agreed that an educational approach would be a good way to address the problem, backed up with warnings from the sheriff's dept. The county is no longer plowing the area and we are putting up no parking signs to inform the public. The local USFS Silverthorne</p>	<p>Management of trailheads is not part of this process, however, the Dillon Ranger District will continue to work with the parties involved on this issue.</p>	Meetings/Collaboration (Public)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	118	5-275.1	SAINTS JOHN ROAD (275.1) (new restrictions) Since the northern side of this road falls into the 5.5 lynx habitat prescription, we assume this is why you set the new standard that motorized use must now stay on this road, although there is unrestricted use close to its southern side.	That is a correct assumption. The 5.5 management area is managed for mammal landscape linkages.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	120	5-275.1	SAINTS JOHN ROAD (275.1) (new restrictions) This is great news for the backcountry skier and rider since much of their terrain was also to the north of this road.	This comment agrees with the recommended TMP to allow snowmobile use only on the Sts John road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	119	5-275.1	SAINTS JOHN ROAD (275.1) (new restrictions) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] suspect that this new ruling will be ignored and we hope that the Forest Service will post numerous signs to educate all users as to this new restriction and why it is there.	The Forest will use several methods to educate the public about appropriate motorized uses.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
342	1	5-275.1	The proposed bubble for snowmobile use in Summit County engulfs our town on the east, south and west sides. In my previous letter concerning the lack of parking and access on Sts. John Rd. (5-275.1) to the west of town I expressed the fact that there is literally no parking on the streets and roads in town during the winter.	Management of trailheads is not part of this process, however, the Dillon Ranger District will continue to work with the parties involved on this issue.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
320	50	5-276.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Snake River Basin Hunki Dori Road (5-276.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Mechanized – Recommendation: Mechanized: Separation of use and wildlife concerns.	Thanks for the comment. This route will go forward as mechanized in the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	87	5-2840.1	FSR 2840.1 Lonesome Gulch/Dillon RD The whole lower Blue River valley comprises critical elk habitat, and the Williams Fork roadless area in particular has the greatest diversity of migration corridor, production area and winter range in the whole valley. It makes no sense to fragment it with short spur roads of limited recreational or other value. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] support the closure and decommissioning of FSR 2840.1 as recommended in the DEIS Alternative E.	FSR 2840.1 Lonesome Gulch/Dillon RD is open to the specified uses to allow for hunting access and wildlife management.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
509	88	5-2845.1	<p>FSR 2845.1 Shane Gulch/Dillon RD</p> <p>The whole lower Blue River valley comprises critical elk habitat, and the Williams Fork roadless area in particular has the greatest diversity of migration corridor, production area and winter range in the whole valley. It makes no sense to fragment it with short spur roads of limited recreational or other value. Alternative G would reduce the level of use of 2845.1 from all vehicles to mountain bike or non-mechanized travel. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] support a further reduction in intensity of use to hiking only, as recommended in the DEIS Alternative E.</p>	<p>FSR 2845.1 Shane Gulch/Dillon RD is open to the specified uses to allow for diverse recreation opportunities for visitors to the Green Mountain Reservoir area during the summer season.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
509	89	5-2850w.1	<p>FSR 2850W.1 Cottonwood Gulch, FSR 2855.1 Mumford Gulch/Dillon RD</p> <p>The whole lower Blue River valley comprises critical elk habitat, and the Williams Fork roadless area in particular has the greatest diversity of migration corridor, production area and winter range in the whole valley. It makes no sense to fragment it with short spur roads of limited recreational or other value. All alternatives include this road as a full size vehicle route but we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] still urge you to reduce the intensity of use to non-mechanized travel only for the reasons above. Barring that, we cannot comprehend or support linking 2855.1 to the non-system 2850W.1 in order to create a fully motorized loop through a roadless area when both Alternatives E and F recommend decommissioning it and the No Action alternative classifies it as closed. We recommend decommissioning 2850W.1 at the very least.</p>	<p>FSR 2850W.1 Cottonwood Gulch/Dillon RD is open to the specified uses to allow for diverse recreation opportunities for visitors to the Green Mountain Reservoir area during the summer season as well as providing hunting access and wildlife management.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
436	122	5-290.1	<p>STAR OF THE WEST (290) off Deer Creek Road</p> <p>Once again we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] are requesting that this route be closed to motorized. It sees very little winter motorized use, yet is a great Nordic ski tour or backcountry ski zone. It is a small corner of the Deer Creek Valley that could be sacrificed to the non-motorized user.</p>	<p>It would be very difficult to manage a small pod of non-motorized use within a large motorized area. The nearby Peru Creek drainage provides for non-motorized winter recreation.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
480	53	5-2950.1, 9-2859.2A, 9-2900.1, 5-2851.1, 5-2855.1(3A & 3B), 5-2849.1, 5-2848.1, 5-2845.1, 5-2840.1, 9-2950.5A, 5-N262.1.	<p>Dillon Ranger District:</p> <p>Routes 1) The roads listed below should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 5-2950.1, 9-2859.2A, 9-2900.1, 5-2851.1, 5-2855.1(3A & 3B), 5-2849.1, 5-2848.1, 5-2845.1, 5-2840.1, 9-2950.5A, 5-N262.1.</p> <p>Currently, these roads allow for licensed and unlicensed vehicles during the summer and the roads are closed during the winter. These roads provide for a network of access to historical hunting areas. Conflicts with other user groups have not been an issue in this area. Abuse by motorized vehicles has also not been an issue in this area. Keeping this area open to motorized use (licensed and unlicensed) is important for big game harvest. Maintaining the closure during the winter months is needed in this area as this area is critical winter range for both deer and elk.</p>	There are many roads in the area east of Green Mountain Reservoir. The TMP decision provides for allowing a system of travel routes that balances the needs of natural resources, allows for diverse recreation opportunities for visitors to the Green Mountain Reservoir area during the summer season, hunting access and wildlife management.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	30	5-3.1b, 5-3.1c	<p>SIBERIAN LOOP (BRECKENRIDGE NORDIC CENTER, 3.1B, 3.1C)</p> <p>These trails are non-motorized in the summer and are finally growing back in the summer to look like narrow trails on this old roadbed. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] realize this falls within a ski area permit, but we do want to include in the SDEIS that these are considered non-motorized routes, so please be sensitive to this popular public perception and we hope it will remain this way year round. It is especially popular as a winter non-motorized Nordic, since it falls so closely to the popular Peaks Trail. Siberian Loop is used mostly by locals since visitors to the Nordic center find it too steep and long. Peak 7 residents love this area for walking the dog. Moose, mountain lion and bear have all been seen in this area and it deserves a higher level of environmental protection.</p> <p>There are two connections within the Siberian Loop that are not reflected on the winter maps. One connects them in the middle, near the huts (Siberian Cutoff), and the other connects the northern ends via a trail called "Jeffrey's Biff." Jeffrey's Biff also exists as a summer route. We recommend that the mapping errors be corrected.</p>	3.1b and 3.1c are not proposed for motorized winter use. These Siberian Loop trails are within the Breckenridge Nordic Ski Area Permit boundary and are not inventoried on the summer maps, therefore are not considered in this analysis.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	17	5-3.1b, 5-3.1c	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-3.1B and 5-3.1C, South Barton West and South Barton South Trails (A.k.a. Siberian Loop). This is a heavily used winter ski touring route that is also part of the Breckenridge Nordic Center. There is a summer (and winter) route that connects the northern ends of these two routes (Jeffrey's Biff) and should be included on the map for summer non-motorized use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that Jeffrey's Biff be added for both summer and winter non-motorized uses.</p>	These trails are within the Breckenridge Nordic Ski Area Permit boundary and are not inventoried on the summer maps, therefore are not considered in this analysis.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	16	5-3.1d	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-3.1D, Middle Barton Trail, North. The line work for this trail appears incomplete, because the trail connects all the way to the Peaks Trail, creating a loop. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the map be corrected to create a loop all the way to the Peaks Trail and the non-motorized use designation remain.</p>	Mapping error noted. The route does connect to the Peaks Trail and will be included in the inventory and designated as non-motorized uses.	Mapping, GIS
320	28	5-3.1d	<p>Upper Blue</p> <p>Middle Barton Trail-North (5-3.1D): Inaccurate line work: Trail should connect with Peaks Trail to the west. SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.</p>	Mapping error noted. The route does connect to the Peaks Trail and will be included in the inventory and designated as non-motorized uses.	Mapping, GIS
435	9	5-316w.1b	<p>5-316W.1B, SODA CREEK TRAIL. Alternative G identifies this critical connection as closed to all uses. This is a heavily used, sustainable, non-motorized trail that connects the Colorado Trail/Horseshoe Gulch area with Summit Cove and the Soda Creek area. This is very important, sustainable connection that should not be closed. We recommend this trail be identified as open to all non-motorized uses, as it has been for many years.</p>	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	46	5-316w.1b	<p>Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations:</p> <p>Snake River Basin</p> <p>Soda Creek (5-316W.1B) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Mechanized use: Major connection between Keystone Ranch and Colorado Trail/Horseshoe Gulch.</p>	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	6	5-316w.1b	<p>Soda Creek, 316W.1B - Keystone Ranch/Soda Creek: This is a vital part of the Summit Cove/Soda creek trail system. It provides high quality loop opportunities with the rest of the Soda Creek trail system. Closing this trail also isolates trails 132W.2 & N817.1 from loop opportunities with the upper Soda Creek trail system and the Colorado trail. this trail has some short</p>	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	14	5-316w.1b	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-316W.1B, Soda Creek Trail. Alternative G identifies this critical connection as closed to all uses. This is a heavily used, sustainable, non- motorized trail that connects the Colorado Trail/Horseshoe Gulch area with Summit Cove and the Soda Creek area. This is very important, sustainable connection that should not be closed. We recommend this trail be identified as open to all non-motorized uses, including bicycles, as it has been for many years.</p>	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	16	5-316w.1b, 5-1029.1	Keystone: I do not support the closures of 5-316W.1B (Soda Creek Trail) and 5-1029.1 (Keystone Aqueduct Trail) and recommend that these trails are designated as open to all non-motorized users, as they have been for many years. 5-316W.1B, a sustainable, beautifully aligned trail, is one of the most important trails in the Soda Creek area, as it helps create the main loop out of Summit Cove/Keystone and it one of only 2 direct connections from the Keystone area to the Colorado Trail and Horseshoe Gulch. Closing this trail isolates trails 132W.2 and N817.1 from loop opportunities with the Colorado Trail and much of the Soda Creek trail system. In addition, this closure would concentrate heavy use onto only one trail out of Keystone/Summit Cove, creating potential for high levels of impact and user conflicts. 5-1029.1 is a heavily used, sustainable route that connects the greater Keystone area with Summit Cove and provides a critical connection to the Soda Creek trail system because it provides the only option for forest users to the busy, paved Keystone Ranch Road. This trail is also one of the crucial connections for the entire trail system in this area. As well, under in the 2006 TMP/Preferred	The intent for the SDEIS in Alternative G was to show this route as open to mountain bike, horseback, and hiking, however, it was erroneously identified as a route to be closed. The final Travel Management Plan will reflect this route as designated as open to those uses as it is an important non-motorized route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
429	1	5-331.1	N331.1 EISENHOWER TUNNEL TRAIL – I would like this trail left open to mountain bikes. Few mountain bikers use the trail; therefore, their use has little or no impact on the environment or wildlife. Nevertheless, this short section of trail is critical to some mountain bike rides. It is the only trail in the area in which a rider can get over the Continental Divide. That trail is necessary to connect the Bakerville Trail, and the Loveland Ski area roads on the East side of the Continental Divide with the Straight Creek trail on the West side of the Continental Divide. Closing this very short section of trail over the top of the Eisenhower Tunnel would deny a needed access for long, cross-country mountain bike rides that need to cross the Continental Divide.	The route in question is open only to non-mechanized use in order to protect the high alpine environment. In addition, the route follows the corridor of a buried gas line and was not designed/constructed as a sustainable for mountain bike use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	17	5-351.1	COPPER MOUNTAIN AND SOUTH WHEELER FLATS TRAIL 351.1 (new designation) We [High Country Snowmobile Club] are disappointed to see this road closed to snowmobiles. For years, many local snowmobile riders have traveled from the outskirts of Frisco and have used this trail to access Mayflower Gulch and the Chicago Ridge area. We feel it is a great benefit to allow people to access trails close to their home that bring them into the national forest.	There is no need to provide motorized winter access to Mayflower Gulch as it is closed to that use. Also, there is no legal public access to Chicago Ridge from this trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	125	5-351.1	WHEELER FLATS TRAIL 351.1 (new designation) Just in the last few years snowmobiles were using this flat route to access the Sky Chutes and highmarking up the base of these avalanche chutes. Not only was this extremely dangerous, but it ruined the quiet and primitive experience of this entire western end of the Tenmile area which is still largely untouched.	The non-motorized designation addresses this concern.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	123	5-351.1	WHEELER FLATS TRAIL 351.1 (new designation) This road is within an 8.32 prescription, 'utility corridors' and it is now closed to winter motorized use despite falling within an area that could have restricted motorized use.	This trail does not access a winter motorized trail network .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	124	5-351.1	WHEELER FLATS TRAIL 351.1 (new designation) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] thank the WRNF for making this new designation. This is a super ski trail because it is so flat and easy and one of the few ski trails near Copper Mountain. It is one of the few beginner ski trails in the county.	Thanks for the comment.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	99	5-352.1	Summit Gulch (352.1) If this is just a mapping error, please consider instead of having Rock Island Gulch (355W.1B) as the only non-motorized winter route from the north. This is another incredibly beautiful road that is adjacent to Brown's Gulch, where special emphasis has been made on protecting its natural resources.	352.1 Summit Gulch Road, as it crosses NFS land on the lower end, is under easement to Summit County Government. It is under jurisdiction of the county as a public road to provide access to private lands. The upper portion of the route on NFS lands is open to snowmobile use.	Designation of Lands
436	97	5-352.1	Summit Gulch (352.1) It appears that where this road travels through WRNF land, winter motorized use is not allowed. This could be a mapping error, but if not, the non-motorized community will take advantage of this beautiful route into the heart of the Golden Horseshoe. This is one of the few non-motorized routes from the northern side of this zone.	352.1 Summit Gulch Road, as it crosses NFS land on the lower end, is under easement to Summit County Government. It is under jurisdiction of the county as a public road to provide access to private lands. The upper portion of the route on NFS lands is open to snowmobile use.	Designation of Lands
436	98	5-352.1	Summit Gulch (352.1) Some kind of winter parking for the non-motorized user (or a route from the Dredge parking lot) needs to be considered for access to trail GH-82, Discovery Trail.	Management of trailheads is not part of this process, however, the Dillon Ranger District will continue to work with the parties involved on this issue.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
320	41	5-354.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin North Fork Skid Road (5-354.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Closed: Not needed, alternative route provided.	The designation of decommission addresses this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	42	5-354.1 spur	<p>Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations:</p> <p>Upper Blue Basin</p> <p>Spur off of North Fork (5-354.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Closed: Not needed, alternative route provided.</p>	The designation of decommission addresses this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	112	5-354.2, 5-356.1	<p>NORTH FORK OF SWAN (354.2), WISE MTN RD. (356.1) (new designations)</p> <p>It was great to see that Wise Mtn. Road is now closed to winter motorized use, not only for the prime backcountry ski terrain it offers to the Nordic skier, but also because this is significant wildlife habitat. Conditions on the road from snowmobile use had made this ski route too dangerous to use. Snowmobiles also had a rough time getting up this road and were always getting stuck. So thanks.</p>	This comment supports Alternative G and was considered for final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	113	5-354.2, 5-356.1	<p>NORTH FORK OF SWAN (354.2), WISE MTN RD. (356.1) (new designations)</p> <p>Unfortunately, Wise Mtn. summit and road 356.1 which goes across the summit is also the boundary line between “closed to motorized” to “unrestricted motorized” as it heads eastward. It seems obvious that snow machines will just descend down Wise Mtn. Road, despite it being closed. Wouldn't it make sense to create more of a buffer around Wise Mtn and the North Fork and change the boundary and the road from Wise Mtn (356.1) closed to motorized as it heads east and open it back up to unrestricted motorized when it links onto 275.1?</p>	The boundary line between "closed to motorized" and "unrestricted motorized" is based on WRNFL&MP management areas (5.5 Forested Flora and Fauna and 4.31 Recreation, respectively). The boundary between the two management areas is defined as generally the treeline and above treeline elevation. Due to the topography and open above treeline character of the area along the divide it is not practical to move the boundary to the east.	Designation of Lands
436	111	5-354.2, 5-356.1	<p>NORTH FORK OF SWAN (354.2), WISE MTN RD. (356.1) (new designations)</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] question how well this closure will be respected and we suggest closing this road sooner, right after the play area to avoid temptation. If the closure to motorized was placed right after the play area, you would also eliminate having to install a second gate at the junction with Wise Mountain road.</p> <p>This would also give the non-motorized user one small route amongst hundreds of acres dedicated to the winter motorized community (from the northern end of the Golden Horseshoe, all the way to the eastern end of Montezuma). In order to truly protect this area for lynx habitat, you need to eliminate motorized use – in summer and winter.</p>	The boundary line between "closed to motorized" and "unrestricted motorized" is based on WRNFL&MP management areas (5.5 Forested Flora and Fauna and 4.31 Recreation, respectively). The boundary between the two management areas is defined as generally the treeline and above treeline elevation. Due to the topography and open above treeline character of the area along the divide it is not practical to move the boundary to the east.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	110	5-354.2, 5-356.1	NORTH FORK OF SWAN (354.2), WISE MTN RD. (356.1) (new designations) We're [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] assuming that the abrupt closure to motorized a few miles up the North Fork Road is because it enters the Forest Plan 5.5 prescription which is intended to protect lynx habitat and travel corridors. Motorized use does reduce habitat effectiveness, and increases stress on wildlife (SDEIS p. 163).	The boundary line between "closed to motorized" and "unrestricted motorized" is based on WRNFL&MP management areas (5.5 Forested Flora and Fauna and 4.31 Recreation, respectively). The boundary between the two management areas is defined as generally the treeline and above treeline elevation. Due to the topography and open above treeline character of the area along the divide it is not practical to move the boundary to the east.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	40	5-354.2a	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin North Fork Skid Road (5-354.2A) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Motorized – Recommendation: Motorized: Connects to non-motorized Colorado Trail.	The non-motorized designation addresses this concern.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	39	5-356.4a	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Ridge Spur Road on Wise Mountain (5-356.4A) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Closed: Not needed, alternative route provided.	The designation of decommission addresses this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	20	5-38.1	Keystone: I do not support the closures of 5-316W.1B (Soda Creek Trail) and 5-1029.1 (Keystone Aqueduct Trail) and recommend that these trails are designated as open to all non-motorized users, as they have been for many years. 5-316W.1B, a sustainable, b	These routes are being added to the system for summer non-motorized uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	144	5-38.1	MINERS CREEK TRAIL (38.1) In the past few years, snowmobiles have illegally left the Miners Creek Road and traveled on the Miners Creek Trail to access the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. Please, a gate up here should be top priority.	The District is working to build a fence at that location.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
436	146	5-38.1	MINERS CREEK TRAIL (38.1) Peaks 1-4 are prime backcountry ski terrain but other than Peak 1, they see light use. It is very disturbing to work so hard to ski these Peaks, only to find the lower half filled with snowmobile tracks.	Peaks 1-4 are closed to snowmobile use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	145	5-38.1	MINERS CREEK TRAIL (38.1) This is pristine, primitive terrain and we are thrilled to see is still non-motorized. Of all our requests for gates, this trail deserves your foremost attention. You cannot expect to manage this during the winter months since access is difficult, and one gate would eliminate this illegal activity.	The District is working to build a fence at that location.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
435	19	5-39.1	5.39.1 WHEELER TRAIL FROM HOOSIER PASS TO MCCULLOUGH GULCH – Please realize that this alignment for this section of the Wheeler Trail is incomplete and not finished. Also missing are the three jeep roads on the west side of CR 851. These roads offer some nice loop options for the mountain biker and currently some of these jeep roads are part of the Wheeler Trail alignment. These roads are in fine shape, and it seems like it would take more work to close and enforce then it would to leave them open to bikes.	The District will work to repair this route. Roads not inventoried are not considered in this analysis.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	10	5-40w.1a	Summer Routes; Upper Blue: 5-40W.1A, Aspen Grove Trail. We [Town of Breckenridge] agree with the designation of this route as open to non-motorized uses, including bicycles. However, the line work on the map is inaccurate as currently presented. The route begins south of the junction of Boreas Pass Road and the Baker's Tank Trail, rather than north of that junction as shown on the map. Also, the trail does not cross Boreas Pass Road by Illinois Creek, but rather connects to the southernmost portion of the broad turn on Lower Boreas Pass Road. Town staff is willing to work with USFS staff to improve the line work for this trail, especially as it gets closer to being distributed for public way finding purposes. We recommend the non-motorized designation remain, but the line work be corrected.	The map will be corrected.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	24	5-40w.1a	Upper Blue Aspen Grove Trail (5-40W.1A): Inaccurate line work: Route begins south of the junction of Boreas Pass Road and Baker's Tank Trail, rather than north of junction. Trail connects to southernmost portion of the broad turn on Boreas Pass Road, rather than crossing road by Illinois Creek. SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.	The map will be corrected.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
509	40	5-41.1	FST 41.1 Corral Creek/Dillon RD Alternative G would create a new and more intensive use by opening this short spur trail into a de facto wilderness to mountain bikes. This seems inappropriate and redundant: there is no proper trailhead at the start of the route, which is the shoulder of Interstate 70. To get to it one must ride down the paved bike path from Vail Pass and pass under the westbound barrel of the interstate next to Corral Creek and back up to the actual trail on a user-created path. There are numerous other and more interesting and appropriate mountain-biking opportunities in the Vail Pass/Copper Mountain area, including Wilder Gulch, almost directly opposite Corral Creek on the west side of the highway.	The original intent in Alternative G was to provide for a mountain bike loop opportunity, however, the link to Vail Pass does not exist, therefore, the issue raised here will be addressed by restricting use to hiking and horseback.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	44	5-44.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Upper Crystal Lake (5-44.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Mechanized – Recommendation: Mechanized: Resource protection and separation of use. Shared route provided to Crystal Lake.	The non-motorized designation addresses this concern.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	41	5-44.1	FST 44.1 Crystal Lake/Dillon RD It seems unnecessary to maintain this miners' road across a major talus slope as a mountain bike route when there are so many other roads and trails in the Tenmile Range that are more heavily used and desirable. It is our understanding that the local mountain bikers are generally satisfied with the road up to the Lower Crystal Lake and are not particularly interested in the rough road to the upper lake. Most of the other alpine valleys in the Tenmile Range are open to motorized and mechanized use: We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend reserving this one for pedestrian use.	The goal of the TMP is to provide a balance of uses while emphasizing separation of uses where practicable. The Crystal Lakes road provides mountain bike opportunities along an historic road profile in a high elevation setting not otherwise available to mountain bike use in the Tenmile range.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	45	5-44w.2a	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Lower Crystal Lake (5-44W.2A) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Closed: Resource protection.	This comment agrees with the recommended TMP to close route 44w.2a.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	33	5-45.1	PEAKS TRAIL (45.1) Occasionally snowmobiles illegally cross the Peaks Trail (from CR3 and Slalom Drive) and continue onto the Siberian Loop. BSA has signed these entry points.	Thanks for the comment and for the signing.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	32	5-45.1	<p>PEAKS TRAIL (45.1)</p> <p>This is the renowned winter and summer trail in the Breckenridge and Frisco area. The initial southern portion falls within a ski area prescription but we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe this trail should be removed from this permit boundary and instead given a national historical trail status, due to its longstanding popularity and incredible terrain for skiing, hiking and mountain biking. We must protect this trail from the nearby heavy development – preserve parking, keep a 300 foot buffer of trees around it. Please leave it out of a ski area permit zone since it has been a Nordic non-permit trail for many years.</p>	<p>Pursuing National Historic Trail Status is out of the scope of this proposal. Parking and vegetation management are also out of the scope of this proposal. Management to the Peaks Trail (portion) will be incorporated into the operation plan for the Nordic and Ski area permits.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
436	36	5-45.1	<p>PEAKS TRAIL (45.1)</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] also recommend a new parking area designed at the top of Slalom Drive so that we can have access to the high country of Peak 6 through Peak 3. This is one of the quickest routes to these distant summits in the winter.</p>	<p>Management of trailheads is not part of this process, however, the Dillon Ranger District will continue to work with the parties involved on this issue.</p>	<p>Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)</p>
436	35	5-45.1	<p>PEAKS TRAIL (45.1)</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] want it to be known that 3.1 A and 3.1 D (from the northern end of Coyne Valley rd) are great non-motorized links to the Peaks Trail both summer and winter. Parking at the bottom for winter would be appreciated. These two trails aren't as well known, but we expect more folks to discover these routes, especially as the Peak 7 and 8 developments crowd the Breckenridge end of this trail.</p>	<p>This comment supports the designation of 3.1A and 3.1D as non-motorized. Management of trailheads is not part of this process, however, the Dillon Ranger District will continue to work with the parties involved on this issue.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
436	34	5-45.1	<p>PEAKS TRAIL (45.1)</p> <p>You are missing numerous trails throughout the Peak 7 neighborhood and comments were given on these a few years back. Some of these seem to meet the 7.1 intermix Forest Plan designation but do deserve future attention to management.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
320	38	5-520w.1	<p>Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations:</p> <p>Upper Blue Basin</p> <p>West side of Mount Baldy Road (5-520WW.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Closed – Recommendation: Closed: Not needed, alternative route provided.</p>	<p>The designation of decommission addresses this issue.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	12	5-520w.3, 5-538w.1, 5-528.1b	<p>5-520W.3, UPPER BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD; 5-538W.1, ILLINOIS GULCH ROAD; AND 5-528.1B, BOREAS PASS</p> <p>It appears that a mapping error has occurred in this area. These routes are all designated as open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles in Alternative G, but there is no legal access for unlicensed vehicles to them or from them. We recommend that the primary switch-backed Baldy Mountain Road be designated for licensed vehicle use only, and the rest of the routes in that area be designated as open to non-motorized use only. This designation would allow licensed vehicle access to Iowa Mill and above, but would discourage the proliferation of user-created motorbike trails on the western face of Baldy and in the 3.1 Backcountry Non-Motorized management prescriptions. Such a designation would also reduce unlicensed vehicle access on Sallie Barber Road.</p>	<p>The routes in question are located in the 7.1 management area, which does allow for motorized and non-motorized recreation uses. However, to access the routes one must use roads under county jurisdiction, which currently does not allow unlicensed motorized use. The comment is valid in that there is a designation error in the mapping. The final decision will change the designation of routes 520W.3, 5-538W.1, and 5-528.1B, to licensed vehicles only.</p>	Mapping, GIS
285	23	5-520w.3, 5-538w.1, 5-528.1b	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-520W.3, Upper Baldy Mountain Road; 5-538W.1, Illinois Gulch Road; and 5-528.1B, Boreas Pass. It appears that a mapping error has occurred in this area. These routes are all designated as open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles in Alternative G, but there is no legal access for unlicensed vehicles to them or from them. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the primary switch-backed Baldy Mountain Road be designated for licensed vehicle use only, and the rest of the routes in that area be designated as open to non-motorized use only. This designation would allow licensed vehicles access to Iowa Mill and above, but would discourage the proliferation of user-created motorbike trails on the western face of Baldy and in the 3.1 Backcountry Non-Motorized management prescriptions. Such a designation would also reduce unlicensed vehicle access on Sallie Barber Road.</p>	<p>The routes in question are located in the 7.1 management area, which does allow for motorized and non-motorized recreation uses. However, to access the routes one must use roads under county jurisdiction, which currently does not allow unlicensed motorized use. The comment is valid in that there is a designation error in the mapping. The final decision will change the designation of routes 520W.3, 5-538W.1, and 5-528.1B, to licensed vehicles only.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	11	5-528.2	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-528.2, Illinois Gulch (a.k.a. Pinball Alley Trail). The line work for this route is inaccurate and should be corrected before being distributed for way finding purposes. Route 5-559W.3 (Nightmare on Baldy Trail) should be extended south from its junction with route 5-520W. 1 (Mt. Baldy Road) all the way to route 5-538W.1 (Illinois Gulch Road) on contour. This connection represents a sustainable, on-grade route that is heavily used by non-motorized users. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the line work be corrected before the final travel management plan decision is rendered and that the non-motorized designation be retained.</p>	<p>The Forest Service will work to correct the line work.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
446	10	5-528w.2b	Pinball Alley, 528W.2B - Blady Mountain/Breckenridge: Pinball alley provides a high quality connection between the Mountain Pride/ Bakers Tanks trail area in Illinois Gulch and the system of roads and trails in the upper Baldy Mountain area. It has been a standard part of the Firecracker 50 and Fall Classic mountain bike races for more than 15 years. It is an old road bed that has reverted to single track and is very sustainable.	The route crosses private property and there are parallel routes near by that provide a similar experience.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	11	5-528w.3a	SFTS (AKA Lower Pride Rd), 528W.3A - Baldy Mountain/Breckenridge: The Lower Pride Road is a double track road that connects the Pride Mine and cabins with Baldy Rd. It should be kept open as a non motorized route as a less challenging alternative to pinball alley 528W2B to provide a connection between Baldy Road and Bakers Tanks trail.	The route crosses private property and there are parallel routes near by that provide a similar experience.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
435	7	5-531.2a	HORSESHOE GULCH/SODA CREEK ZONE There are important and missing trails in the Horseshoe Gulch area in the Swan River Drainage. The Blair Witch Trail connects between the Colorado Trail (5-2108.3) west of the Horseshoe Gulch connection (5-351.1) and the Keystone Ranch Trail (5-351.2A). This is an extremely heavily used trail that provides a loop opportunity between the Colorado Trail area and Keystone Ranch. It is one of the earlier trails to dry out in the spring and is very sustainable.	The Blair Witch Trail was omitted in the draft but added to the inventory prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently omitted on the map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	12	5-540w.1	Bakers Tank (AKA Upper Okie Hwy), 540W.1 - Baldy Mountain/Breckenridge: The upper Okie Highway is an old double track road that has been reverting to single track. While not highly used, it provides a fun, roller coaster type experience and an alternative connection between the Upper Pride Rd 528.2 -528.1A area and the Mountain Pride/Bakers Tanks trail area. It was used as part of the Fall Classic mountain bike race for many years..	The route crosses private property and there are parallel routes near by that provide a similar experience.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	11	5-55.2b, 5-66w.2h connector	There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting singletrack northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of "journey" to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
432	19	5-569w.1a	Breckenridge: 5-569W.1A (Farncomb Ridge South) has been heavily used, especially by mountain bikers, for 20 years. It has been part of both the annual SFTS Poker Fun Rides and the Fall Classic race. Sustainable because it follows an old ditch, it is significant because it provides the only connection between 5-569.1 (Little French Gulch) and 5-GH-63, which connects to the heavily used Humbug Hill Road. I oppose the closure of this route and recommend that it remain open to non-motorized use. Also, 5-569W.1B is an extension of 5-569W.1A and should be kept open	Route 569W.1A was identified as open to non-motorized use prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently mislabeled in the matrix and map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	18	5-569w.1a	Breckenridge: 5-569W.1A (Farncomb Ridge South) has been heavily used, especially by mountain bikers, for 20 years. It has been part of both the annual SFTS Poker Fun Rides and the Fall Classic race. Sustainable because it follows an old ditch, it is significant because it provides the only connection between 5-569.1 (Little French Gulch) and 5-GH-63, which connects to the heavily used Humbug Hill Road. I oppose the closure of this route and recommend that it remain open to non-motorized use. Also, 5-569W.1B is an extension of 5-569W.1A and should be kept open.	Route 569W.1A was identified as open to non-motorized use prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently mislabeled in the matrix and map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
373	4	5-569w.1a	Closure of Trail 5-569W.1A, Farncomb Ridge South. This is an old flume that contours along the south side of Farncomb Hill in an exhilarating ride because of it's exposure in places. Under Alt G, the road up Little French Gulch, 5-569.1, and a short ride of .6 miles on an old flume on trail 5-GH-63 are both out and back routes. Trail 5-569W.1A connects those two rides and makes possible a very nice loop ride rather than just an out and back. The trail is not heavily used, but the more advanced riders use it often. It is entirely sustainable and has no erosion because it contours around the hill. It was a part of past SFTS Poker Fun Rides.	Route 569W.1A was identified as open to non-motorized use prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently mislabeled in the matrix and map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	13	5-569w.1a	Farncomb Ridge South (Little French Flume), 569W.1A -Little French Gulch/Golden Horseshoe: The Little French Flume has been heavily used by mountain bikes since the mid 1980s. It has been used by practically all major mountain bike races since that time. it provides a high quality loop experience from Little French Gulch Rd to the Humbug hill area of The Golden Horseshoe. It was recommended to be included as a designated non motorized trail by the Golden Horseshoe travel committee in 2005. Since it is an old mining ditch it is among the most sustainable trail alignments possible.	Route 569W.1A was identified as open to non-motorized use prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently mislabeled in the matrix and map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
85	6	5-569w.1a, 5-569.1	I support Alternative G, with the exception below, as the best balance between the interests of all users and wildlife and resource conservation. Closure of Trail 5-569W.1A, Farncomb Ridge South. This is an old flume that contours along the south side of Farncomb Hill in an exhilarating ride because of it's exposure in places. Under Alt G, the road up Little French Gulch, 5-569.1, and a short ride of .6 miles on an old flume on trail 5-GH-63 are both out and back routes. Trail 5-569W.1A connects those two rides and makes possible a very nice loop ride rather than just an out and back. The trail is not heavily used, but the more advanced riders use it often. It is entirely sustainable and has no erosion because it contours around the hill. It was a part of past SFTS Poker Fun Rides.	Route 569W.1A was identified as open to non-motorized use prior to the release of the Supplemental EIS but inadvertently mislabeled in the matrix and map. It will be included in the final decision as open to mountain bike, hike and horse use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
446	14	5-569w.1b	SFTS (Little French Flume West), 569W.1B - Little French Gulch/Golden Horseshoe: This is simply the western extension of 569W.1A and should be kept open for the same reasons as above.	There are three separate and parallel routes along the southern side of Farncomb Ridge, 569W.1B, GH 63 and 569W.1A. Only one route is needed along the ridge and is made up of route 569W.1A and GH 63, which is consistent with the comment expressed.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	10	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>A historically popular snowmobile access to Boreas Pass Road and Pennsylvania Gulch with nice play areas, we [High Country Snowmobile Club] appreciate this area remaining open to motorized recreation.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	70	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>How does it make sense to have the popular groomed non-motorized trails join an area of unrestricted winter motorized? We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] realize this is private property adjacent to forest service, but it the non-motorized use is far more prevalent on the Forest Service lands here than snow machines. Often the grasses and meadows at the fork of 593.1 and 611W.3A are damaged from off-road travel.</p>	<p>The Forest Service does not groom any trails in the Indiana Gulch road area. The groomed non-motorized trail is on non-federal land. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	69	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>If this road stays as winter shared use, WRNF should consider grooming because it only takes a few snowmobile passes on this steep road to make it extremely dangerous for a descending skier. Consider extending the private grooming from Spruce Creek Ranch up this road.</p>	<p>The Forest Service does not groom any trails in the Indiana Gulch road area. The current groomed non-motorized trail is on non-federal land. Grooming routes on National Forest land is outside the scope of the TMP. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
436	68	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>Why is this within an unrestricted motorized use? It is too popular for mixed use to give snowmobilers free range. We've never seen snow machines in the section of Hoosier Ridge (between x12029 and Boreas Pass). Please protect this sensitive region!</p>	<p>The Forest Service does not groom any trails in the Indiana Gulch road area. The current groomed non-motorized trail is on non-federal land. Grooming routes on National Forest land is outside the scope of the TMP. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
436	66	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>A historically popular ski and snowshoe route with loops via Boreas Pass Road, Bakers Tank Trail, Blue River Trail, Dyersville trails and PA Gulch.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comment. Alt G does address allowing non-motorized uses along the routes specified.</p>	Action not Specified

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	67	5-593.1	<p>INDIANA GULCH ROAD (593.1)</p> <p>Skiers are being displaced from this road due to a recent increase in winter motorized use making conditions unsafe. (see forest Plan, 2-36 and 37).</p>	<p>The Forest Service does not groom any trails in the Indiana Gulch road area. The current groomed non-motorized trail is on non-federal land. Grooming routes on National Forest land is outside the scope of the TMP. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
107	9	5-597	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>There is a single track that connects the south ends of 5-597 and two roads that currently dead end and they could be designated single track motorized and make a loop that would be a great ride.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	16	5-597.1	<p>597.1 UPPER DYERSVILLE ROAD</p> <p>This road is awfully steep and I've only descended it on my mountain bike a handful of times in the last twenty years. It really shouldn't be open to full sized vehicles. It is so steep, it is scary to bike down, but it is a nice loop from Boreas Pass Road. I would suggest re-evaluating this route as a motorized route.</p>	<p>Steep roads provide a challenging opportunity for four-wheel drive vehicles.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	11	5-597.1	<p>DYERSVILLE ROAD (597.1)</p> <p>Dyersville Road (597.1) leaves Indiana Creek Road two-thirds of the way up, and we [High Country Snowmobile Club] appreciate that it is now open to unrestricted motorized use. It is an area seldom used by snowmobilers but may see increased use in the future as snowmobile numbers increase.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	57	5-597.1	DYERSVILLE ROAD (597.1) Dyersville Road (597.1) leaves Indiana Creek Road two-thirds of the way up, and is now open to unrestricted motorized use.	This comment supports Forest Service proposal for lower portion of road	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	59	5-597.1	DYERSVILLE ROAD (597.1) Opening the upper portion of this road to unrestricted winter motorized is invading a region that is still mostly untouched by ALL recreational use, both summer and winter. Please help us protect one of the last remaining quiet, untrammelled areas in the Upper Blue. Very few skiers even wander up this road. Please, reconsider this boundary line and keep the current use of this road as closed to motorized.	The Forest Service does not groom any trails in the Indiana Gulch road area. The current groomed non-motorized trail is on non-federal land. Grooming routes on National Forest land is outside the scope of the TMP. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	58	5-597.1	DYERSVILLE ROAD (597.1) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] would like the Dyersville road to be taken out of the unrestricted motorized designation and become closed to winter motorized. We never see winter motorized travel on this road. The initial creek crossing is probably an obstacle to motorized. But a brief initial part of this road is a well-traveled ski route because it is part of the Dyersville loop.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, and no legal winter access, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	20	5-597.1	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-597.1, Dyersville Road. This road is an out and back for motorized use, is unsustainable itself, and accesses other unsustainable routes. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be closed to all motorized use, and closed altogether south of the junction with the (missing) Dyersville Single Track Trail. This designation would take advantage of the existing, sustainable portion of the route to connect to the non-motorized Dyersville single track trail and create a sustainable, non-motorized loop in this basin. The upper portion of the Dyersville Road should be closed to all users for sustainability reasons.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. These roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities and motorized access to historic structures. These routes can be sustainable with maintenance.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	14	5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector	<p>Designate the single track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single tracks. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	12	5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate the singletrack trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized singletrack. Otherwise these two roads, that are in themselves beautiful, will just dead end where they could make a loop.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	18	5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
378	13	5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate the singletrack trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized singletrack. Otherwise these two roads, that are in themselves beautiful, will just dead end where they could make a loop.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
109	12	5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector	<p>The general Summit County area outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot.</p> <p>Designate the single track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single tracks. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
191	12	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
398	10	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the single track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
281	12	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
510	11	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the single track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead end where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
468	13	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. Otherwise these two roads that are in themselves beautiful will just dead where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
415	13	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the singletrack trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized singletrack. Otherwise these two roads, that are in themselves beautiful, will just dead end where they could make a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
404	11	5-597.1, 5-611.1, connector	Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the single track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single track to provide a loop.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. Both of these roads are indeed dead end routes, but they provide dispersed camping opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	115	5-6.2	MIDDLE FORK (6.2) AND MISSOURI GULCH (new designation) This doesn't seem at all compatible, and we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] recommend more restricted travel in the upper reaches of the Middle Fork all the way to the ridge line, especially since the South Fork and the North Fork are restricted and Missouri Gulch is no longer a winter motorized route. Non-motorized use is light in this area, and this could be prime wildlife habitat in the future.	Snowmobile use is restricted to the Middle Fork of the Swan River Road (6.2) from Parkville to Swandyke. The area east of Swandyke is in the 4.31 management area that allows for motorized recreation year-round and therefore is open to snowmobile use off designated routes. There is a logical ridgeline/bowl southeast of Swandyke that defines boundary of the restricted area. The open unrestricted terrain at the headwaters of the Middle Fork is mostly above timberline and not considered prime wildlife habitat.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	114	5-6.2	MIDDLE FORK (6.2) AND MISSOURI GULCH (new designation) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] are concerned that so much of the Forest Plan 5.5 prescription which has guidelines for restricting motorized use, borders an area where you are allowing unrestricted motorized use, as seen how the Middle Fork suddenly changes.	Snowmobile use is restricted to the Middle Fork of the Swan River Road (6.2) from Parkville to Swandyke. The area east of Swandyke is in the 4.31 management area that allows for motorized recreation year-round and therefore is open to snowmobile use off designated routes. There is a logical ridgeline/bowl southeast of Swandyke that defines boundary of the restricted area. The open unrestricted terrain at the headwaters of the Middle Fork is mostly above timberline and not considered prime wildlife habitat.	Designation of Lands
509	42	5-60.1	FST 60.1 Gore Range Trail/Dillon RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] cannot support turning the very northern end of a Wilderness/Wilderness access trail into part of a mountain bike loop (with FST 1831.1A) as Alternative G proposes to do. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend keeping 60.1 and 1831.1A as non-mechanized routes.	The northern end of 60.1 (the Gore Range trail) is needed to connect the trailhead and road system to a mountain bike trail system. Mountain bike use on 1831.1A allows for mechanized access to Mahan Lake. This provides a rare opportunity for mountain bike access to an alpine lake. All of these trail segments are outside of wilderness. In order to provide for both access to the wilderness and access to the mountain bike trail system, both uses need to share 1/2 mile of trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	17	5-600.1	600.1 UPPER FREDONIA GULCH ROAD – why does this suddenly close to mountain bikes half way to the top? It isn't used much by mountain bikes but occasionally we will ride it to its end for the scenic qualities and the higher altitude feel. This could be difficult to enforce.	At the point where the route changes to hiking and pack animals only, there is an alternate route that mountain bikers can take (N-3621). The non-mechanized section will close off a dead-end route that accesses several non-system, user created trails that will be closed to mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	22	5-600.1	FREDONIA GULCH ROAD (600.1) Please consider winter parking at the bottom of this road. This has become more popular with backcountry skiers and snowshoers due to its excellent gladed, low-angle terrain, and gorgeous views of Tenmile.	Management of trailheads is not part of this process.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	21	5-600.1	FREDONIA GULCH ROAD (600.1) This road has often seen snowmobile use, but it is now within the 1.31 prescription. Thank you and thanks to Robin Theobald, for putting up the gate across this road.	This comment supports Forest Plan prescription and current travel management	General Support

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	25	5-600.1	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-600.1, Upper Fredonia Gulch Road. The upper portions of this historical road is designated as closed to mountain bikes, but open to other non-motorized users, even though it is a sustainable road that could certainly withstand mountain bike use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be designated as open to all motorized users, including mountain bikes.</p>	<p>At the point where the route changes to hiking and pack animals only, there is an alternate route that mountain bikers can take (N-3621). The non-mechanized section will close off a dead-end route that accesses several non-system, user created trails that will be closed to mountain bikes.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	11	5-6013.1	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized singletrack. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.</p>	<p>The route described is not N-6013.1. That route is on the Eagle-Holy Cross RD. N-6018.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	18	5-611.1, 5-61 1.1, 5-593.1, and 5-61 1 W.3A	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-611.1, Pennsylvania Creek. Neither full-sized vehicles nor other motorized use should be allowed on this road. This section of the road accesses other routes that are unsustainable, closed, or non-motorized and has no legal access for motorized users. Utilization of this section by motorized users is at best an out and back experience and otherwise encourages unauthorized and impact use. As a twenty-five year resident of this area, and the current town mayor, I have watched this route degrade appreciably over the last many years, thereby threatening the users and the surrounding natural resources. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that Pennsylvania and Indiana Creek Roads (including 5-61 1.1, 5-593.1, and 5-61 1 W.3A) be closed to all motorized use due to resource protection issues and no legal public access.</p>	<p>These roads provide for a five-mile system of roads that offer opportunities for four-wheel-drive vehicles. These routes provide access to dispersed camping sites as well as access to historic structures. The public has legal access to this road system from the Boreas Pass Road.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	8	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>PENNSYLVANIA GULCH ROAD (611.1 and 611W.3A)</p> <p>Thank you for continuing to realize how important this area is for winter snowmobiling!</p> <p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] strongly believe all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side and Indiana Gulch Road (593.1) should continue to be winter motorized.</p> <p>This area is perhaps the most important area in the Upper Blue valley for snowmobile riding. It provides important access to Indiana Creek thru the connector trail 611W.3A (on the former TMP). From Indiana Gulch road, there is the opportunity to continue on to Boreas Pass road into the Pike National forest and looping back into Upper Horseshoe Gulch. This provides local riders with the opportunity for one of the longest loops in the area. The many large flat areas provide some excellent play areas and room for beginning riders to enhance their skills.</p> <p>The trailhead at Pennsylvania gulch is seldom used for trailer parking as residents ride (legally) right from their houses. Often times, residents bring in guests and have them park their trailers at their houses, this reduces parking problems and congestion at the trailhead.</p> <p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] feel that this area is important for motorized users as well as non motorized users and would be willing to work in any way with the Dillon Ranger district to minimize any future conflicts.</p> <p>After careful study of the proposed and current plans, we [High Country Snowmobile Club] have a suggestion that may allow all parties to co-exist. We propose extending the winter boundary for unrestricted motorized from the intersection of road 611W.3A, up into Upper Pennsylvania Gulch to include the Horseshoe Basin. The unrestricted motorized area would be</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch. The area south of Pennsylvania Creek is closed to all motorized use by Forest Plan direction and changing this use is outside the scope of the TMP.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	39	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>PENNSYLVANIA GULCH ROAD (611.1 and 611W.3A)</p> <p>PLEASE RE-EVALUATE THIS REGION!</p> <p>This area is a big concern for the winter non-motorized user and we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] ask that you take a closer look at this entire area, especially because it was given in this draft the 'unrestricted motorized' designation. Unrestricted motorized use doesn't blend well with a region that is much more popular with the winter non-motorized user. It also clashes with the goals of trying to protect much of the non-motorized land adjacent to it – Hoosier Ridge and Horseshoe Basin are all given the 1.31 prescription and we expect that this will only exacerbate management issues. This region truly is more widely used by the non motorized winter skier and rider, and it makes much more sense to close PA. Gulch and other routes to winter motorized and designate this region as 'restricted motorized'.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	43	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Currently, what we have witnessed is that most of the snow machines are going up PA. Gulch road to play/highmark in Horseshoe Basin, which will be closed to winter motorized with the new Forest Plan's designation of this area as 1.31 or non-motorized. Rarely is PA gulch used as a winter motorized access Boreas Pass. On December 31st, after five days of no new snow, and during the busy holiday season, we noticed that no snowmobiles had used road 611W.3A to head towards Indiana Gulch and Boreas Pass. All motorized traffic continued straight into Horseshoe Basin (1.31 non-motorized.) Horseshoe Basin is rich in natural resources and part of a land mass where there is still potential to give it a buffer of protection. If we are going to give so much of Summit County away to the recreationalists, it is even more important to protect the small patches left that do not see much human interference.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	42	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>For the following comments please understand that 611W.3A is the number taken from the previous TMP. Your current summer Alternative G map doesn't appear to give this important connecting route a number. It is the connector between 611.1 (PA Gulch) and 593.1 (Indiana Gulch). We are assuming it is also the road which continues south on the 'ridge-burned zone' road between Indiana and PA.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	40	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>For thirty plus years this was a primary Nordic ski destination for its great gentle terrain, loop options and being one of the few destinations in the Upper Blue for low angle glade skiing. This used to be Nordic skiing at its finest for many locals. Motorized use only recently has increased for access to Horseshoe Basin, and infrequent access to Boreas Pass. In the last two years, snowmobiles have inched their way towards the gladed areas where the backcountry riders and skiers go.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	45	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>If you do not close lower PA gulch Road to winter motorized, then a gate at the junction between PA Gulch Road (611.1) and 611W.3A will be its location but unfortunately, this location will not be effective. Snow machines can easily bypass it via the open meadow. Attempts to block this in the past with beams and signs are always ignored or destroyed. Fencing across the entire meadow to the south might be necessary along with a gate. Weekly law enforcement efforts should be expected.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	49	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Many snowmobilers travel county roads to access PA Gulch. There is not enough room for trailer parking in this cul-de-sac – One more management reason for consideration of closing this to winter motorized. Without adequate parking, how can you claim this as winter motorized?</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	47	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Oddly, the TMP gave PA Gulch Road unrestricted motorized use to the north where there is minimal play area, yet on the southern side it is now closed to winter motorized yet this is where snow machines travel - circling in every open meadow, destroying willows and polluting the creekbed. Often snowmobiles travel across bare dirt on the sunny sections of this road. On January 2, 2009 we saw snowmobile tracks already on the south side of the road, in the meadow/creek bed despite that much of the creek was still exposed and flowing and numerous willows are still showing. Again, one gate at the bottom of the road will solve all of these future enforcement hassles.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
436	41	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Snowmobiles have made skiing this route miserable and dangerous. Please refer to your Forest Plan, 2-36 and 2-37 on how you decide if a route should be closed or kept open. Safety is a huge issue in this mixed use area. It is extremely dangerous and awkward for a skier to descend down this narrow road on the snowmobile's non-stop roller coasters which are now created even more quickly with newer, more powerful machines.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	50	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Snowmobiles have numerous other more appropriate destinations: Boreas Pass Road to Como, Indiana Creek, hundreds of acres in Montezuma, the Swan River drainages, the Golden Horseshoe, Tenderfoot Mountain. For a minority recreation group in a very crowded national forest, they have plenty of terrain.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Designation of Lands
436	51	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>The TMP clearly states that non-motorized traffic do not have the ability to travel as far, and consideration should be given to grant non-motorized routes such as PA Gulch, which is relatively short, while snowmobiles are given zones which allow them to travel further. It takes the non-motorized user only about an hour and a half to get to Horseshoe Basin, while snow machines get there in minutes.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	46	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>Trying to enforce snowmobiles to not wander on to the south side of the road and to not enter Horseshoe Basin (all proposed as closed to motorized) seems like a huge enforcement nightmare when one gate at the bottom would solve all these problems. Is the WRNF equipped to sign the entire south side of this road as closed to winter motorized?</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	44	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>We believe it would be much easier to manage if you close PA gulch road to winter motorized at its entry point rather than halfway up a rough snowmobiled road, which would make enforcement difficult, especially since the vast majority of the winter motorized are only using this road to access terrain that will be closed to them. If WRNF will not gate PA. Gulch Road at the bottom, are you prepared to invest time and money into enforcement?</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	48	5-611.1, 5-611w.3a	<p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] believe that there is good reason to consider making all of Pennsylvania Gulch Road (611.1) as well as road 611W.3A from the PA Gulch side as closed to motorized in winter for the following reasons:</p> <p>We rarely see trailers parked at the cul-de-sac at the end of Blue River Estates. On December 30 and January 2, 2009 we had several snowmobiles pass us on the road, but no trailers present at the trailhead. They also had not accessed this area from Boreas Pass because we noticed no snowmobile tracks from that direction (611W.3A).</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	54	5-611.3a	<p>PLEASE ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNRESTRICTED MOTORIZED WINTER USE IN THIS REGION</p> <p>In the summer, a section of 611W.3A on the ridge is a mud bog. The old motorized connection road down into Tarryall Creek has been blocked off from the Como side. To ease your management costs, and to protect the natural resources of Hoosier Ridge and its surroundings, as well as one of our few remaining elk herds in the Upper Blue, why wouldn't you close and gate all of this area to year round motorized from where 611W.3A first summits from Indiana? Motorized users can easily walk the short distance on this road for the view. 611W.3A and PA Gulch Road are both deteriorating from heavy motorized use. We've [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] never seen snow machines in the section of Hoosier Ridge (between x12029 and Boreas Pass). Please protect this sensitive region.</p>	<p>Route 611W.3A is the 4WD road that goes from Indiana Gulch to the summit of the Mount Argentine ridge. The route along the eastern ridge of Mount Argentine is 611.1, and provides access to dispersed recreation and camping opportunities on the saddle of the ridge. The Forest Service will conduct the necessary maintenance to bring the road up to a sustainable level and reduce ongoing deterioration. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Designation of Lands
285	21	5-611w.2a	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-611W.2A, Mount Argentine Trail (a.k.a. 360 Trail). This trail has become very eroded in areas due to heavy motorized use and extremely steep grades. Although the summit of Mount Argentine offers an excellent vista, the unsustainable trail grade to and from the summit is inappropriate. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be closed to all uses, with a future goal of reestablishing this route sustainably, and for non-motorized use only to ensure long term sustainable use.</p>	<p>Route 611W.2A was originally proposed as open to motorcycle use in Alt G. However, after further evaluation the Forest Service has determined that there are many segments of the trail that are deteriorated and unsustainable. Therefore the route will be closed to all uses until additional environmental analyses is conducted to determine the appropriate type of use and location of a suitable sustainable trail.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	14	5-611w.3a	<p>5-611W.3A (NUMBER FROM PREVIOUS ALT D MAP (CONNECTING ROAD BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA CREEK AND INDIANA CREEK)</p> <p>- This road has seen major deterioration in the last few years from full sized motorized traffic because it is so steep. Please consider closing it to all motorized use with the exception of dirt bikes.</p>	<p>This route provides the only link between Pennsylvania Creek and Indiana Creek roads. These roads provide for a five-mile system of roads that offer opportunities for four-wheel-drive vehicles. These routes provide access to dispersed camping sites as well as access to historic structures</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	137	5-65.1	<p>Tenderfoot Road (65.1)</p> <p>The parking lot is inadequate for trailers and only holds five or six vehicles.</p>	<p>Management of trailheads is not part of this process.</p>	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	136	5-65.1	<p>Tenderfoot Road (65.1)</p> <p>This road is surrounded by a dense urban area and folks use this road regularly to walk their dogs, snowshoe and ski, if it holds snow. It is a crowded route and we think you should re-evaluate opening this to motorized.</p>	<p>This route (also known as the Oro Grande Trail) is already open to ATVs and motorcycles. Because of other issues, this route will be closed to motorized uses.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
219	15	5-66w.1a	<p>Here are a couple bullet points for trails that were not included in Alternative G:</p> <p>There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
171	8	5-66w.1a	<p>Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail.</p> <p>Connecting 5-n287.1 and 5-n298.1 with 5-66w.1a would Allow an alternative route to the upper riding and could possibly be one way to make things safer for all users.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
191	9	5-66w.1a	<p>I am in favor of the the road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
373	5	5-66w.2	<p>Closure of Trail 5-66W.2. This trail provides a singletrack connection from Highway 6 up the hill below the landfill and connects to the landfill road. It eliminates the necessity to ride the landfill road, competing with the numerous garbage trucks on the way up or down, when folks from the Keystone and Summit Cove areas ride the Oro Grande Trail or access the Frey Gulch complex of trails. It is not heavily used, but it is used by our group several times a year, particularly in early season when this trail and Oro Grande are among the few that are dry enough to ride. It is in good shape, has no erosion, and is sustainable along it's entire length.</p>	<p>This route originates on Summit County property and the Master Plan designates this area as closed to motorcycles and ATVs.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
85	7	5-66w.2	<p>I support Alternative G, with the exception below, as the best balance between the interests of all users and wildlife and resource conservation.</p> <p>Closure of Trail 5-66W.2. This trail provides a single-track connection from Highway 6 up the hill below the landfill and connects to the landfill road. It eliminates the necessity to ride the landfill road, competing with the numerous garbage trucks on the way up or down, when folks from the Keystone and Summit Cove areas ride the Oro Grande Trail or access the Frey Gulch complex of trails. It is not heavily used, but it is used by groups several times a year, particularly in early season when this trail and Oro Grande are among the few that are dry enough to ride. It is in good shape, has no erosion, and is sustainable along its entire length.</p>	This route originates on Summit County property and the Master Plan designates this area as closed to motorcycles and ATVs.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
432	13	5-66w.2	<p>Keystone: Trail 5-66W.2 (Landfill Road Bypass) provides a crucial and safe connection between Highway 6 and trail 5-65W.1 (Oro Grande Trail) by routing recreational users off the busy and dangerous (due to heavy truck traffic) access road to the Summit County Landfill. This trail not only acts as an important access but is also used as a critical link between the trails near Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch and the trails on the other side of Highway 6.</p>	This route originates on Summit County property and the Master Plan designates this area as closed to motorcycles and ATVs.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
446	16	5-66w.2	<p>SFTS (Landfill Rd Bypass), 66W.2 - Keystone/Summit County Landfill: This trail provides an needed alternate to travel from the Oro Grande trail 65W.1 to Highway 9 without having to ride the access Rd to the Summit County Landfill and the shooting range which is very dangerous as it is heavily used by large trucks. It is a sustainable trail with few erosion issues</p>	This route originates on Summit County property and the Master Plan designates this area as closed to motorcycles and ATVs.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
107	8	5-66w.2h	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>Northeast of the top of Tenderfoot trail 5-66W.2H is a great network of trails which are fun and exciting and need be preserved as single track motorized. These technical trails are great for more experienced riders and must be preserved for motorcycle riders. Outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas there are other important trails, also. 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road should be designated single track motorized. It is a fun and steep trail suitable for motorcycles.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. N6013.1 originates on the Boreas Pass Road which is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
411	1	5-66w.2t	<p>As a representative of The Keystone Center and property owner adjacent to the proposed route, we disagree strongly with designated route 5-66W.2T as open to motorized use because we feel that it would encourage trespass on The Keystone Center property and use of the parking area at The Keystone Center as a trailhead for motorized use.</p>	This trail will be designated at open to non-motorized use only to address this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	49	5-66w.2t	<p>Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations:</p> <p>Snake River Basin</p> <p>Frey Gulch (5-66W.2T) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Motorcycle – Recommendation: Mechanized use: SCG holds non-motorized access easement through Tenderfoot Subdivision.</p>	This trail will be designated as open to non-motorized use only to address this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	43	5-69.1	<p>FST 69.1 Ptarmigan Pass/Dillon RD</p> <p>Alternative G would create a new and more intensive use on this urban-accessed hiking trail that we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] believe is inappropriate to both the location and the trail itself. It is too steep overall for uphill riding on a mountain bike so it would be used only as a downhill return loop for riders ascending on FST 30.1. This will create conflicts with hikers on the trail and severely impact the condition of the trail itself, leading to rapid tread deterioration and erosion. We strongly recommend keeping this trail into the Ptarmigan Wilderness as a foot and pack route.</p>	Hikers can use 30.1 to ascend and descend to avoid mountain bikers riding downhill.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	44	5-72w.1	<p>FST 72W.1 Bemrose Ski Circus/Dillon RD</p> <p>There is no need for a new mountain bike route on top of Hoosier Pass bordering a Research Natural Area. This old and apparently abandoned water diversion should be fully decommissioned, not turned into a new impact that will only encourage the creation of new non-system trails in a sensitive alpine area.</p>	This trail may border a research natural area, but the management prescription for this area is Back-country Recreation (Non-motorized). It would be an unfair policy to close mountain bike trails because off-trail use may occur.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
285	22	5-72w.1	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-72W.1, Bemrose Trail. The Town supports the designation of this trail as a non-motorized summer and winter route, as shown in Alternative G. This designation is recommended in the Town's Trail Plan.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	18	5-72w.1, 5-n358.1	<p>72W.1 (BEMROSE TRAIL) and N358.1 (BEMROSE ROAD)</p> <p>I am excited to work with the SFTS and hopefully the Town of Breckenridge to make this trail up to their sustainability standards. It is a great experience for a visitor seeking something physically easy, at high altitude and not to mention the stellar views of the majestic southern end of the Tenmile Range. This trail will also be part of a future loop with the Wheeler Trail from Hoosier Pass. It will never see heavy use given its distance from town.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	5	5-75.1, 5-41.1	<p>75.1 WILDER GULCH and 41.1 CORRAL CREEK</p> <p>- Contrary to the previous TMP commenting process, these two trails were closed to mountain bikes. Thanks so much for leaving them open to bikes and also for recognizing the short section of the Wilder Gulch trail that can be reached right from the Vail Pass Rest Area. (The other option was descending down the bike path to access Wilder Gulch). Looping Wilder gulch with Corral Creek is a great riding opportunity because it is fairly short yet in gorgeous country and both trails are in good shape. We hope to work with the SFTS to work on the rougher sections of Wilder Gulch.</p>	<p>This comment supports the designation of Wilder Gulch Road and Trail in Alternative G, however, because of other issues identified, the Corral Creek Trail will be closed to mountain bikes. This change is necessary because the trail leads into a wilderness (where mountain bikes are prohibited) and there is no existing trail to provide a loop opportunity.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	54	5-76.1, -5-65.1, -5-66.2A, -5-66.1.	<p>Dillon Ranger District:</p> <p>The roads listed below are listed as a combination licensed and unlicensed vehicles and motorcycle routes allowed in Alternative G. -5-76.1, -5-65.1, -5-66.2A, -5-66.1.</p> <p>There are currently miles of motorcycle trails that network in this area that are not system trails by the Forest Service. The number of user created trails in this area has increased significantly in the last five years. The creation and use of these illegal trails have had adverse impacts to local wildlife. The noise and disturbance has pushed wildlife into areas that are more difficult to access for hunters. Conflicts have increased between motorcycle riders and hunters in this area. Adjacent landowner complaints about increased motorcycle use have also increased in this area. This area is important for big game management for hunter harvest, summer range for deer and elk, elk calving areas, and elk winter range. The seasonal closure for elk calving must be maintained to protect important elk habitat. Signing open/closed trails, enforcing trail closures, and decommissioning illegal trails will be critical in this area to maintain quality wildlife habitat and reduce user conflicts.</p>	<p>Because of issues raised (noise, proximity to residences, and user conflicts), the final travel management plan will designate these routes as open to non-motorized uses only (mountain biking, horseback riding, and hiking), except for 66.1 (the Frey Gulch Road) which will remain open to full-sized vehicles.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	7	5-80.1	<p>Other areas on the Dillon Ranger District where a mix of motorized use is BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation)</p> <p>Not a popular motorized snowmobile trail. We [High Country Snowmobile Club] think that the gain of this area for non motorized users is important as there are many snowshoe and cross country ski loops in the area. We recognize that the impact to motorized users is smaller.</p>	<p>This comment supports Alternative G. The District appreciates the input from the HCSC on this route.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	26	5-80.1	<p>BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation)</p> <p>Few people realized that this trail falls within a motorized prescription, but because it is so narrow, windy and fragile and so popular with the year round non-motorized, this makes sense to keep it non-motorized.</p>	<p>While it does fall within a prescription that ALLOWS motorized, an area can also be non-motorized within such a prescription. Being more restrictive is and having non-motorized activities and areas within such a prescription is compliant with Forest Plan.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	28	5-80.1	BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation) It does see some snowmobile use – this route needs to be heavily signed. Access to this trail is achieved from numerous illegal points, none which allow parking with trailers. Ski Area employees need to be educated that it is closed to motorized.	The District will take measures as suggested for implementation.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
436	29	5-80.1	BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation) Need to work with Ski Area and Beaver Run to allow free parking for skiers wanting to use this trail.	Management of trailheads is not part of this process.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	27	5-80.1	BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation) See BSA surveys on this trail. If this were motorized, safety concerns and conflicts between user groups would be huge.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Traffic Control and Safety
436	25	5-80.1	BURRO TRAIL (80.1 new designation) Thanks so much for honoring the historical use of this trail which has always been non-motorized.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	General Support
337	6	5-800.1, 5-803.1	SPRUCE CREEK ROAD AND CRYSTAL LAKE ROAD (800.1 AND 803.1, new designation) This area was a close in area for local residents to access. As the roads are not long and there are no real play areas, most winter motorized access was for short rides. We [High Country Snowmobile Club] think that the gain of this area for non motorized users is important as there are many cross country ski loops in the area. We recognize that the impact to motorized users is smaller.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	24	5-800.1, 5-803.1	SPRUCE CREEK ROAD AND CRYSTAL LAKE ROAD (800.1 AND 803.1, new designation) Spruce Creek Trail and Spruce Creek Road could be the most heavily used winter non-motorized destinations in the Upper Blue. This is a perfect one-three hour loop. The scenery in the high basins of Mohawk and Crystal Lakes makes it an appealing destination for our visitors and locals. The parking lot is full every weekend with skiers and riders and we rarely see snow machines and trailers parked. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] do not think this loss to the motorized community is all that significant, but the gain for the hundreds of non-motorized users is huge.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	23	5-800.1, 5-803.1	SPRUCE CREEK ROAD AND CRYSTAL LAKE ROAD (800.1 AND 803.1, new designation) This is another huge success for the non-motorized winter user. We believe this designation makes total sense, since most of the winter motorized use was so short (within a few minutes) but illegal travel was beginning to increase in the Crystal Lakes basin and onto Mohawk Lakes Trail.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
509	70	5-803.1	FSR 803.1 Crystal Creek/Dillon RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend limiting travel on this route to mountain bike, foot and pack/saddle animals as recommended in Alternative D. There are numerous other roads for four-wheeling into the alpine terrain in the Dillon district and relatively few strictly for non-motorized travel.	This route is open to four-wheel drive vehicles because it provides a route to a destination (cabin, lake). It will be closed to unlicensed vehicles.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	1	5-849.1	HOOSIER PASS WEST (new winter non-motorized designation) A huge thanks from the non-motorized user. Other than the initial jeep road from the parking lot, it appears that the roads to the west and north of are now winter non-motorized (for instance, the road to Crystal Lakes, (849.1).	This comment supports Alternative G	General Support
337	3	5-850.1	BLUE LAKES ROAD (850.1 new designation) We [High Country Snowmobile Club] are disappointed to see this changing this from unrestricted motorized to restricted. This area is a popular starting point for the many residents of the Blue Lakes Road area who snowmobile. Being able to ride Blue Lakes Road to the Upper and Lower McCullough gave many riders the opportunity to access popular areas like Pennsylvania Gulch without utilizing trailers and clogging up the trailheads elsewhere in the area.	The routes accessed via Blue Lakes Road offer limited opportunity for snowmobiling on National Forest land. The use of the Blue Lakes Road to connect to Pennsylvania Gulch implies trespass onto private lands along Highway 9.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	11	5-850.1	BLUE LAKES ROAD (850.1 new designation) Because it is so short, dead-ending at the dam, it does make sense that non-motorized use is preferred. Past BSA surveys showed very little motorized winter use on this road, yet non-motorized users love this road because of its scenic beauty and easy access to Monte Cristo.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	12	5-850.1	BLUE LAKES ROAD (850.1 new designation) No parking available for trailers. Please consider gating or signing this road in the winter to prevent the temptation of cars getting stuck.	The Blue Lakes Road is under easement to Summit County Government who is responsible for management of the road to access private lands. Management of trailheads is not part of this process.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	10	5-850.1	BLUE LAKES ROAD (850.1 new designation) When the section of this road crosses FS land it appears that motorized use is not allowed, despite this falling within a "restricted motorized zone." We wonder if this is a mapping error, but we do appreciate it if motorized use is not allowed.	Winter prescription for restricted motorized zone allows for designated motorized routes. But a route has to be designated in order for motorized use to occur (in the area on the route only). Therefore if there isn't a route then there would be no motorized activity. The reason for the prescription to remain as restricted is to allow for motorized route opportunities should the need arise. This is different then the motorized activity is prohibited prescription where a designation of a motorized route could not occur. These categories are based on Forest Plan prescriptions.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	33	5-851.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin McCullough Gulch Road (5-851.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Licensed Vehicles – Recommendation: Licensed Vehicles: Provides access to Wheeler National Recreation Trailhead.	This comment supports Alternative G which thus helps back the final decision which in this case is compliant with the SCG master plan.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	35	5-851.1	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin McCullough Gulch Trail (5-851.1) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Foot and Horse – Recommendation: Foot and Horse: Separation of use, alternative route provided.	This comment supports Alternative G which thus helps back the final decision which in this case is compliant with the SCG master plan.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
337	4	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) This road provides great access for local area riders. Without connections to various areas this leaves residents with nowhere to ride. There are not any large play areas but it is an important link.	There are no routes open to snowmobiles that this route would access.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	17	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) Forest plan prescription above this road is 2.1 – 'minimal use' area, good to keep a seamless transition from moderate non-motorized use to lighter use, which would help protect the botanical values found there. See Forest Plan FEIS at H-16.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative, provides rationale, and thus helps to back the final decision for this area.	Resource Protection Designations (e.g., Class 1 Air, AIZ, etc.)
436	18	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) Quandary Peak is the most popular winter Fourteener, makes sense to keep this area non-motorized with its year- round popularity.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	14	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) See BSA surveys on this road – very little winter motorized traffic last year, but increasingly popular with non-motorized users, especially because it is one of the first destinations for skiers in early winter and due to the popularity of skiing Quandary, a fourteener.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	16	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) Snow machines can only travel short distances and there are no play areas, thus this is not a valuable area for them. No parking available for trailers.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	15	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) This is also a popular ski tour destination because it is so easy. Wide, Flat roads which aren't motorized are a rare experience for the skier and snowshoer but definitely appreciated. It is great for beginners or for Nordic skiers and this road is also part of numerous loop options with the various jeep roads adjacent to both sides, as well as numerous ways to ascend Quandary from this road.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
436	13	5-851.1	UPPER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (851, new designation) This is wonderful news that motorized use is not allowed on this road despite it falling in a 'restricted motorized prescription'. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] would recommend gating this road for winter at the FS boundary (Quandary Trailhead). This is one road which deserves a late October/early November winter closure since it is one of the first areas to receive adequate snow for skiing and snowshoeing and the occasional vehicle which can only go a mile or so, ruins the ski conditions for the skier in the early winter months.	This comment supports Alternative G . Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. Gates will not be installed. This area receives full-sized vehicle traffic during fall hunting season.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	34	5-852.1a	Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations: Upper Blue Basin Lower McCullough Gulch Road (5-852.1A) – Master Plan Designation: Non-motorized – USFS TMP Recommendation: Licensed Vehicles – Recommendation: Mechanized use: Public access prohibited through McCullough Gulch Preserve.	The route designation will be changed to non-motorized uses only to address this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	19	5-852.1a	LOWER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (852.1A new designation) - (across the street from 'Skiers Edge') Thanks for making this winter non-motorized! (It is within a restricted motorized designation, but no winter motorized routes were allowed).	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	General Support
436	20	5-852.1a	LOWER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (852.1A new designation) - (across the street from 'Skiers Edge') This does see occasional snowmobile use and will probably need a gate, but this is lower priority than other locations. Lower McCullough Gulch road has become increasingly popular with snowshoers who pack out a few loops off of this road and into the woods.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
337	5	5-852.1a	LOWER MCCULLOUGH GULCH ROAD (852.1A new designation) This road provides access for local area snowmobilers. Without connections to various areas this leaves residents with nowhere to ride. This is an important link to other areas.	There are no routes open to snowmobiles that this route would access.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	9	5-852.1a	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-852.1A, Lower McCullough Gulch Road. This route provides good access to a portion of the Wheeler Trail, McCullough Gulch, and the northern flank of Quandary Peak. However, the bottom (eastern) end of this route enters a platted subdivision that has a dedicated non-motorized access to Blue River residents for the portion of the Lower McCullough Gulch Road that crosses it. Accordingly, we recommend that the entire route be dedicated as open to non-motorized access to match the existing platted subdivision and discourage user/landowner conflicts. This designation would help separate uses accessing the McCullough Gulch Trail (5-43.1) and the Wheeler Trail (5-39.1). In addition, the Town of Breckenridge will continue to encourage the Town of Blue River to provide broader public access, rather than limiting public access to residents and guests of Blue River.</p>	The route designation will be changed to non-motorized uses only to address this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	61	5-88.1	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-88.1, Windy Point Trail. This route is designated under Alternative G as open to winter snowmobile use, but is an inappropriate location for such use. The trail in question is a user-created single track on a steep side slope. In addition, snowmobile use on Dillon Reservoir during winter months (which would be the result of such a designation) is contrary to policies held by Denver Water and Summit County Government. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend removing the winter motorized designation for this route.</p>	This route designation will be changed to non-motorized to address this issue.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	13	5-962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.</p>	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	43	5-986w.2	<p>Conflict with the Summit County Government master plan designations:</p> <p>Upper Blue Basin</p> <p>Iron Springs Road (5-986W.2) – Master Plan Designation: Shared – USFS TMP Recommendation: Mechanized – Recommendation: Mechanized: Connects with other mechanized routes.</p>	This comment supports Alternative G which thus helps back the final decision which in this case is compliant with the SCG master plan.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	14	5-GH-54	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54)</p> <p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] recognize that the future of this road is now primarily in the hands of County government. We would like to note its importance as a link between Baldy and French Gulch. Sallie Barber is so close to town, and it provides access to many of the local riders.</p>	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road. In addition there are several routes in the Baldy area that cross private lands without proper authorization for public use. Until site specific analysis is done the route is closed to all use. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
107	7	5-n287.1, 5-298.1,5-6	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>The road and single track connecting the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-6 give us a way up or down.</p>	<p>To address other issues (noise, user conflicts, etc.) these routes will be closed to motorized uses. This issue may also be addressed in a future travel management proposal for the area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
378	10	5-n287.1, 5-298.15-66w.1 connector	<p>There is a road and a singletrack that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p>	<p>To address other issues (noise, user conflicts, etc.) these routes will be closed to motorized uses. This issue may also be addressed in a future travel management proposal for the area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
468	10	5-n287.1, 5-n298.1, 5-66w.1a, connector	<p>There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p>	<p>To address other issues (noise, user conflicts, etc.) these routes will be closed to motorized uses. This issue may also be addressed in a future travel management proposal for the area.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
285	12	5-n300.1	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>5-N300.1, Gilrose Back Door. This route is identified as open to non-motorized users, but the route in question is unsustainably steep and dead ends in private property. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the route be closed to further use, or realigned to a secure, legal public access.</p>	<p>This issue will be addressed by changing the designation to Decommission.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	1	5-n331.1	<p>N331.1 EISENHOWER TUNNEL TRAIL – I would like this trail left open to mountain bikes, despite what is found in alternative G. I realize that this trail is within a wildlife corridor and possibly this is the reason for it being closed to mountain bikes.</p> <p>There are so few mountain bikes who use this incredible trail and we wonder if our presence is anymore detrimental to wildlife travel than the steady flow of hikers who love this area for the same reasons the mountain bikers do – easy traveling through the high country, (especially in late July where this is some of the most dense wildflowers in the county.) If nothing else, please consider a seasonal closure on this trail or possibly just leaving it open briefly for four weeks in late July/august. If this trail is closed to mountain bikes because of wildlife habitat, then why isn't it closed to ALL users, especially since the vast majority of users are hikers?</p> <p>The other reason might be that this trail has never been considered a mountain bike route. Over the last few years though, this has become one of our new favorites. Given its distance from towns it probably wouldn't ever see much use. Once you get past the initial hike-a-bike section, this trail offers some surprisingly easy high altitude riding on smooth single-track with an incredible view at the top of the ridge. Please consider opening this to bikes. It really is an incredible riding experience. Every time I have ridden on this</p>	<p>This trail is in the 5.5 Management Area where mechanized trails are minimized.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/M anagement</p>
509	90	5-n354.1	<p>FST N354.1/Dillon RD</p> <p>There is no need for new mountain bike routes in the Blue River town area as proposed for this short non-system route in Alternative G. The only other alternative to open this closed route to any type of use is DEIS Alternative C. Alternatives D, E and F all recommend its decommissioning, as do We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al].</p>	<p>This trail provides for a mountain bike trail system using unimproved roads. Mechanized use is consistent with the backcountry (non-motorized) management prescription for this area.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
509	93	5-n354.1	<p>FST N354.1/Dillon RD</p> <p>There is no need for new mountain bike routes in the Blue River town area as proposed for this short non-system route in Alternative G. The only other alternative to open this closed route to any type of use is DEIS Alternative C. Alternatives D, E and F all recommend its decommissioning, as do we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al].</p>	<p>This trail provides for a mountain bike trail system using unimproved roads. Mechanized use is consistent with the backcountry (non-motorized) management prescription for this area.</p>	<p>Activities on Public Lands (General)</p>
509	91	5-n358.1	<p>FST N358.1, FST N359.1/Dillon RD</p> <p>There is no need for a new mountain bike loop on top of Hoosier Pass, part of which borders a Research Natural Area and all of which will encourage unauthorized use of other non-system trails in the area. This route and all the others in the Bemrose Circus area need to be decommissioned, as recommended in Alternatives C, D, E and F.</p>	<p>This trail provides for a mountain bike trail system using unimproved roads. Mechanized use is consistent with the backcountry (non-motorized) management prescription for this area. This trail may border a research natural area, but the management prescription for this area is Back-country Recreation (Non-motorized).</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	9	5-n358.1	<p>LOWER BEMROSE ROAD (N-358.1)</p> <p>Please continue to allow parking at the bottom of County Road, next to the old Bemrose sign. There is potential for parking close to the beginning of the trail adjacent to a Colorado Springs tunnel project feature.</p>	Management of trailheads is not part of this process.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	8	5-n358.1	<p>LOWER BEMROSE ROAD (N-358.1)</p> <p>This road is used heavily by local non-motorized travelers as an out and back route or a shuttle from Hoosier Pass.</p>	N-359.1 provides for this use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	7	5-n358.1	<p>LOWER BEMROSE ROAD (N-358.1)</p> <p>This road, which appears to be on the border between private and public land, has been the illegal entrance from past snowmobile traffic. Please post and gate it as non-motorized. Current WRNF sign is buried in winter.</p>	Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps and possible signs if it logistically can be done. Gates will not be installed due to safety concerns.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	92	5-n362.1	<p>FST N362.1/Dillon RD</p> <p>There is no need for new mountain bike routes in the Blue River town area as proposed for this short non-system route in Alternative G. Every other action alternative recommends this old mining road's decommissioning, as do we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al].</p>	This trail provides for a mountain bike trail system. Mechanized use is consistent with the backcountry (non-motorized) management prescription for this area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
178	13	5-N6013.1	Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	9	5-N6013.1	<p>General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.</p>	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	11	5-N6013.1	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.</p>	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
510	10	5-n6013.1	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	18	5-N6013.1	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	19	5-N6013.1	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
219	17	5-N6013.1	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
171	7	5-n6013.1	Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail. Connecting Boreas pass rd with Indiana Gulch with a shared route is critical 5-n6013.1 Riding exists south of Boreas pass and having a legal connector from Baldy Mtn. to Indiana gulch. I am simply asking for a route, single track exists and would be great but a jeep road would be fine.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
191	11	5-N6013.1	Please designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
109	11	5-n6013.1	The general Summit County area outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot. Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	12	5-n6013.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indian Gulch Road as motorized single-track. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	12	5-n6013.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized singletrack. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	12	5-n6013.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized singletrack. This is a great connector that is currently slated to be for mountain biking. They would only be able to go down it as it is a steeper trail.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
404	10	5-n6013.1 connector	Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single track.	N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
455	20	5-n6013.1 connector, 5-597.1, 5-611.1 connector, 5-n962.1, peak 9 to peak 10, 9-2950.5a, 5-2950.1 connector	<p>Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative.</p> <p>The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation.</p> <p>Summit County (General- outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mtn. areas)</p> <p>-Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized singletrack.</p> <p>-Designate the singletrack trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized singletrack.</p> <p>-Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities.</p> <p>-Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible.</p> <p>-Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.</p> <p>Again, these routes offer unique and sustainable recreational opportunities and a better network of connected access facilitating both motorized and nonmotorized activities.</p>	<p>N-6013.1 connects Boreas pass Road with Indiana Gulch and is proposed as open to non-motorized uses only because the Boreas Pass Road is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads. 597.1/611.1 connector route: Only those routes inventoried are considered in this analysis. N-962.1/n-364.1/611.3A -These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.. 2950-5A/2950.1 - The connector proposed would involve private property.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
153	2	5-n7101.1, 2-2108.2	<p>I have personally hiked trail 5-N7 101.1 from Copper Mountain to Guller Creek and concur completely with the submissions in comments 48, 49, 172, and 173. "This portion of the trail is not pleasant for hikers and bikers as it is saturated with horse excrement." It is a "miserable place to hike." It does not live up to the aspirations for a national scenic trail to "provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass."</p> <p>Restrictions on commercial horseback riding have been suggested as a way to improve the existing trail. If that course is not followed, however, the best option would be to withdraw the closure of the lower part of trail 5-2108.2 along Guller Creek - perhaps with modifications as necessary to mitigate any riparian concerns. This can be accomplished without formally relocating the CDNST (and/or the Colorado Trail) -- but it would provide an opportunity for individuals to discover a more pleasurable hiking experience.</p>	<p>Regarding horse excrement on the Colorado Trail, because the outfitter is under special use permit, the District is not going to consider restricting that use. The lower section of 2108.2 is in a wet area and not in a condition that it could be adopted into the Travel System at this time.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
107	10	5N962.1, 5-N364.1, 5-611.3A	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>All the trails connecting and including 5N962.1, 5-N364.1, and 5-611.3A should be designated single track motorized and they could form a great loop through thick, old growth forest.</p>	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
178	15	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
191	13	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	11	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	<p>General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.</p>	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	13	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.</p>	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
510	12	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	20	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.</p>	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
219	19	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	14	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	14	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	15	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	16	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
415	14	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
404	12	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
109	13	5-n962.1, 5-n364.1, 5-611.3a	The general Summit County area outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot. Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. This is a beautiful area of thick old growth forest, meadows, and a lake that has incredible views.	These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	9	611w.3a	611W.3A (connector road between PA Gulch and Indiana and also onto ridge between PA and Indiana) This is an important connector road for winter motorized recreation as stated above. We [High Country Snowmobile Club] appreciate you keeping it open to unrestricted winter motorized use. It works well with the alternative we proposed opening the Upper Horseshoe Basin.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	17	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
191	15	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	15	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
510	14	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
219	21	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	22	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	15	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
107	12	9-2950.5A, 5-2950.1 connector	We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as: We'd like to see a motorized designated connection between 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	13	9-2950.5a, 5-2950.1, connector	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	16	9-2950.5a, 5-2950.1, connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
468	16	9-2950.5a, 5-2950.1, connector	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
404	14	9-2950.5a, 5-2950.1, connector	Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak, with a southeast-end exit.	The connector proposed would involve private property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
415	2	alt	I believe that alternative G is the best for us OHV'rs but I have a few concerns about what you would like to close in our forest. I have listed them below. I hope you can see my perspective.	Refer to the responses to Letter #415	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
177	1	alternative	To me it seems like a huge imbalance exists between motorized and non-motorized areas. I am in favor of keeping as much trail access open as possible for bicycle, motorcycle and 4-wheel drives vehicles. As such, I'd like to see Alternative G implemented.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
107	6	alt-motorized	We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as: All of the trails in Alternative G are good and valued by us and we'd ask they all be preserved, especially as single track motorized.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
436	102	american gulch	American Gulch Play Area This play area is adjacent to Monitor Gulch, which is the next 'drainage' over where backcountry skiers and riders have gone to for years to make turns and hike back up. American Gulch once was our initial destination but when the motorized community discovered it, we were displaced and Monitor Gulch became the next best spot. Our [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] concern is that they will slowly head further east into Monitor Gulch and we want WRNF to be aware that this could be a future issue.	This was felt to be one of very few areas in the Golden Horseshoe that could accommodate a snowmobile play area.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	48	bald mountain	<p>Winter</p> <p>The Town [of Breckenridge] strongly opposes the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch. This area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, and no legal winter access, and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain. Contained within this bubble are popular non-motorized trails, such as Bakers Tank and the Blue River Trail. As proposed, the bubble runs above Boreas Pass Road into an area with no clear boundary, so it will be very easy for motorized users to encroach into the non-motorized designated portions of Bald Mountain and Horseshoe Basin. In addition, the Middle Indiana Creek Road (a.k.a. Cabin Road) has failed to make the inventory, but is a heavily used non-motorized route that should remain open only to non-motorized users in both winter and summer. The Indiana Gulch area is accessed by a private non-motorized trailhead, where motorized use is not permitted and the trail is groomed for non-motorized winter use. The Pennsylvania Gulch access is also problematic, as there is no room for trailer parking, and only Town of Blue River residents can legally access the roads leading to it. This Area around Bald Mountain.</p>	For the reasons mentioned in the comment, the open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as closed to snowmobiles.	Designation of Lands
233	8	bald mtn	<p>While SHA does not presently have a hut in the Bald Mountain area, we are in the process of submitting an application to build a site in the Weber Gulch area on the North side of the mountain. The Weber Gulch area is identified as a 1.31 management prescription managed for non motorized winter recreation so conflicts at the Weber Site itself should not be an issue.</p>	This comment supports Alternative G. The non-motorized recreation is consistent with the Forest Plan management area prescription.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
499	4	baldy	<p>Dedicating Baldy Mountain winter non-motorized is a great relief. This area is the local stomping ground for avid backcountry skiers, snowshoers, nordic skiers and simply winter hikers with dogs, family and friends. The mountain is avalanche safe, close to town and one of the most scenic tours in Breckenridge. Not having motorized traffic on this mountain will provide peace of mind to the majority of our community. There are not that many areas left where ski areas have not expanded to which can still offer safe winter travel and quiet solitude. Baldy Mountain is one of these areas. Thank you greatly for preserving it.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
471	21	baldy	<p>We are thrilled about Baldy Mountain, which has always been one of the most popular destinations to make turns or ski a short loop on its numerous surrounding trails but recently has been ruined from an increase in hybrid snow machine use. Thank you.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	General Support

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	79	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>Access to the backcountry terrain is about an hour and a half for the non-motorized user, and about three minutes for a snowmobiler. Snowmobile use should be reserved for areas which are more difficult to reach, and thus less conflict with the non-motorized.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	80	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>Skiers have used this terrain for thirty years because it is avalanche safe and quick access. Backcountry ski terrain is limited in Summit County due to accessibility, snow conditions, avalanche safety and terrain features. We are losing much more terrain than snow machines. Let them continue to enjoy their vast zones where we have been displaced.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	82	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>With the exception of the powerline route off of Sallie Barber, all the other side routes of Baldy are non-motorized and popular Nordic and snowshoe trails, where there are numerous loop possibilities that are extremely popular in winter and summer.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	85	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>Another winter non-motorized parking lot option to access Baldy's western face, is from the top of CR 520.</p>	Management of trailheads is not part of this process.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
436	78	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>For thirty plus years, Baldy has easily been our most popular winter backcountry ski and snowboard destination near Breckenridge. Only recently has snowmobile use (mostly hybrid) increased enough to cause problems.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	83	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!!)</p> <p>Illegal snowmobile use is seen from many of the side routes off of Sallie Barber as well as snowmobile tracks seen as high as the ridge between Baldy Mountain and into Black Gulch which is 1.31, non-motorized zone.</p>	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	84	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!)</p> <p>No trailer parking is available at the winter trailhead for Baldy Road. Please, in future analysis please consider a gate and close this road by November 1st to prevent cars from driving it and (getting stuck).</p>	<p>The management of trailheads is not part of this process. Installing and opening and closing gates is costly. Because vehicles may get stuck in snow is not a valid reason for controlling with a gate.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
436	81	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!)</p> <p>Snowmobiles high mark and track this entire zone making skiing difficult and unpleasant. It only takes one or two snowmobiles to ruin the experience that could've been had by hundred's of skiers.</p>	<p>The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
436	77	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!)</p> <p>This road will need a winter gate. Please make this one of your top priorities.</p>	<p>Installing and opening and closing gates is costly. Because vehicles may get stuck in snow is not a valid reason for controlling with a gate.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
436	76	baldy mountain	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation as winter non-motorized!)</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] applaud the WRNF for choosing to propose this as winter non-motorized. We realize this is still just a draft plan, so we do feel it is important to reinforce why we think this is such a critical area to be left as closed to motorized.</p>	<p>The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
341	7	baldy mtn	<p>Baldy Mountain</p> <p>Many local snowmobilers ride Baldy Mountain to access French Creek and Tiger Road. Please reconsider allowing snowmobiles to access Baldy. This will prevent overcrowding the trailhead at Tiger Road for people trying to access the Swan drainages.</p>	<p>The Baldy area is small and there is a lack of trailheads. It does not provide enough area for a snowmobile network and there are no legal connections to other motorized networks.</p>	<p>Designation of Lands</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	13	baldy mtn	<p>BALDY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND SURROUNDINGS (New designation)</p> <p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] are sorry to see this area selected as winter non-motorized.</p> <p>For many years, Baldy has been a popular winter motorized area. The power line trail provides convenient access to the Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) which allows snowmobile users to access the vast network of French Gulch including Lincoln Park and trails leading into the Swan Drainage. We would encourage the Forest Service to look into ways of making a winter trail connection from Boreas Pass Road to Baldy and on to Sallie Barber. This would create a unique opportunity for Snowmobilers to link several areas together.</p> <p>Many users enjoy snowmobile assisted skiing, within close proximity to the Town of Breckenridge.</p>	The Baldy area is small and there is a lack of trailheads. It does not provide enough area for a snowmobile network and there are no legal connections to other motorized networks.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
316	11	baldy mtn	<p>Baldy Mountain</p> <p>Many local snowmobilers ride Baldy Mountain to access French Creek and surrounding terrain. Please reconsider allowing snowmobiles to access Baldy. Many skiers use that area for snowmobile assisted skiing and riding.</p>	The Baldy area is small and there is a lack of trailheads. It does not provide enough area for a snowmobile network and there are no legal connections to other motorized networks.	Designation of Lands
559	16	baldy mtn	I am thrilled about Baldy Mountain, which has always been one of the most popular destinations to make turns or ski a short loop on its numerous surrounding trails but recently has been ruined from an increase in hybrid snow machine use.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and thus backs the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
389	6	baldy mtn	Instead of the forest service cutting off access to Baldy Mountain, I would love to see you find a way to link the many of winter trails together. You can access just about anywhere on a dirt bike or mountain bike. Why is it that we are being left with these smaller and smaller pieces of winter trails?	The Baldy area is small and there is a lack of trailheads. It does not provide enough area for a snowmobile network and there are no legal connections to other motorized networks. Because of private property, trailhead, and wildlife issues, these small isolated areas will be closed to snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
377	3	baldy mtn	Some of the other areas that are of concern are important to me as well because they are in my county and backyard. As an avid backcountry skier the Baldy Mountain Area is great for skiing and snowmobile assist skiing. it should remain as a great area for both motorized and non motorized use. It also provides a very safe place to snowmobile when the avalanche danger is high, which is a frequent occurrence in our county. Frisco local access has been around from before I was a county resident and should remain available for trailerless access to Miners creek road. Mayflower gulch is one of the few high alpine areas and should remain open as an area that is another great locals spot to ride to avoid some of the crowds of Vail pass and the three forks of the swan.	The Baldy area is small and there is a lack of trailheads. It does not provide enough area for a snowmobile network and there are no legal connections to other motorized networks. Because of private property, trailhead, and wildlife issues, these small isolated areas will be closed to snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	24	baldy mtn	We are thrilled about Baldy Mountain, which has always been one of the most popular destinations to make turns or ski a short loop on its numerous surrounding trails but recently has been ruined from an increase in hybrid snow machine use. Thank you. Enforcement will undoubtedly be an issue, so I hope you will consider making this a high priority for placing a gate at the top of Baldy Road.	This comment supports Alternative G. Education of motorized users will be through the use of maps.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
285	45	barney ford trail, nightmare on baldy trail	Other, unlabeled routes. This comment pertains to the Barney Ford Trail and the Nightmare on Baldy Trail. These two important system routes are identified on the plan for Alternative G as "other routes and trails", but both are very important non-motorized system routes. In addition, the line work for both routes is inaccurate. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the routes be adjusted to reflect on-the-ground reality and the routes be identified as non-motorized system routes, particularly Barney Ford, which crosses a small sliver of National Forest and is managed by the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County Government under a special use authorization.	The Dillon RD will work with the Town of Breckenridge to correct mapping errors.	Mapping, GIS
436	6	bemrose trail	HOOSIER PASS EAST (Bemrose Trail and Road) Our [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] concern with the non-motorized Bemrose Trail is that the roads on each end of this trail occasionally see illegal winter motorized traffic.	Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	52	BGU 37, BGU 371	Dillon Ranger District: BGU 37 and 371 have late seasons that could run past December 1st. Hunters are not typically willing to hike miles back in for a late cow. Having the flexibility to allow four wheeled vehicles would help with harvest.	These routes are open to full-sized vehicles and non-motorized uses only because they do not provide access to a larger OHV trail network. National OHV policy is to prohibit unlicensed vehicles (motorcycles and ATVs) on routes unless they are part of a larger trail network and there are sufficient trailheads. With little mileage of routes open to OHVs, there would be a high likelihood of illegal off-road use if these routes were open to unlicensed vehicles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	88	black gulch, french pass, little french pass	BLACK GULCH ROAD, FRENCH PASS, LITTLE FRENCH ROAD - All of these popular non-motorized roads were previously closed to winter motorized, but all of them see occasional illegal use. Please gate or sign. Since this gate could be effectively placed just past the Lincoln Town site for a winter closure, please close this by November 1st. This winter we routinely had cars driving up French Gulch road and Sallie Barber, and getting stuck.	Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	89	black gulch, french pass, little french pass	<p>BLACK GULCH ROAD, FRENCH PASS, LITTLE FRENCH ROAD -</p> <p>Please consider re-locating your upper year round FS Boundary closure of French gulch trail to a lower location, right after the last home site (Strickland's) right before the avalanche paths and the open meadow. From this point, the road travels only another ¼ mile or so before coming to your gate but it travels through a very wet section, a sensitive wildflower meadow that needs protection and a steep eroding road section.</p>	Education of travel restrictions will be accomplished first with trailhead information and maps. Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan and will work in partnership with adjoining landowners where possible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
446	9	blair witch	<p>Blair Witch Trail, Not shown on TMP DEIS map - Horseshoe Gulch/Soda Creek: Blair Witch Connects 351.1 Horseshoe Gulch and the Colorado trail 2108.3. It is easily accessed via the SCOS Dredge trailhead. This is a very popular trail that gets a great deal of use, especially in the early season since it is among the first trails to dry in Summit County, usually in mid to late May. It is very sustainable and provides for a very high quality experience.</p>	This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
373	3	blair witch	<p>Blair Witch Trail. A hugely popular trail designed and built by mountain bikers several years ago to provide a unique biking experience with log jumps, tight twisty turns, and a narrow trail. It was identified by our group in our response to the 2006 DEIS TMP wherein we requested the FS recognize and include the trail in the inventory. However, that does not appear to have happened since it's not on the map nor in the list of trails and roads. The trail is well built for sustainability and shows little wear and tear despite heavy use and no maintenance for several years. We ride this trail multiple times each season because of its unique features.</p>	This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking.	Mapping, GIS
85	5	blair witch	<p>I support Alternative G, with the exception below, as the best balance between the interests of all users and wildlife and resource conservation.</p> <p>Blair Witch Trail. A hugely popular trail designed and built by mountain bikers several years ago to provide a unique biking experience with log jumps, tight twisty turns, and a narrow trail. It was identified by our group in our response to the 2006 DEIS TMP wherein we requested the FS recognize and include the trail in the inventory. However, that does not appear to have happened since it's not on the map nor in the list of trails and roads; the trail is well built for sustainability and shows little wear and tear despite heavy use and no maintenance for several years. I ride this trail multiple times each season because of its unique features. It starts as a connector directly out of the Keystone back ranch and then connects to the Colorado Trail.</p>	This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking.	Monitoring, Inventories
320	29	blair witch	<p>Upper Blue</p> <p>Blair Witch Trail: Inaccurate line work: Trail connects between the Colorado Trail (5-2108.3) west of the Horseshoe Gulch Connection (5-351.1) and the Keystone Ranch Trail (5-351.2A) [It] should be open to mechanized use.</p>	This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	13	blair witch trail, mushroom trail	<p>Summer Routes; Upper Blue:</p> <p>There are important and missing trails in the Horseshoe Gulch area in the Swan River Drainage. The Blair Witch Trail connects between the Colorado Trail (5-2108.3) west of the Horseshoe Gulch connection (5-351.1) and the Keystone Ranch Trail (5-351.2A). This is an extremely heavily used trail that provides a loop opportunity between the Colorado Trail area and Keystone Ranch. The second missing trail is called the Mushroom Trail. It is located on the northwest flanks of Swan Mountain, connects from routes 5-132W.2 and 5-132.2, and is located on an old ditch, making it a sustainable trail that receives considerable use out of the Keystone Ranch area. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the Blair Witch Trail and the Mushroom Trail be added to the USFS inventory and designated for continued non-motorized use. This comment was originally made by the Town of Breckenridge in October, 2006, so both excluded routes will hopefully be included in the SDEIS inventory.</p>	<p>Blair Witch - This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking.</p> <p>Mushroom Trail - This route was not inventoried and therefore will not be considered in this process.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
233	6	boreas pass	<p>Area around Boreas Pass, Section house and Boreas Pass road.</p> <p>Ideally, SHA would like to see an outright prohibition of snowmobile use on Boreas Pass Road. The road is one of the most popular winter routes for XC skiing, snowshoeing, and dog walking. It is quite common to see families with small children and school groups on the road in the winter. It is only a matter of time before tragedy strikes due to a collision between a speeding snowmobile and a group of children.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
233	4	boreas pass	<p>Area around Boreas Pass, Section house and Boreas Pass road.</p> <p>In alternate G, open motorized travel is permitted approximately .12 miles above Boreas Pass road for the length of the road. SHA feels this arbitrary boundary will be difficult to identify for the users and manage by the Forest Service. SHA feels it would be easiest for all parties to prohibit off route over snow travel above Boreas Pass road as the road is an easily identifiable boundary that can be signed.</p>	<p>This is a mapping error. The boundary of the snowmobile use is the Boreas Pass Road.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
233	5	boreas pass	<p>Area around Boreas Pass, Section house and Boreas Pass road. SHA would also like to increase the size of the Forest Supervisors order which currently requires snowmobiles to stay on the Boreas Pass road approximately ½ mile from the Boreas Pass summit. As it is written, the restriction only applies to a strip approximately 500 feet on other side of the road. SHA would like to have the closure extend on a line across the valley to the west of the road to the line of trees at the bottom of the wetland area . This area currently sees more and more snowmobile use which ruins the skiing experience for the hut users.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
517	1	boreas pass	<p>As a resident of the Upper blue, I am concerned about the potential bottleneck that may occur at the existing Boreas Pass Parking lot and the resulting inherent danger.</p> <p>Over the holidays I observed on several days where the parking lot was full with backcountry skier vehicles. As you know this is one of the most popular trailheads in Summit County and has an abnormally high concentration of skiers. The parking for a car or truck and then the necessary trailers will create quite a bit of congestion as there is not a proper turn around for this type of rig and will reduce the back country skier parking.</p> <p>The proposed Travel Management Plan effectively makes this the only jumping off point for snow machines (snow mobiles and snow cats) to access via several miles of Boreas Pass Road to Pennsylvania Gulch, Indiana Gulch and generally the Boreas Pass area. The Boreas Pass trailhead is some of the best family skiing in the County. It is normal to see families with small children and dogs utilizing this as first time or easier skiing. The natural conflict that arises with such a long overlap of both users is a safety issue. With an increased concentration of snow machines it will not be a question of if there will be and accident, but when.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	74	boreas pass	<p>We respect the rights of the snow machine users but I also respectfully BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>A more seamless transition would be to restrict use to the road since it is surrounded by non-motorized only boundary.</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	72	boreas pass	<p>BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>Boreas Road is the place to take your non-skiing visitors who just want an easy scenic walk on a snowpacked road. This is the destination for a beginner skier, a first time snowshoer. Unrestricted motorized use clashes with the more popular non-motorized user group that you see so often on this road. Please instead consider restricting motorized on Boreas Pass, and potentially closing it to motorized after its junction with Indiana Creek.</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p>	<p>Designation of Lands</p>
436	73	boreas pass	<p>BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>It is the winter route to the Section House where there are restrictions to motorized travel above and near this hut.</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p>	<p>Action not Specified</p>
436	75	boreas pass	<p>BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>The boundary of unrestricted motorized should exclude the junction with the Bakers Tank Trail, which has been signed as non-motorized for years.</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p> <p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	71	boreas pass	<p>BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>This road is given unrestricted motorized use, but only a hundred or so feet to the east of the road where it then changes to closed to all motorized. This seems awfully difficult for management.</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p> <p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	12	boreas pass road	<p>BOREAS PASS ROAD</p> <p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] appreciate that this area is given unrestricted motorized use; it is a valuable road for the many local riders. It provides a wonderful opportunity to get some miles on the trail!</p>	<p>Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p> <p>While the Forest Service appreciates and respects the comment, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
389	7	boreas pass, baldy, montezuma	I would love to see a link from Boreas Pass Road to Baldy, on to Sallie Barber, French Gulch and the South Fork of the Swan. From there you could access all of Montezuma. That is a great ride, believe me. With a winter trail network like that, it could really put Summit County on the map as a snowmobile destination. We already have awesome trails at Vail Pass and Chicago Ridge, connecting some of the dots around Breckenridge would really add to our trail totals.	Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road. While the Forest Service appreciates and respects the comment, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Road and Trail Classification/Management
402	5	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	Boreas Pass beginning at its gate, where Summit County ends plowing, is a high use area. The main issue on Boreas Pass is the incompatibility of motorized machines on blind curves at uncontrolled speeds sharing the same narrow road with pedestrians. It is heavily used by self propelled users of all types including many families with small children, senior citizens, and people with dogs, cross-country skiers and users on snow-shoes. The first mile is too narrow to mix even one snowmobile with this kind of traffic. This is just simply not safe. In the event of an accident, there will surely be liability questions. At this time, Boreas Pass is not a highly popular spot for motorized use but if this plan is adopted, it will force motorized users into this area and we can expect much more impact and the resulting conflict between user groups. Once this area becomes popular with the motorized group, it will be very difficult to reverse its motorized status. The parking area is not adequate to handle more cars let alone the added space for snow-machine trailers. On peak use days the parking area is over capacity. Encouraging more snow-machines in this area will create problems that don't yet exist on a large scale. As a frequent user of this area, I recommend ending all motorized winter use on Boreas Pass Road.	Boreas Pass Road is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road. While the Forest Service appreciates and respects the comment, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
386	7	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>I am particularly disturbed to see the Boreas Pass/Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch areas being turned over to a winter motorized free for all. Boreas Pass Road has always been the domain of the non-motorized winter user, whether cross country skier, jogger, dog walker, snow player, kids on snowboard looking for kicks, or rubber-necking tourist. Currently, snowmobiles high-mark the cut banks along the historic railroad route, destroying vegetation and creating unsafe conditions for other users. Snowmobiles go round and round and round in the Argentine meadow, just 1.5 miles from the trailhead, creating noise and air pollution to the significant detriment of other users. And there is a hut at the top of the pass, where snowmobile play significantly diminishes the hut experience. Boreas Pass Road needs to be protected for the primary enjoyment of the non-motorized user.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
386	8	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>I am particularly disturbed to see the Boreas Pass/Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch areas being turned over to a winter motorized free for all. Indiana Gulch is a play area between Boreas and Pennsylvania, and is hammered by motorized use.</p> <p>Pennsylvania Gulch used to be a delightful winter non-motorized area, popular with both backcountry skiers and cross country ski tourers. It has been nearly ruined in recent years by heavy snowmobile use.</p> <p>Please evaluate the Boreas Pass/Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch areas, change the designation to winter restricted and prepare to install snow gates.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
402	4	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>I oppose motorized use in this part [Boreas Pass, Indiana & Pennsylvania Gulches] of the White River National Forest [because of] impact of motorized use near back-country huts.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
402	2	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	I oppose motorized use in this part [Boreas Pass, Indiana & Pennsylvania Gulches] of the White River National Forest [because of] safety and liability.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
402	3	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	I oppose motorized use in this part [Boreas Pass, Indiana & Pennsylvania Gulches] of the White River National Forest [because of] tranquility of areas close to high density areas.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Private Property
402	1	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	I would like to comment on the proposed winter use "Travel Management Plan." My comments are specifically regarding the Boreas Pass, Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulches. I am against allowing motorized use in these particular areas. I personally believe that the more impact a user makes on the National Forest, the more rules should be in place. The comparison of the noise, erosion and pollution of one snowmobile to one cross-country skier, should be obvious.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	56	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>PLEASE ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNRESTRICTED MOTORIZED WINTER USE IN THIS REGION</p> <p>If Snowmobiles want a passage across Hoosier Ridge, they have Boreas Pass road. Crossing the saddle between x11851 is not a popular route in the winter and now it is closed in the summer, so why would you encourage this? Again, most of the snowmobile use is illegal hybrid use into Horseshoe Basin.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
402	6	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>Regarding Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulch areas. Snow-machines are just not the same things they were only a few years ago. The technology of snow-machines has improved so that machines that once were limited to trails and roads can now expand farther and higher than they have ever been able to before. Only a few years ago, no one understood the term "high marking." Now, we get to see "high marking" in places that before now, were unthinkable. Now, we watch "extreme" snowmobiling on television. My suggestion is that, with the changes in the snow- machines themselves, so too should come the rules for their use. By comparison, the self-propelled users of the back-country have a fairly benign impact on the forest particularly in winter. One snow-machine can destroy the silence for all the people and wildlife within a several mile radius. The same cannot be said about skiers or hikers; they do not generate high decibels. My other point regarding Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulch areas is their accessibility from the high population density Breckenridge area. As a Breckenridge resident of 35 years, I regard these areas as small pockets of peace and quiet close to</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
402	7	boreas pass, indiana, pennsylvania	<p>The whole point of having a back-country hut is to maintain a small envelope that will allow people to safely experience the National Forest in a respectful low impact way. The Section House and Ken's Cabin is a "how-to" model of groups combining their efforts for a common good. The Forest Service, the Colorado and Summit Historical Societies and the Summit Huts have collectively restored these historic structures which are now used as winter huts. Imagine, skiing into a hut 7 miles from the trail head, with essential gear on your back taking several hours to arrive at a back-country hut, only to hear the whine of snow-machines or even have one pass you at high speed. We can do better than that.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
129	5	boreas pass, swan river, green mtn, french cr, montezeuma, indiana gulch	<p>Please do not close existing national forest motorized trails! [A] Specific area of my concern and many of the motorized active users in this area is:</p> <p>There are also many other areas in the Summit CO. area that I am concerned with that are not so specific including Boreas Pass, Indiana Gulch, Swan River Drainage, Green Mountain., French Creek and Montezeuma.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
294	1	burro trail crystal lakes	<p>I'm a winter non-motorized skier in Summit County, Colorado and I would like to thank you for closing the Burro Trail and Crystal Lakes drainage to motorized use.</p>	<p>The comment supports alternative G.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	60	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>Although we've [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] commented on this road since 2000, it still has yet to make your maps, and response to our comments is that this road is not in the WRNF inventory. This is puzzling because it is such a major road and crosses under a powerline as it follows the west side of Indiana Creek, (not to be confused with the more popular 593.1 Indiana Gulch road). It is the summer and winter link to two 'Dyersville Singletrack" trails, also routes which we've commented on but still don't see on your maps. (These are not to be confused with the Dyersville road). These singletracks were brought to the WRNF attention when this process first began and they have been used in mountain bike races for years.) The road dead ends in about a mile next to an old cabin.</p>	<p>This route has not been inventoried and the Dillon RD staff has not confirmed the existence of this route nor been able to determine the condition, therefore, it will not be added to the travel system at this time.</p>	Monitoring, Inventories
436	62	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>For the Nordic skier to ski from the Spruce Creek Ranch horse stables, on the groomed set tracks all the way to the open meadow at this three way intersection, this flat road is a perfect one –two hour ski. It is flatter than Indiana or 593.1 and holds great snow in winter and sees much lighter motorized use than the neighboring Indiana Gulch road and the connector road over to PA. Gulch.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	64	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>It does see motorized use, both summer and winter. In the winter the use is light, and they tend to turn around even before they reach the end of the road. This doesn't seem like it would be much of a loss to the winter motorized, since it so short. In the summer this shady road is wet and seeing significant damage from motorized use despite it dead-ending so quickly. Please consider closing this road to year round motorize use with the exception of authorized use for powerline maintenance.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
436	63	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>It is a wonderful two hour ski loop using the Dyersville singletrack.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Action not Specified
436	65	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>Please, if Indiana Creek and PA Creek Road become restricted motorized, this does make sense to become one of our few non-motorized options in this region.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	61	cabin road	<p>"MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD" or "CABIN ROAD"</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] request that even if WRNF cannot recognize this road, that they instead adjust the designation of this 'area' from unrestricted motorized to motorized prohibited. This new designation should begin at the junction between 611W.3A and Indiana Creek Road (593.1) and extend to the top of the ridge so that everything to the west of x12029 is now closed to winter motorized.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
435	13	cabin road	<p>INDIANA CREEK - 'CABIN ROAD' or "MIDDLE INDIANA CREEK ROAD'</p> <p>Missing on your map is a road and trail that we have given comments to WRNF in the past. This road lies between the valley bottom of 593.1(Indiana Creek) and 611.W.3A (Indiana to Pennsylvania connector road). Some folks call this the 'Cabin' road because it dead-ends in about a mile at a well-preserved cabin. It crosses underneath some power lines. It is a major 4WD road that every year deteriorates a little more because it is shady and wet and unsuitable for jeep traffic. It really doesn't go anywhere for a full size vehicle because it dead-ends quickly in a wet marshy area that is seeing much degradation from heavy motorized use. This road also connects to the popular winter and summer Dyersville Single-track, another trail that we have commented on in the past to the WRNF exactly so that it was on record and it would not have to undergo the NEPA process if it was left out. Both this road and single-track are significant, heavily used routes and we would like them to become non-motorized. They are extremely popular in the winter and in the summer for trail runners and mountain bikes. Because this is a year round motorized closure recommendation, we would suggest a gate at the On behalf of our members and other hikers who visit the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail in the White River National Forest, we strongly urge a revision to improve the experience of trail users in the Copper Mountain area.</p>	<p>Because this route was not inventoried, it will be closed to motorized use in the summer when the Travel Plan is implemented. Additionally, In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
153	1	CDNST	<p>On behalf of our members and other hikers who visit the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail in the White River National Forest, we strongly urge a revision to improve the experience of trail users in the Copper Mountain area.</p>	<p>Regarding the use by the horseback riding outfitter, the Dillon Ranger District will not be restricting the use on this trail.</p>	Planning Document (Rule, EIS, etc.)
291	1	cemetery trail	<p>I am writing to ask that the trail head adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road be closed to motorcycle use in Summit County:</p> <p>Important deer and elk summer and winter refuge in the area that would be accessed.</p>	<p>These two trailheads are on Summit County property and are not considered in this proposal.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
291	5	cemetery trail	<p>I am writing to ask that the trail head adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road be closed to motorcycle use in Summit County:</p> <p>Noise and dust pollution - Close proximity of trails to the Keystone community and the very narrow valley means the noise will be heard by everyone.</p>	These two trailheads are on Summit County property and are not considered in this proposal.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
291	3	cemetery trail	<p>I am writing to ask that the trail head adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road be closed to motorcycle use in Summit County:</p> <p>Safety - All trails would be shared among hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders and motorcycles/dirt bikes.</p>	These two trailheads are on Summit County property and are not considered in this proposal.	Traffic Control and Safety
291	2	cemetery trail	<p>I am writing to ask that the trail head adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road be closed to motorcycle use in Summit County:</p> <p>The 500 acre Dillon Bay Fen (peat) area would be disturbed. More proliferation of noxious weeds carried in from non-native areas than has already occurred.</p>	These two trailheads are on Summit County property and are not considered in this proposal.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
291	4	cemetery trail	<p>I am writing to ask that the trail head adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road be closed to motorcycle use in Summit County:</p> <p>Wildfire potential - hot engines and mufflers on dry grass, with no spark arrestors.</p>	These two trailheads are on Summit County property and are not considered in this proposal.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
435	4	copper mtn	<p>COLORADO TRAIL THROUGH COPPER MOUNTAIN SKI RESORT – This is not on your map. This is a necessary part of the ride up to Searle Pass especially since the lower section of Guller Creek was decommissioned a few years ago. It is also part of our most difficult mountain bike loop in the county (Copper Mtn. to Searle Pass to Kokomo to Camp Hale to Wilder Gulch to Copper Mtn.) Hopefully this is just a mapping error. Why is a commercial horse operation allowed on this trail? This operation has caused significant damage to this trail as well as the almost unbearable stench of horse urine odor trapped in this woody zone. Please consider re-routing the horse operation onto the open ski runs where their impact will be much less.</p>	This is a mapping error. This route is in Alternative G, however, it is difficult to view on the map. Regarding horse excrement on the Colorado Trail, because the outfitter is under special use permit, the District is not going to consider restricting that use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
432	21	copper mtn	<p>Copper Mountain: The section of the Colorado Trail that travels through the Copper Mountain Ski Resort is not on the inventory map and needs to be added and designated as open to all non-motorized users.</p>	This is a mapping error. This route is in Alternative G, however, it is difficult to view on the map.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	22	copper mtn	Copper Mountain: The section of the Colorado Trail that travels through the Copper Mountain Ski Resort. I am very concerned that a commercial, heavy volume horse operation is allowed on this very important trail. Although this trail is relatively new, it has been basically destroyed by the commercial operation. Which had created numerous negative impacts to non-paying trail users including deep trenching that often doesn't dry out and makes the trail difficult to travel on and the concentrated stench of horse urine odor due to such high volume horse use. Since the operation is under the auspice of Copper Mountain Resort, they should be required to re-locate the horse operation. There is more than enough room to locate the constant stream of horses onto their own trail. I would think from a safety perspective, the horse operators would appreciate their own trail where they don't have to worry about their often unskilled clientele trying to calm a horse that is agitated by a backpacker or cyclist. This operation generates enough income that is could certainly finance the construction of another trail specifically for its own use.	Regarding horse use on the Colorado Trail, because the outfitter is under special use permit, the District is not going to consider restricting that use.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
337	18	copper mtn, mayflower gulch, humbug hill, west side tenmile	COPPER MOUNTAIN AND SOUTH MAYFLOWER GULCH AND HUMBUG GULCH (SOUTH OF COPPER MTN. (NEW DESIGNATION) This area is a sad loss for the motorized community. There are few areas on the west side of the Ten Mile Range where snowmobilers can access high alpine bowls like these. We [High Country Snowmobile Club] realize that this is a significant gain for the winter non-motorized users.	There is not enough terrain to make this a viable snowmobile area. There is heavy non-motorized use on the road. It will be closed to snow mobiles to reduce user conflicts and to provide for safety.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
3		crystal, mt helan mccullough, monte cristo	Area 9 – Crystal Lake, Mt. Helen, McCullough Gulch, Monte Cristo Creek areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	There is not enough terrain to make this a viable snowmobile area. There is heavy non-motorized use on the road. It will be closed to snow mobiles to reduce user conflicts and to provide for safety.	
3		crystal, mt helen, mccullough, monte cristo	Crystal Lake, Mt. Helen, McCullough Gulch, Monte Cristo Creek areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use.	There is not enough terrain to make this a viable snowmobile area. There is heavy non-motorized use on the road. It will be closed to snow mobiles to reduce user conflicts and to provide for safety.	
285	49	cr 450	Winter CR 450, Forest Hills Drive. This route climbs from the Town of Breckenridge through the Western Sky subdivision and is a paved, switch-backed, plowed Summit County road. The plan shows this route as open to snowmobiles, which would prompt safety concerns on a plowed County road. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the route be removed from the winter map and shown as "other roads and trails" because it is managed by Summit County Government and unsafe for winter snowmobile use.	Forest Hills Drive (Summit County Road 450) is under county jurisdiction via an easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road. This is a mapping error that will be corrected on the final decision.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
455	31	Crystal Lake, Mt. Helen, McCullough Gulch, Monte Cristo Creek	Area 9 – Crystal Lake, Mt. Helen, McCullough Gulch, Monte Cristo Creek areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	There is not enough terrain to make this a viable snowmobile area. There is heavy non-motorized use on the road. It will be closed to snow mobiles to reduce user conflicts and to provide for safety.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
233	3	crystal, spruce cr	Area around Francies Cabin (Crystal & Spruce creek drainages) SHA [Summit Huts Association] feels it will be necessary to install a gate near the current winter trail head at Spruce Creek road to preserve the non-motorized experience of this area. SHA will be willing to partner with the Forest Service in the purchase and management of this gate. Authorized over snow vehicle traffic from the City of Colorado Springs which operates two water diversions in the area, SHA, and search and rescue operations would have to have access through this gate so the gate would have to be of a design that will allow operation during the snow season.	Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan and will work in partnership with Summit Huts Association to install the appropriate closure technique on the Spruce Creek and Crystal Lake roads.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
233	1	crystal, spruce cr	Area around Francies Cabin (Crystal & Spruce creek drainages) Summit Huts Association supports the lack of designated winter motorized use on Spruce Creek road (FDR 5-800.1) and Crystal Creek (FDR 5-803.1) and the Burro Trail. (FDT 5-80.1). All these routes are heavily used by non-motorized day users and overnight users of Francies Cabin and insuring a non motorized experience will greatly increase the quality of their experience.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
233	2	crystal, spruce cr	Area around Francies Cabin (Crystal & Spruce creek drainages) While snowmobile traffic on these routes is not heavy, the impacts to non motorized users are. The tracks and “whoop-de-doo” of even a small number of machines cause ruts that degrade the experience and can even be a safety concern for skiers. Snowmobile incursions on the Forest Supervisors order surrounding Francies Cabin have not uncommon in the past and SHA [Summit Huts Association] is in support of eliminating snowmobile use on Crystal Creek Road as the best solution to this ongoing problem.	The comment supports alternative G the preferred alternative and provides some of the rationale toward the final decision for this area.	Traffic Control and Safety
15	4	dillon cemetery	Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation including: The Dillon Cemetery: A place for quiet remembrance and reflection that was for at least one of our homeowners visiting a friend's graveside shattered by motorcycle noise. An experience that engendered intense emotion when recounted.	This trailhead is on Summit County property and not considered in this process.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	100	Dry Gulch, Gold Run Gulch, Sidewinder, Sawmill gulch	<p>"The Nordic Bubble" Zone (Dry Gulch, Gold Run Gulch, Sidewinder, Sawmill gulch etc.)</p> <p>The map is very confusing in this zone and we will support the Town of Breckenridge and County Open Space comments regarding this zone as well as the respecting the owner of Dry Gulch who has designated his property as year round non-motorized, already a success for so many skiers and 'shoers, and a great balance between the user groups in the GH. The winter map seems to respect the recommendations sent in from the Golden Horseshoe Recreation group, but again it is difficult to determine this from your winter Alternative G map.</p>	We agree the Alternative G winter use map, at the large scale, is confusing in those areas of a high density of trails and mixed land ownership patterns. The final decision for winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group.	Mapping, GIS
436	101	Dry Gulch, Gold Run Gulch, Sidewinder, Sawmill gulch	<p>"The Nordic Bubble" Zone (Dry Gulch, Gold Run Gulch, Sidewinder, Sawmill gulch etc.)</p> <p>We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] would like to make sure that all obvious access points into Dry Gulch are closed to winter motorized use (i.e. Sidewinder, BackDoor) and also closed at locations that make sense – i.e. even though this is on WRNF land, it makes better sense to close Sidewinder from the top at its junction with Sawmill, so Snow machines can turn around, rather than having them descend steeply down to the private property boundary.</p>	The final decision for winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. Backdoor Trail (aka Jessie Road - GH 19) is inside the Nordic bubble and therefore closed to snowmobile use. Sidewinder (GH35) is located on lands owned by Summit County and the Town of Breckenridge as well as National Forest lands. The trail is located in a "Multisport Winter Management Area" per the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" with uses to be determined by the three land managers. At this point in time the route will be open to snowmobile use where legally permissible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
432	20	dryersville	<p>Breckenridge: The Dyersville Trail is a heavily used trail that connects routes 5-597.1 with 5-611.1. The FS has allowed it to be used for cycling and running races and it should be included in the inventory and should be opened to all non-motorized uses. 5-597.1 (Dyersville Road) acts as an extension of the Dyersville Trail and connects this trail to Indiana Gulch Road. This road actually dead ends high above the junction with the Dyersville Trail and acts mainly as a motorized out and back and an access to some higher up, unsustainable trails that are mainly used by dirt bikes. The best way to manage this road and improve resource impacts would be to make the section between Indiana Creek Road and the Dyersville Trail open only to non-motorized and to close the Dyersville Road to everyone above this junction for sustainability reasons. Missing on your map is a road that has been mentioned in comment letters for previous TMP drafts. This road lies between the valley bottom of 593.1(Indiana Creek) and 611.W.3A (Indiana to Pennsylvania connector road). It is sometimes called the "Cabin" road because it dead-ends (for motorized use) in about a mile at a well-</p>	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
433	15	dryersville	I recommend at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes Dyersville Road to be winter non-motorized. This road is within the unrestricted motorized boundary but we rarely see any tracks on it because it is so steep and difficult to reach in the winter. Opening this trail up to motorized is opening up a huge amount of land above it as well that rarely sees any humans – in winter and summer. We believe this region should maintain the higher level of protection it still has today. It is not a desirable destination for the snow machines because when the road travels above treeline it is often windscored and holds patchy snow.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch. A restricted motorized use designation for the winter would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.	Designation of Lands
285	19	dyersville trail	Summer Routes; Upper Blue: The Dyersville Single Track Trail is a heavily used trail that has been permitted by the USFS in the past for cycling and running races. The single track trail connects routes 5-597.1 with 5-6 1 1.1 and should be included in this inventory as open to non-motorized uses. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the line work representing the Dyersville Single Track Trail be added and the route be designated as open to all non-motorized uses (including mountain bikes).	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
446	17	dyersville, upper indiana	Trail not shown on map but should be included into system Dyersville Trail, Upper Indiana Creek south east of Breckenridge: The Dyersville trail connects the Dyersville townsite spur rd (5-597.1) with the west Indiana Creek road which is also not shown on the DEIS map. This trail is a short section of approximately ½ mile of single track that is quite popular with mountain bikers. It provides a high quality experience and although it has some sections that need minor drainage improvements or short (less than 100') re-routes, it is mostly sustainable. It enables users to create a loop between the Indiana and Pennsylvania Creek drainages. It has also used in several mountain bike races over the last 10+ years. The SFTS recommends this trail be included into the travel system as a non motorized trail.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	139	eisenhower tunnel	<p>WEST SIDE OF EISENHOWER TUNNEL</p> <p>The west tunnel side (between Coon Hill and x13010) is within the 2.1 prescription which emphasizes minimal use. One would think this 2.1 prescription would extend over to the Arapaho National Forest side as well. Please work with Arapaho National Forest on eliminating the illegal winter motorized travel out of the adjacent South Fork of the Williams Fork.</p>	The 2.1 Management prescription does not preclude a hiking trail. The Dillon RD is aware to the illegal snowmobile use and will work on education and enforcement.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
436	138	eisenhower tunnel	<p>WEST SIDE OF EISENHOWER TUNNEL</p> <p>This west side of the tunnel is a great destination for the backcountry skier and rider, and also growing in popularity because access is easy and the high alpine terrain is a top notch ski experience. Occasionally they will descend down into the South Fork of the Williams fork.</p>	Because of the mangement prescription and safety issues the west side of Eisenhower Tunnel will not have designated motorized winter routes and thus there is no motorized activity.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
477	14	french gulch	Please consider re-locating your upper year round FS Boundary closure of French Gulch trail to a lower location, right after the lat homesite, right before the avalanche paths and the open meadow. From this point, the road travels only another ¼ mile or so before coming to your gate but it travels through a very wet section, a sensitive wildflower meadow that needs protection and a steep eroding road section.	Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan. French Gulch Road is under an easement to Summit County and the Travel Plan is not proposing any changes in management of that route.	Technical Studies (Resource Reports, etc.)
539	2	french gulch, middle fork	The summer travel plan shows a strong emphasis on bicycles around the French Gulch and Middle Fork of the Swan area near Breckenridge. Our family has been riding motorcycles here for many years, and a lot of the trails we enjoy are being closed off to our use.	The travel management in the Golden Horseshoe area was determined by coordinating with Summit County and the Town of Breckenridge. A majority of this area is in the 7.1 Management Area (Intermix) where coordinating with local governments is the Forest Plan direction. A recreation travel master plan was developed with representatives of all user groups participating in a collaborative process. This plan represents a compromise and allows for a balance of all uses. Some Routes open to motorcycles were closed to reduce user conflicts.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
523	2	frey gulch	Please do not allow the use of the trailhead entrance to Frey Gulch road.	The trailhead is on Summit County property and not considered in this process.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	8	frisco	<p>4.□Frisco: The open motorized zone recommended in Alternative G for the Iron Springs/Miner's Creek area includes a few non-motorized routes as well as the Summit County Recpath. I recreate in this area 4-5 times a week and over many years, have seen an evolution to recreational use dominated by snowmobile traffic. Non-motorized users have been squeezed onto the Peaks Trail and Mt. Royal Trail (which is so steep it is only really used by snowshoers and winter hikers and only when the avalanche danger is low). Two non-motorized routes are insufficient for the large number of winter users in this area (due to the proximity to Frisco.) In addition, I've noticed a large increase in motorized use at the head of Miner's Creek Road, in the remote and designated as non-motorized timberline areas below Peaks 1-4. I recommend that the Alternative G Designation change to that of restricted motorized use, with Miner's Creek Road being the designated winter motorized route. In addition, the non-motorized boundary on the Tenmile Range should be extended further down Miner's Creek Road to prevent the increasing encroachment into the remote basins at the base of the range. I am particularly disturbed to see the Boreas Pass/Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch areas being turned over to a winter motorized free for all.</p> <p>Outskirts of Frisco and South to Iron Springs and Summit High School Area:</p> <p>Please re-evaluate the designation for this area as winter motorized unrestricted. Please change it to winter restricted. Currently, illegal snowmobile use has proliferated in this area to the detriment of wildlife and other users. I am particularly concerned about land near the Summit High School at Iron Springs that is protected by a conservation easement held by Continental Divide Land Trust. Keeping snowmobiles off the protected open space property will be even more difficult with no restrictions on the neighboring national forest.</p>	<p>A restricted motorized use designation for the winter would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Reducing the area even further is not a valid option as a smaller area would not provide enough rideable terrain. Regarding the proximity to neighborhoods, some user conflicts are inevitable. Additionally, there are many residents who use this area for snowmobile riding.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
386	10	frisco	<p>Outskirts of Frisco and South to Iron Springs and Summit High School Area:</p> <p>Please re-evaluate the designation for this area as winter motorized unrestricted. Please change it to winter restricted. Currently, illegal snowmobile use has proliferated in this area to the detriment of wildlife and other users. I am particularly concerned about land near the Summit High School at Iron Springs that is protected by a conservation easement held by Continental Divide Land Trust. Keeping snowmobiles off the protected open space property will be even more difficult with no restrictions on the neighboring national forest.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch. A restricted motorized use designation for the winter would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	143	frisco	<p>Outskirts of Frisco South to Iron Springs and Summit High School Area:</p> <p>Please re-evaluate the designation for this area as winter motorized unrestricted. Please change it to winter restricted. Currently, illegal snowmobile use has proliferated in this area to the detriment of wildlife and other users. We are particularly concerned about land near the Summit High School at Iron Springs that is protected by a conservation easement held by Continental Divide Land Trust. Keeping snowmobiles off the protected open space property will be even more difficult with no restrictions on the neighboring national forest.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
559	14	frisco	<p>Outskirts of Frisco to the south</p> <p>All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention. The amount of unrestricted winter motorized use does not mix well being so close to an urban environment. I had a too close for comfort encounter with 3 snowmobiles on New Years Day. One driver quickly got stuck in the willows when he couldn't control his machine. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously trashed by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. I would recommend WRNF meeting with Frisco user groups to come up with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	140	frisco	<p>OUTSKIRTS OF FRISCO TO THE SOUTH</p> <p>All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention. The amount of unrestricted winter motorized use does not mix well being so close to an urban environment. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously trashed by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] would recommend WRNF meeting with Frisco user groups to come up with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	Outreach/Education
436	142	frisco	<p>OUTSKIRTS OF FRISCO TO THE SOUTH</p> <p>Why offer such a small play area off of Miners Creek Road and to the north of Rainbow Lake when it's so close to town? This should be switched to restricted motorized use. This road is used by all users, and unrestricted motorized is not appropriate for shared use.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	141	frisco	<p>OUTSKIRTS OF FRISCO TO THE SOUTH</p> <p>Winter non-motorized user groups are three times as popular as motorized, yet this is not reflected in how you distributed the trails between user groups.</p>	<p>In Alternative G, there is actually is a much greater proportion of routes open to winter non-motorized uses and closed to motorized. Alternative GM will have even fewer routes open to snowmobiles.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	22	frisco	<p>OUTSKIRTS OF FRISCO TO THE SOUTH</p> <p>All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention. The amount of unrestricted winter motorized use does not mix well being so close to an urban environment. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously trashed by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. We would recommend WRNF meeting with Frisco user groups to come up with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.</p> <p>Why offer such a small play area off of Miners Creek Road and to the north of Rainbow Lake being so close to town? This should be switched to restricted motorized use. This road is used by all users, and unrestricted motorized is not appropriate for shared use.</p> <p>□</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
337	19	frisco	<p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] appreciate the Forest service recognizing the need for snowmobilers to have access to riding areas in quick proximity to their houses. Many of our members enjoy quick rides on the local trails surrounding Frisco. We would support some increased signage to differentiate between the motorized and non- motorized trails. We believe this would alleviate some of the congestion and complaints between users.</p>	<p>This comment supports Alternative G. The Dillon RD will work with the High County Snowmobile Club to educate non-motorized users about motorized use in that area.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
172	1	Frisco Peninsula	<p>Our comment pertains to the Winter Travel Map G:</p> <p>The Town of Frisco agrees with the recommendations as identified for the trails on the USFS land at the Frisco Peninsula area. (The Town also agrees with the summer recommendations for this area, as identified with Summer Map G for these trails.)</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	<p>General Support</p>
341	10	frisco, miners creek	<p>Frisco</p> <p>Please continue to allow snowmobiles access to the areas surrounding Frisco and granting access to Miners Creek Road. When I visit friends in Frisco we like to take rides on the Miners Creek Road.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
316	4	frisco, miners creek	<p>Frisco</p> <p>Please continue to allow snowmobiles access to the areas surrounding Frisco and granting access to Miners Creek Road.</p>	<p>A motorized use designation for the winter and specific route designation would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. It will be their responsibility to only ride in areas open to that use.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
232	11	general	<p>We applaud the efforts of SCORR and FDRD in bringing people together to work on maintaining our forests and preserving their access to future generations. Rather than having special interest groups at odds with each other it is refreshing to have an opportunity to work with each other with our common goal in mind. We applaud the Summit County Ranger District for their visionary efforts to include motorized recreation in their planning which not only recognizes very skilled sports riders but also allows the young, old, disabled and ill opportunities to enjoy the forests. We were disheartened to see an effort on the part of Summit Daily Newspaper to encourage vehement opposition to these efforts on Tenderfoot Mountain by asking folks to contact you by the 1/6 deadline.</p> <p>Let's keep our forests diversified so that everyone can enjoy them, not just a select few.</p>	<p>This comment supports multiple use on the National Forest which is the goal of the travel plan.</p>	<p>Activities on Public Lands (General)</p>
285	58	gluteus maximus	<p>Winter</p> <p>Gluteus Maximus (and the parallel Gluteus Minimus) are other missing trails that connect the CR3 trailhead for the Peaks Trail with the Siberian Loop. These two trails are a part of the Breckenridge Nordic Center and are included in the Nordic Center's Forest Service permit. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that these routes be identified on the map as open in winter under special use authorization.</p>	<p>Winter non-motorized routes are not part of this travel planning process and will not be reflected on the winter maps.</p>	<p>Mapping, GIS</p>
436	31	gluteus maximus, gluteus minimus	<p>Gluteus Maximus (and the parallel Gluteus Minimus) are other missing trails that connect the CR3 trailhead for the Peaks Trail with the Siberian Loop. These two trails are a part of the Breckenridge Nordic Center and are included in the Nordic Center's Forest Service permit. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] recommend that these routes be identified on the map as open for winter and summer.</p>	<p>Winter non-motorized routes are not part of this travel planning process and will not be reflected on the winter maps.</p>	<p>Mapping, GIS</p>
436	108	gold run	<p>Gold Run Road</p> <p>A primary access between French Gulch and the Swan River drainage. The route provides good recreational access on both ends and also bisects the center of the proposed Gold Run Nordic expansion area. The current map identifies this route as open to winter motorized use, in direct contrast to the GH winter travel recommendations.</p>	<p>These trails are within the Breckenridge Nordic Center Special use permit area and are not considered in this analysis .</p>	<p>Mapping, GIS</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	109	gold run	<p>Gold Run Road</p> <p>The route [Gold Run Road] is managed as a Summit County road. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] recommend identifying Gold Run Road as "other roads and trails" or at least removing it as a winter motorized access route to match the mutually agreed upon GH winter travel recommendations. This includes portions of the road from Wellington Road all the way to the Peabody Placer (misabeled as Preston Way on the SDEIS maps).</p>	<p>The Alternative G winter use map, at the large scale, is confusing in those areas of a high density of trails and mixed land ownership patterns. The final decision for winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed thorough the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" acutally indicates this route as a plowed road and shared use from French Gulch Road to Dry Gulch. Gold Run Road is under an easement to Summit County. The winter travel map for Alternative G does not indicate if routes on the National Forest are under other jurisdictions, therefore, the map must indicate the portions of this route on the National Forest as open to motorized uses. Since Gold Run Road is under county jurisdiction it is subject to the decisions of the county regarding allowable uses.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	50	gold run road	<p>Winter</p> <p>Gold Run Road is a primary access between French Gulch and the Swan River drainage. The route provides good recreational access on both ends and also bisects the center of the proposed Gold Run Nordic expansion area. The current map identifies this route as open to winter motorized use, in direct contradiction to the GH winter travel recommendations. Also, the route is managed as a Summit County Road and one portion is within the Town's jurisdiction, where snowmobiles, ATV's, and motorcycles are expressly prohibited via plat. We recommend identifying Gold Run Road as "other roads and trails" or at least removing it as a winter motorized access route to match the mutually agreed upon GH winter travel recommendations. This includes portions of the road from French Gulch Road all the way to the Peabody Placer (misabeled as Preston Way on the SDEIS maps).</p>	<p>The Alternative G winter use map, at the large scale, is confusing in those areas of a high density of trails and mixed land ownership patterns. The final decision for winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed thorough the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" acutally indicates this route as a plowed road and shared use from French Gulch Road to Dry Gulch. Gold Run Road is under an easement to Summit County. The winter travel map for Alternative G does not indicate if routes on the National Forest are under other jurisdictions, therefore, the map must indicate the portions of this route on the National Forest as open to motorized uses. Since Gold Run Road is under county jurisdiction it is subject to the decisions of the county regarding allowable uses.</p>	Mapping, GIS
292	2	golden horseshoe	[ATT 1]: Map of Dry Gulch Site; dated June 26, 2007	The information in the document was provided to support the response of the commenter.	See Attachment
292	3	golden horseshoe	[ATT 2]: Copy of a Document from the Town of Breckenridge and Tiger Run, Inc. Title: Dry Gulch Easement Agreement. Date: December 17th, 1999.	The information in the document was provided to support the response of the commenter.	See Attachment

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	27	golden horseshoe	5-GH-14 and 5-GH-16, Last Chance and Pelican Trail, respectively. The GH Task Force evaluation from summer 2008 indicated that these two routes are duplicative and that 5- H-14, Last Chance Trail should be closed and 5- GH-16, Pelican Trail should remain open. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that route 5-GH-14 be closed and decommissioned and 5-GH-16 be retained in the travel system for motorbikes and non-motorized uses.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-16 as proposed (motorcycle) and GH-14 as decommission.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	30	golden horseshoe	5-GH-19, Jesse Road (a.k.a. Backdoor). This route dead ends into private property for which the landowner expressly forbids motorized use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be retained for non-motorized use, which is acceptable to the private land owner, and connects to an existing non-motorized route on a legal easement (5-GH-23).	Alternative GM will reflect GH-19 "Jesse Road" - aka Backdoor, as open only to non-motorized use from the junction of GH-34 southeast to Dry Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	28	golden horseshoe	5-GH-21, Peabody Road. This route is identified as open to licensed and unlicensed motorized use, but has poor access for trailers and unlicensed motor vehicles. In addition, the vast majority of this route is located on the Town/County-owned Peabody Placer, which was funded by GOCO funds and precludes unlicensed motor vehicle access. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend the Peabody Road be designated as open to licensed vehicles only.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-21 as open to licensed vehicles only, since it is located in part on private land and landowner does not allow unlicensed vehicles.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	31	golden horseshoe	5-GH-23, Preston Way. This route has an existing legal easement through Dry Gulch that forbids public motorized use, but the Alternative G map identifies the route as open to FSV and all other uses. We [Town of Breckenridge]recommend that the legal easement agreement be honored and the route be identified as open only to non-motorized users through Dry Gulch. Doing so would still retain a full sized vehicle, motorized through-route via Sawmill (5-GH-22).	In the final decision GH-23 will be differentiated into two sections. The first section, from Preston to the entrance driveway to Dry Gulch, will be open to full sized vehicles as it is the access to GH-22. The second segment, from the Dry Gulch entrance driveway, through Dry Gulch to GH-19, will be open only to non-motorized uses, subject to the terms of the easement agreement with the landowner.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	32	golden horseshoe	5-GH-29, Molly B Trail. The line work reflected on the map is inaccurate. The connection was reviewed by the GH Task Force in summer 2008 and proved to have an unsustainable grade and cross several private parcels with landowners who have objected to public access across their property. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the inaccurate line work be corrected, and the route shown to be closed to all uses due to natural resource concerns and lack of legal access.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-29 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Mapping, GIS
285	33	golden horseshoe	5-GH-32, Slide Lode Trail. Field evaluation by the GH Task Force revealed that this route is unsustainable due to excessive grade and also leads to other routes that the Town recommends be closed for natural resource protection and private access issues (e.g. 5-GH-29,5-GH-34,5-GHa-nd3 65-,G H-76). We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend this route be closed to all uses.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-32 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	34	golden horseshoe	5-GH-34, Traylor Way. The line work reflected on the map is inaccurate. The primary route on that hillside is misrepresented by the map which instead includes an extremely unsustainable fall line route as the primary FSV route. The portion of 5-GH-34 on the western portion of Discovery Hill should correspond with the line work currently attributed to the switchback on 5-GH-30 (Moscow #1 Trail) and the fall line connection should be shown as decommissioned. In addition, field visits from summer 2008 by the GH Task Force revealed that the portion of 5-GH-34 east of the junction with 5-GH-32 are unsustainable and should be altogether closed. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the map be adjusted to repair the incorrect line work, and that Traylor Way (5-GH-34) be closed entirely east of the junction of 5-GH-32, and that the remainder of the route (on the western portion of Discovery Hill) be open to FSV. This would allow full-sized vehicles an out and back experience to the top of Discovery Hill for scenic vistas and access to the Jessie Mine stope. The Moscow #1 Trail (5-GH-30) would be the only open route from that point with the recommended closure of 5-GH-29 and 5-GH-32, and that access to Moscow #1 would be limited to non-5-GH-35, Sidewinder Road. The landowner of Dry Gulch has expressed interest in working with the GH Task Force to plan a non-motorized trail system in this area, but expressly forbids motorized through access to the property. In addition, the GH Task Force evaluated the northwestern most routes in summer 2008 and found that, although identified as a full sized vehicle route in the planning process (and on the Alternative G map), the route is actually an unsustainable, user-created single track. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the majority of route 5-GH-35 be identified as open to non-motorized use only based on this landowner access requirement. The misclassified section of this route (northwest of the junction with 5-GH-36) should be closed to all uses, and the section south of the junction with 5-GH-22 (Sawmill/Heinous Hill) remain open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles.	The line work will be corrected as recommended in the comment. Alternative GM will reflect GH-34 as closed to all uses east of the junction of 5-GH-32, and that the remainder of the route (on the western portion of Discovery Hill) will be open to FSV. Since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use road it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Mapping, GIS
285	35	golden horseshoe	5-GH-35, Sidewinder Road. The landowner of Dry Gulch has expressed interest in working with the GH Task Force to plan a non-motorized trail system in this area, but expressly forbids motorized through access to the property. In addition, the GH Task Force evaluated the northwestern most routes in summer 2008 and found that, although identified as a full sized vehicle route in the planning process (and on the Alternative G map), the route is actually an unsustainable, user-created single track. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the majority of route 5-GH-35 be identified as open to non-motorized use only based on this landowner access requirement. The misclassified section of this route (northwest of the junction with 5-GH-36) should be closed to all uses, and the section south of the junction with 5-GH-22 (Sawmill/Heinous Hill) remain open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-35 as open to non-motorized use only from the intersection of GH-22 northwest to Dry Gulch. The misclassified section of this route (northwest of the junction with 5-GH-36) will be closed to all uses, and the section south of the junction with 5-GH-22 (Sawmill/Heinous Hill) will remain open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	36	golden horseshoe	5-GH-36, Lightburn Road. The southern terminus of this route is in Dry Gulch Placer, whose owner has clearly stated his opposition to motorized access across his property. The upper portion of this route is unsustainable and should be closed altogether. Given access limitations and poor alignment, we [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that Lightburn Road be altogether closed.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-36 as closed. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	37	golden horseshoe	5-GH-44, Fuller Trail. The line work reflected on the map is inaccurate. The northeastern portion of route 5-GH-44 connects all the way to 5-352.1 (Summit Gulch Road) and should be reflected as such on the maps so that 5-GH-44 can be a usable connection for motorbikes and non-motorized users. Similarly, the western terminus of the route should connect all the way to 5-GH-22 (Sawmill Road), coinciding with the northernmost segment of 5-GH-27 (Brakesville Road). We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the mapping line errors on both ends of the route be corrected and the entirety of route 5-GH-44 be designated as open to motorbikes and non-motorized uses.	The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22;	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	38	golden horseshoe	5-GH-47, Minnie Mine and XIOU8 Trails. The mapping line work for these routes are inaccurate and should be shown as open to non-motorized vehicles along the entire length of the route (including the portions of lower trail currently shown as black or "other routes". In addition, the portion of Sidedoor Trail, west of the 5-GH-47 should be shown as open to non-motorized users only. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the mapping line work be corrected to include the remainder of the XIOU8 Trail as non-motorized, and all of the Sidedoor Trail also identified as open only to non-motorized use.	The line work will be corrected as recommended in the comment. The route is primarily on land owned by the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County and may cross small slivers of National Forest. GH-47 and the portion of GH 42 (Sidedoor) west of GH-45 on NF land is designated as non-motorized use only.	Mapping, GIS
285	39	golden horseshoe	5-GH-63, Little French Flume. The line work reflected on the map is incorrect. The trail connects from 5-GH-63 south to 5-569.1 and creates a loop. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this line work be corrected and the route be designated open to non-motorized use only. We also support the closure of the unsustainable motorized route on the ridge. This change would match the GH recommendations.	The line work will be corrected as recommended in the comment. The final decision for travel on this route in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group.	Mapping, GIS
285	40	golden horseshoe	5-GH-67, Governor King Trail (a.k.a. Moto Descent). This route is shown as closed on the current plan due to natural resource protection concerns. However, this route is the most sustainable of the unsustainable routes and given the USFS staffs willingness to assume maintenance responsibility of the route; we believe that this route could be a good candidate for inclusion in the travel system (with significant drainage and minor realignment work to be performed). We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be included in the system for motorbikes and non-motorized uses, and the USFS staff assume immediate, necessary maintenance responsibility of the route, as has been requested by USFS staff.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	41	golden horseshoe	5-GH-71, Golden Rule Trail. The map line work for this route is inaccurate. The eastern terminus of this route as shown on the map was closed by the Rocky Mountain Youth Corps in 2008. At the last turn towards the eastern end of the existing line, the route should veer south, and then connect to 5.567.9A (Lincoln Road) closer to Lincoln Park. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the line errors be corrected, but the use designation remains open to motorcycles and non-motorized uses, as recommended through the GH planning process.	The line work will be corrected as recommended in the comment. The final decision for travel on this route in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the recommendations of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group.	Mapping, GIS
285	42	golden horseshoe	5-GH-76, Galena Gulch Road, Upper. This route was reviewed by the GH Task Force in summer 2008 and found to be unsustainable and requiring active closure. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the upper portion of Galena Gulch Road be actively closed, but route 5-350.2A be retained so that a FSV loop can be established on the northern portion of the GH.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-76 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	43	golden horseshoe	5-GH-90, Georgia Gulch Road. The line work reflected on the map is inaccurate, based on the site visits performed during summer 2008. The westernmost portion of this route actually switches back to the south, providing the same full sized vehicle access on a much more sustainable grade and alignment. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this line work be corrected to reflect the existing, sustainable route in lieu of the current unsustainable, fall line route currently shown.	The route is a non-system road that crosses several parcels of private land, without the public having legal access. Alternative GM will reflect GH-90 as closed. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Mapping, GIS
285	44	golden horseshoe	5-GH-95, Brewery Hill Trail (a.k.a. Divide Overlook). The SDEIS provides conflicting information on this route. The map shows the route as closed entirely, while the associated tabular information shows the route as open to motorbikes only. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend this route be closed until additional site specific NEPA can be performed to accommodate a new route, as outlined in the GH travel recommendations.	There was an error in the mapping of this route. The tabular information is correct. Alternative GM will reflect GH-95 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	18	golden horseshoe	<p>Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative.</p> <p>The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation.</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 - designate for motorcycle use -Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 -Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized singletrack. -Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail, if not already designated. -Designate as motorized singletrack the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. -Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized singletrack. -Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized singletrack. <p>These routes generally offer excellent and sustainable opportunity, provide important connections to other trail systems, and would enhance public safety and visitor perceptions by reducing the need for OHVs to travel roads.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment on specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed due to environmental resource issues; -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM; -The American Ditch/flume trail system GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. is open to non-motorized 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
394	2	golden horseshoe	As proposed in Alternative G, here are some suggestions for better access. The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 could be a shared route to connect these routes. Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 with a section of 5-GH-27 to avoid a dead end. Designate 5-GH-67 as a motorized trail; this can also be used by mountain bikes.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; and GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
432	7	golden horseshoe	Breckenridge: Regarding winter use in the Golden Horseshoe, I support the citizen-based recommendations that have been approved by the "Golden Horseshoe Recreation Group," Town of Breckenridge and the Summit County Commissioners. Since the FS was an active participant in this process, it should be fully aware of and should support of these recommendations and must make every attempt within Alternative G to accommodate the plan that was approved, in order to help create a balanced recreational use plan that begins to remedy the unsustainable use patterns that were developed in the past in this area. Any inaccuracies or inconsistencies within Alternative G for the Golden Horseshoe area should be corrected to accurately reflect the recommendations made by the citizens of Breckenridge and Summit County.	The final decision for winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources.	Designation of Lands
125	3	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
177	3	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
178	5	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
179	7	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
281	3	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	4	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
398	2	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
109	3	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
404	6	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	4	golden horseshoe	Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH-27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
109	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
177	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
178	10	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
179	12	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
398	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
404	4	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop with trail 5-GH-29.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	9	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
125	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized singletrack. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	9	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized singletrack. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
179	9	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	6	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent singletrack experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	5	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized single-track. I believe that this trail has been added anyway we'll comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent single-track experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	6	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent single-track experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
177	5	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
178	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	4	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
109	5	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
125	5	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent singletrack experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
404	3	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-67 a motorized trail.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
404	9	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail also provides loop opportunity.	The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
179	11	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
177	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
398	6	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
109	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	9	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
468	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname “the Bookcase trail”. This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
281	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail alternating going up a hill and connecting with a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname “the Bookcase trail”. This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
378	8	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized singletrack. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	7	golden horseshoe	Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized singletrack. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
109	6	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
177	6	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and private property rights. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
178	8	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
179	10	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	5	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
404	8	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single track the trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is level and sustainable, and provides a connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
468	7	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	6	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is nearly perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
125	6	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized singletrack the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
378	7	golden horseshoe	Designate as motorized singletrack the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
404	5	golden horseshoe	Designate the section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 a shared route.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
256	4	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized multi-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for off road users.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specfic trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. <p>Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
404	7	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management
177	4	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
179	8	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management
398	3	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
109	4	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; - GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	6	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; - GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
378	5	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized singletrack. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	4	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized singletrack. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
281	4	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH-45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. 	Road and Trail Classification/Management
468	5	golden horseshoe	Designate trails 5-GH-45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH-17 as motorized single-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and 	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
415	4	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails: - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	9	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized singletrack. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	6	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent singletrack experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
415	8	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized singletrack. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname “the Bookcase trail”. This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
415	7	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Designate as motorized singletrack the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
415	5	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized singletrack. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails: - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	3	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	2	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. At the Upper Blue Planning Commission meeting last Tuesday night I learned that we are really getting the short end of the stick in the Golden Horseshoe. After two years of meetings with the Golden Horseshoe Consensus Based Planning Group we thought we had come up with a plan that we all could live with. The plan was presented to the public in the fall of 2006 and we were told that any "unsustainable" trails would remain open on a probationary basis till we could make them sustainable. Then the County and Town of Breckenridge went back on their word. At this time the Town and county are proud of the fact that they are offering 82 percent of the trails that EVERYONE in the 2 years of meetings at the Golden Horseshoe Consensus Based Planning Group came up with – about 76 miles of roads and trails. The fact of the matter is that motorized singletrack were reduced from the plan by 75%, leaving us only about 4 miles. The Chairman of the Upper Blue Planning Commission summed it up well by calling the result of the plan and two years of work "a crock". The County and Town have said that they do not have approval from private land owners to cross their lands for our trails – I know several land owners that have trails thru their lands that were never contacted. The Town and County cannot	The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. However, those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
125	1	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. At the Upper Blue Planning Commission meeting last Tuesday night I learned that we are really getting the short end of the stick in the Golden Horseshoe. After two years of meetings with the Golden Horseshoe Consensus Based Planning Group we thought we had come up with a plan that we all could live with. The plan was presented to the public in the fall of 2006 and we were told that any “unsustainable” trails would remain open on a probationary basis till we could make them sustainable. Then the County and Town of Breckenridge went back on their word. At this time the Town and county are proud of the fact that they are offering 82 percent of the trails that everyone in the 2 years of meetings at the Golden Horseshoe Consensus Based Planning Group came up with – about 76 miles of roads and trails. The fact of the matter is that motorized singletrack were reduced from the plan by 75%, leaving us only about 4 miles. The Chairman of the Upper Blue Planning Commission summed it up well by calling the result of the plan and two years of work “a crock”. The County and Town have said that they do not have approval from private land owners to cross their lands for our trails – I know several land owners that have trails thru their lands that were never contacted. The Town and County cannot agree with the Forest Service on which trails are or can be made sustainable so they just closed them. Please know that the USFS Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Motorized trails continue to close due to pressure from the non-motorized users despite the instruction of the Summit County Board of County Commissioners that trails be available for all user groups as a condition of the acquisition of this area. Motorized use of trails in the Golden Horseshoe should be allowed.	The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. However, those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
219	7	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge. Motorized trails continue to close due to pressure from the non-motorized users despite the instruction of the Summit County Board of County Commissioners that trails be available for all user groups as a condition of the acquisition of this area. Motorized use of trails in the Golden Horseshoe should be allowed.	The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. However, those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
301	37	golden horseshoe	<p>Golden Horseshoe Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 - designate for motorcycle use -Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 -Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail, if not already designated. -Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. -Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. <p>These routes generally offer excellent and sustainable opportunity, provide important connections to other trail systems, and would enhance public safety and visitor perceptions by reducing the need for OHVs to travel roads.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment on specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed due to environmental resource issues; -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM; -The American Ditch/flume trail system GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. is open to non-motorized <p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-16 as proposed (motorcycle) and GH-14 as decommission.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	51	golden horseshoe	<p>Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus:</p> <p>□</p> <p>Last Chance (5-GH-14) – TMP: Motorcycle – Oversight Consensus: Closed: Alternative route provided (5-GH-16). Route failed private property and natural resource/sustainability filters.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	53	golden horseshoe	<p>Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus:</p> <p>Detroit Placer Loop Trail (5-GH-26) – TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Consensus: Removal of northern segment from TMP: Northern segment is improved driveway for Western Sky Ranch home sites. Alternative route provided.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will reflect that only the southern portion of GH-26 as open licensed and unlicensed vehicles use as a route to access GH 41 and GH25. The northern portion of GH-26 will be closed.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
320	59	golden horseshoe	<p>Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus:</p> <p>Fuller Trail (5-GH-44) – TMP: Motorcycle – Oversight Consensus: Motorcycle: Northeast segment should connect to Summit Gulch Road (5-352.1). Western segment should connect to lower segment of Brakesville Road (5-GH-27) to make complete route.</p>	<p>The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44;</p> <p>The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22;</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	61	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Galena Gulch Road, Upper (5-GH-76) – TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Motorcycle: Closed: Upper segment of route failed natural resource/sustainability filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-29 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	60	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Governor King Trail (5-GH-67) – TMP: Closed – Oversight Consensus: Motorcycle: USFS to assume immediate maintenance responsibility to address natural resource/sustainability concerns.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	58	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Lightburn Road (5-GH-36) – TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Consensus: Closed: Route failed private property and natural resource/sustainability filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-36 as closed. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	54	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Molly B Trail (5-GH-29) – TMP: Motorcycle – Oversight Consensus: Closed: Route failed natural resource/sustainability and private property filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-29 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	52	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Preston Way (5-GH-23) – TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Consensus: Mechanized: Easement thought Dry Gulch private property restricted to non-motorized uses only.	In the final decision GH-23 will be differentiated into two sections. The first section, from Preston to the entrance driveway to Dry Gulch, will be open to full sized vehicles as it is the access to GH-22. The second segment, from the Dry Gulch entrance driveway, through Dry Gulch to GH-19, will be open only to non-motorized uses, subject to the terms of the easement agreement with the landowner.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	57	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Sidewinder Road (5-GH-35) TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Consensus: Mechanized: Route failed private property and natural resource/sustainability filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-35 as open to non-motorized use only from the intersection of GH-22 northwest to Dry Gulch. The misclassified section of this route (northwest of the junction with 5-GH-36) will be closed to all uses, and the section south of the junction with 5-GH-22 (Sawmill/Heinous Hill) will remain open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. ??? Since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future. ???	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	55	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Slide Lode Trail (5-GH-32) – TMP: Motorcycle – Oversight Consensus: Closed: Route failed private property and natural resource/sustainability filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-32 as closed to all uses. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	56	golden horseshoe	Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus: Traylor Way (5-GH-34) – TMP: Licensed and Unlicensed – Oversight Consensus: Closed east of junction with 5-GH-32. The section to the west of junction with 5-GH-32 should be open to Licensed Vehicles: Route failed natural resource/sustainability filters.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-34 as closed to all uses east of the junction of 5-GH-32, and that the remainder of the route (on the western portion of Discovery Hill) will be open to FSV. Since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use road it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	26	golden horseshoe	<p>Golden Horseshoe</p> <p>The Golden Horseshoe (GH) is of great importance to the Town of Breckenridge, due to its close proximity to the town, its historical connection to the town, it's recreational opportunities and its natural resource values. For over 130 years, the GH has been the "wild west" both literally and figuratively. The results of that mentality are multiple, duplicative, unsustainable user-created routes lacking overall planning. These routes are largely unmanageable in their current state. There are also some historical roads, ditches and a few user-created routes that warrant inclusion in a public travel system because they provide a sustainable connection to important activity hubs, trail accesses or points of interest.</p> <p>The goal of this travel management plan is to separate the poorly designed routes and retain and improve on the sustainable ones. Inevitably, after many years of a free-for-all in the GH area, users of all types will complain about the loss of access. As land management partners, the USDA Forest Service (USFS), Town of Breckenridge (TOB), and Summit County Government (SCG) must balance those recreational access concerns with natural and historical resource protection mandates and a reasonable management presence.</p> <p>We [Town of Breckenridge] urge you not to underestimate the importance of directing the future use of this as-yet unmanaged area with a long history of misuse. This travel management planning process is our best chance to make the GH functional and sustainable in the short and long term. We need to take this opportunity to do the right thing for the long term health of the Golden Horseshoe and the citizens who use and benefit from it.</p> <p>As partners in managing the GH area, the TOB, SCG and the USFS embarked upon a lengthy citizen-driven planning process for the GH area that concluded in October 2006. This process included a thorough evaluation</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	8	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles. I think this issue is just a mapping detail that got missed.</p>	<p>- The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses du</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	9	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end and we may not be able to access the trails at all. Again, I think this issue is just a mapping detail that got missed.</p>	<p>Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
219	14	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.</p>	<p>GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	11	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized single-track. I believe that this trail has been added anyway we'll comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent single-track experience opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	13	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail alternating going up a hill and connecting with a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
219	12	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is nearly perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan. These trails have been used by off road motorcycles for years before the mountain bike was invented and are still in great shape.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	10	golden horseshoe	<p>Here [is] a specific trail section within the Golden Horseshoe that should be included in the TMP as motorized single-track:</p> <p>Designate trails 5-GH-45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years. They offer rolling terrain with lots of turns that provide the excitement we want. Closing these trails would contribute to concentrate our user group onto too few trails making for dangerous congestion and contribute to trail degradation.</p>	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; - GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. <p>Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as open to motorcycles and non-motorized uses since the resource issues have been mitigated. .</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
171	5	golden horseshoe	<p>Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail.</p> <p>5-gh 67 aka moto decent. Summit County off road riders (SCORR) did trail work on this trail this fall with the guidance of Friends of Dillon ranger district. The trail has water bars and drainage now and also many of the braided sections have been decommissioned. This trail would also benefit if it were designated as one direction. Downward seems to be the most sustainable.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as open to motorcycles and non-motorized uses since the resource issues have been mitigated. .</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
171	4	golden horseshoe	Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail. Connecting 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 using 5-gh-27.	Alternative GM will reflect a section of GH-27 as open to motorcycles and non-motorized to connect with GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
171	3	golden horseshoe	Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail. Connecting 5-gh-45 with 5-gh-27 with 5-gh-33 and 5-gh-17 these trails are all close together and it seems to make sense for them to be connected and shared use. For the most part topography is not an issue and these trails can be made sustainable.	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails: - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
171	6	golden horseshoe	Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail. Creating a loop with 5-gh-73 with 5-gh-31 and 5-gh-29. The trails exist and SCORR would love to help.		Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
171	2	golden horseshoe	<p>Here is a trail I would encourage you to consider becoming shared use trail.</p> <p>The great flume or 5-gh-92 through to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2a to 5-385.1 This is a historic Trans Continental flume that is built on grade and has only a few sustainability issues on it 6.7 miles. It was cleared and "opened for recreation" with permission by the forest service by a motorcycle club in the early 80's. This trail sees limited traffic and serves a connector to the north fork of the Swan River. This trail was also top of the list of trails to keep from the motorized community during the "consensus based planning process". The argument has been made from the forest service that this is vital lynx habitat. I do not have the expertise to comment specifically but if this is true then I feel this trail should be closed to ALL, not some. I would much rather prefer for our community work together so we can enjoy this beautiful, pleasurable, sustainable and vital connector.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	1	golden horseshoe	<p>I am a rider of these trails and don't see why these trails can't be shared between all the users. The land in the Golden Horseshoe area is land that was used for mining in the 1800's is has lots of old mining debris and because of this the soil is bad you cannot get water up from this land because it is contaminated. There is enough land here that could be shared for all users there are trails that are good for mountain biking and other trails good for motorcycles some could not even work for mountain bikes because of the steepness of the trails. I'm am also an avid hunter and have walked most of this land and I don't believe that use of this land by motorcycles is moving the herds around. I have seen lots of Deer, Elk and Moose.</p>	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
386	9	golden horseshoe	<p>I am particularly disturbed to see the Boreas Pass/Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch areas being turned over to a winter motorized free for all.</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe Area:</p> <p>Sallie Barber Road (GH 54): This is a Summit County Road and designated in the Golden Horseshoe Plan as winter non-motorized. However, the road continues to see more and more motorized winter use and abuse. Recognizing this route in the TMP as winter non-motorized is important in addressing other trail issues in the area.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch. Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
118	3	golden horseshoe	I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation: Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
118	8	golden horseshoe	I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation: Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
118	5	golden horseshoe	I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation: Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
118	7	golden horseshoe	I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation: Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-73 is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
118	6	golden horseshoe	I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation: Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
118	4	golden horseshoe	<p>I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation:</p> <p>Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-45 is a shared use trail, GH-27 is closed to all uses due to resource damage, and GH-33 and GH-17 are closed pending additional environmental analysis. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
118	2	golden horseshoe	<p>I am supporting Alternative G and below [is] my recommendation:</p> <p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails.</p>	<p>Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
315	1	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing on behalf of my family and the off-road motorcycle community here in Breckenridge, Colorado. I am specifically referring to proposed trail closures in the Golden Horseshoe area North East of town. My family and I have been riding off-road motorcycles in this area for the past 15 years. The motorcycle single track trail system has provided us with years of recreation, exercise and stress relief. It will be very disappointing to lose these trails, such as 5-GH-45, 27, 33, and 17. Closure of the motorcycle trails will force more motorized use onto congested multi-use roads causing more conflict and frustration. These trails in the White River National Forest are located just a few miles from my house and are easily accessed with a street legal motorcycle. It is very important to me to have this opportunity to enjoy my National Forest from the seat of my motorcycle and hope to be able to do so for years to come.</p>	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and 	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
190	1	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issue addressed.</p> <p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.</p>	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
190	2	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issue addressed.</p> <p>Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.</p>	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; and GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
190	7	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issues addressed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.</p>	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
190	4	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issues addressed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.</p>	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
190	6	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issues addressed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
190	5	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issues addressed.</p> <p>Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5-386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5-386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
190	3	golden horseshoe	<p>I am writing this letter to support alternative G. I would also like to see the following issues addressed.</p> <p>Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-45 is a shared use trail, GH-27 is closed to all uses due to resource damage, and GH-33 and GH-17 are closed pending additional environmental analysis. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	6	golden horseshoe	<p>I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.</p>	<p>Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
182	11	golden horseshoe	<p>I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.</p>	<p>GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	8	golden horseshoe	<p>I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
182	10	golden horseshoe	I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.	The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	9	golden horseshoe	I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
182	7	golden horseshoe	I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-45 is a shared use trail, GH-27 is closed to all uses due to resource damage, and GH-33 and GH-17 are closed pending additional environmental analysis. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
182	5	golden horseshoe	I believe that, of the alternatives presented, Alternative G is the best, [but:] The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
225	1	golden horseshoe	I primarily use the WRNF for mtn. biking, xc skiing, and off road motorcycling. The area most valuable to me would be the Golden Horseshoe near Breckenridge. As a mtn. biker and xc skier the town and forest service seem to be opening new and fun trails almost weekly. As a motorcyclist, it seems the only new trailheads are closed signs. The reason I really like riding in the Golden Horseshoe, (besides the world class terrain) is the proximity to my house. I am really enjoy riding where I live and not driving to ride. The miles of challenging, singletrack terrain are wonderful. If I had to pick the one trail that is most important to me it would be the "enduro trail". I am aware that it might be deemed unsustainable, but with the right rerouting, I believe that could be changed. Trails that are not singletrack and challenging are not of interest to the off road enthusiast.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
175	10	golden horseshoe	I support Alternative G with the following provision: Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge: Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comment presented, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22;	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	15	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.</p>	<p>GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p> <p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
175	12	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent single-track experience opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
175	14	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	13	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	11	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, GH-45 is a shared use trail, GH-27 is closed to all uses due to resource damage, and GH-33 and GH-17 are closed pending additional environmental analysis. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	9	golden horseshoe	<p>I support Alternative G with the following provision:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe – near Breckenridge:</p> <p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.</p>	<p>Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
182	4	golden horseshoe	<p>I understand that there are multiple user groups and I believe that a balance must be struck so that everyone can enjoy public lands. I believe that the Forest is comprised of 2.3 million acres yet there are only 67 miles of motorized single track. There are 750,000 acres of non-motorized Wilderness and another 640,000 acres of inventoried Roadless areas that are essentially non-motorized, too. Yet, ATV Routes are reduced by some 300 miles in the preferred alternative. It seems to me that our access should be expanded, not contracted.</p>	Forest-wide comment	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	15	golden horseshoe	Keystone/Breckenridge: Within the Horseshoe Gulch and Soda Creek areas (between Summit Cove/Keystone and Tiger Road/Swan River drainage) there are important trails missing. I recommend the following trails are added to the inventory (these were identified in numerous comment letters for the 2006 TMP and so, should be on the inventory) and are also designated as open to non-motorized use. The "Blair Witch Trail" (not on your map) which provides a significant connection between 5-2108.3 (Colorado Trail) and 5-351.2A (Keystone Ranch Trail), is well used, relatively sustainable and is one of the few trails in Summit County that is dry by early June. Another missing trail is the "Mushroom Trail" that is located on the flanks of Swan Mountain and connects 5-132W.2 and 5-132.2. It's location on an old ditch makes it sustainable and it is heavily used by people living in the Keystone and Summit Cove areas.	Blair Witch - This route was inadvertently left out of Alternative G. It will be included in Alternative GM as a trail open to Mountain biking, pack stock, and hiking. Mushroom Trail - This route was not inventoried and therefore will not be considered in this process.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
191	3	golden horseshoe	Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan. Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end.	Based on the comment presented, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22;	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
191	8	golden horseshoe	Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan. Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
191	5	golden horseshoe	Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan. Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. I believe that this trail has been added anyway but let's comment for it just the same. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also and we worked on it last October and it is now in great shape! This trail provides more excellent single-track experience opportunity and gets us off the road.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
191	7	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails – hence its nickname “the Bookcase trail”. This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
191	6	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan.</p> <p>Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
191	4	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan.</p> <p>Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. These trail sections offer some of the best experience for our user group in the Golden Horseshoe and we have been riding those for years.</p>	<p>The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44. 	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
191	2	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed [is a] specific trail item that I support, in general I favor option G of the forest plan.</p> <p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.</p>	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
510	4	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed.</p> <p>Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 or we have another dead end</p>	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22.	Action not Specified
510	9	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single track. This trail would provide loop opportunity with trail 5-GH-29 and is a very fun twisty trail.</p>	GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
510	6	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail. This is a very popular trail with mountain bikes also. It has been maintained and is in great shape</p>	Alternative GM will reflect GH-67 as opened to motorcycles and non-motorized uses. The Forest Service will work with trail use partners to assure that the trail is maintained to appropriate standards for the recommended uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
510	8	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed.</p> <p>Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single track. This trail is an exciting mixture of trail going up a hill connecting a series of small flume trails - hence its nickname "the Bookcase trail". This trail also provides loop opportunity and gets us off the road.</p>	<p>The comment has conflicting information in how trails numbers and common names are referenced. GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses. GH-78 is the "Bookcase Trail" that is recommended as a shared use trail. The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. Specifically, GH-73 is open to non-motorized uses only. GH-44 is a parallel shared use trail that allows for a motorcycle loop experience.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
510	7	golden horseshoe	<p>Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed.</p> <p>Designate as motorized single track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. This trail is perfectly level and is as sustainable as it gets while still providing an exciting connector between the Golden Horseshoe and the North Fork of the Swan.</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the American Ditch/flume trail system (GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1) is open to non-motorized use only. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
510	5	golden horseshoe	Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed. Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single track. These trail sections offer some of the best experiences in the area for specific OHV uses.	The final decision for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment of specific trails: - The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; - GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed to all uses due to environmental resource issues. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
510	3	golden horseshoe	Listed are trails listed to close and the negative impact it would cause if closed. The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	2	golden horseshoe	Many pro-environment types push for closure, but what good is it if no one can reach most of the land? Riding a dirt bike on an ATV track, road or even better, on a single track trail takes one to incredible vistas and is good physical exercise and provides incredible family bonding opportunities that should be available to those of us who desire it.	The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
171	1	golden horseshoe	<p>My wife and I own a property in the Golden Horseshoe and our property is a popular gateway into this part of the WRNF. We have a good understanding of the amount traffic and the type of users that enter the Golden Horseshoe through our land. This historically has been a multi-use area with a rich mining history and road network.</p> <p>We are very disappointed with the lack of single track motorcycle trails throughout the WRNF but our specific knowledge is for the Summit county area. The 4 +/- miles of single track open under Alt. G is simply not enough. A typically day (for me) of motorcycle riding usually consumes 50 -100 miles of single track, while mountain biking consumes 15-30 miles. This lack of mileage will lead to dangers on the trail that the community has not ever seen before. With such congestion I would like to see directional trails. This eliminates the possibility of head on collisions and the direction of trails could be altered seasonally to keep things "fresh".</p>	<p>The final travel system in alternative GM for the Golden Horseshoe area allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
129	3	golden horseshoe	<p>Please do not close existing national forest motorized trails! [A] Specific area of my concern and many of the motorized active users in this area is:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe- near Breckenridge</p> <p>This area of concern is a very "Hot" topic. It had been in the planning process for over 2 and half years. After the original planning was completed we retained some 15 miles of the original 50 plus single track system. This has now been changed by the Breckenridge Town and County to allow only 4 miles of single track trails to remain open.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer and winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	1	golden horseshoe	<p>Responsible use of the national forest and other public lands should be encouraged, not discouraged. I believe the key is management, not closure.</p>	<p>Management includes close to protect resources and deal with user conflicts and safety.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	92	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) Allowing snow machines to travel along that short section of French Gulch road might attract illegal use further down this road (already happening) where non-motorized use is prevalent.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	94	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) Because snowmobile tours no longer pass through Lincoln Meadows, this area has seen a dramatic decline of winter motorized use. Instead Snowmobilers prefer to use the quick Humbug Hill access to reach their play area as well as circumnavigating the eastern side only of Lincoln Meadows.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Designation of Lands
436	93	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) Snowmobiles already have access to Lincoln Meadows via Humbug Hill, American Gulch, Galena Gulch, Rock Island Gulch and Prospect gulch. Skier access is limited to mostly sun baked routes such as Humbug Hill and Upper Sidedoor while Rich Gulch offers better snow conditions.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Designation of Lands
436	95	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) There are plans to build a new sustainable trail paralleling Rich gulch Road to Lincoln Meadows. In turn this new access route could replace Rich Gulch Road which should then be decommissioned.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	90	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) This road is still open to winter motorized via the Lincoln Town site Parking lot. Winter motorized use is infrequent on Rich Gulch, because Humbug Hill, directly from the parking lot, is the main access to Lincoln Meadows.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
436	96	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) This road sees little winter motorized use but the little it does see, makes it extremely difficult to ski because it is steep.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	91	golden horseshoe	Rich Gulch (GH-62) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] think it makes more sense to close this route to winter motorized.	Because the route crosses private land, for which there currently is no legal access agreement and to access the route implies use of a county road, GH-62 will be closed in Alternative GM. However, routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
285	29	golden horseshoe	Route 5-GH-34 would be opened to full-sized vehicles (FSV) and all other uses up to the collapsed slope of the Jesse Mine. 5-GH-32, 5-GH-29, 5-GH-36 and the remainder of 5-GH-34 would be closed to all use. 5-GH-30 would remain open to non-motorized vehicles. This proposed route designation would address natural resource protection concerns, private property access issues and management capabilities in the Discovery Hill area.	Alternative GM will reflect GH-34 as closed to all uses east of the junction of 5-GH-32, and that the remainder of the route (on the western portion of Discovery Hill) will be open to FSV. Since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use road it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	103	golden horseshoe	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) Because this is largely a county road, with only a short section traveling through WRNF, we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] recognize that the future of this road is now primarily in the hands of County government. But because this is such an important non-motorized route in the winter, and because it is adjacent to national forest lands, we feel our comments on Sallie Barber should be noted.	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	107	golden horseshoe	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54)</p> <p>BSA surveys noted that very rarely did they see trailers at the parking lot. Despite the limited motorized use, their tracks still occasionally ruined the skiing experience, especially after a period without much new snow. Often though, you will see numerous skiers and snowshoers on this route. Why should one or two motorized users destroy the experience for hundreds of skiers and snowshoers?</p>	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	106	golden horseshoe	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54)</p> <p>Most of the side routes off of Sallie Barber are non-motorized, and yet winter motorized primary objective is to use these non-motorized routes to get to Baldy Mtn. If Baldy Mountain does become non-motorized, it makes even more sense to close this road on each end to winter motorized use.</p>	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	105	golden horseshoe	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54)</p> <p>The road is wide enough for strong beginner skiers, and the distance to the top is an achievable goal for an hour or two ski tours. Sallie Barber is so close to town, and it also offers numerous loops into the adjacent national forest lands for the non-motorized community.</p>	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	104	golden horseshoe	<p>Sallie Barber Road (GH-54)</p> <p>This could be the most popular winter ski and snowshoe route in the Upper Blue. Because it faces north this is one of the first routes to ski every winter, yet every fall vehicles attempt to drive up this route and get stuck.</p>	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
171	10	golden horseshoe	<p>Summit county and Town of Breckenridge officials claim they are having a difficult time obtaining permission from "in holding" land owners. We own 3 claims in the Golden Horseshoe and 11 claims with in the WRNF and we have never been contacted by any authority. It was my understanding that the County, Town and Forest service were going to work together to find solutions to these issues.</p>	The County, Town and Forest Service are working together to find solutions to these issues, however, because of the enormity of the task, not all property owners have been contacted yet to resolve issues.	Valid, Existing Rights/Claims

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	11	golden horseshoe	<p>THE GOLDEN HORSESHOE</p> <p>Dry Gulch is a privately owned parcel that the landowner decided to make non-motorized yet the summer map shows numerous motorized routes still entering his property. The two that stand out for me are the Jesse Road (GH-19) and Preston Way (GH-23) Both of these routes now enter his property as motorized routes. Please respect his rights and retain them for non-motorized use only.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind and in response to the comment and those from the owner of Dry Gulch, the final alternative GM will reflect GH-19 "Jessie Road" - aka Backdoor, as open only to non-motroized use from the juncton of GH-34 southeast to Dry Gulch. Also, GH-23 (Preston Way) will be differentiated into two sections. The first section, from Preston to the entrance driveway to Dry Gulch, will be open to full sized vehicles as it is the access to GH-22. The second segment, from the Dry Gulch entracne driveway, through Dry Gulch to GH-19, will be open only to non-motorized uses, subject to the terms of the</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
13	2	golden horseshoe	<p>The original draft of the WRNF Forest Plan was released in 1999. Subsequently, the Travel Management Plan portion of the Forest Plan was separated from the Forest Plan, which was released for comment in 2006. At that time, the WRNF Forest Supervisor rejected a requested comment period extension that would have enabled the citizen-driven Golden Horseshoe planning process to be completed within the comment period. The 2006 extension denial greatly complicated the citizen review process and allowed neither the general public nor the cooperating governmental partners (including the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County Government) adequate time to complete the necessary review process and provide inclusive and well-reasoned comments for the Golden Horseshoe area. Instead, a "bubble" was drawn for winter Golden Horseshoe uses with details submitted at a later date.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer and winter travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer and Winter Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Public Involvement Process

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
566	5	golden horseshoe	<p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 - designate for motorcycle use -Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 -Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail, if not already designated. -Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. -Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. <p>These routes generally offer excellent and sustainable opportunity, provide important connections to other trail systems, and would enhance public safety and visitor perceptions by reducing the need for OHVs to travel roads.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment on specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed due to environmental resource issues; -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM; -The American Ditch/flume trail system GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. is open to non-motorized 	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	1	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so those trails can be connected. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
468	3	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
281	2	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
378	3	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
125	2	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for off road motorcycles.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
177	2	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
179	6	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
109	2	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
256	3	golden horseshoe	The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use. This would allow circular routes and lower traffic in the area.	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
502	9	golden horseshoe	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Golden Horseshoe Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 - designate for motorcycle use -Connect the west end of 5-GH-44 to 5-GH-22 via a section of 5-GH 27 -Designate trails 5-GH 45, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-67 "Moto Descent" as a motorized trail, if not already designated. -Designate as motorized single-track the flume trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. -Designate 5-GH-73 as motorized single-track. -Designate 5-GH-31 as motorized single-track. <p>These routes generally offer excellent and sustainable opportunity, provide important connections to other trail systems, and would enhance public safety and visitor perceptions by reducing the need for OHVs to travel roads.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment on specific trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; The northern end of GH-27 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for connection between GH-44 and GH-22; -GH 45, GH-27(Upper portion), 5-GH-33, and 5-GH 17 are to be closed due to environmental resource issues; -GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM; -The American Ditch/flume trail system GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. is open to non-motorized 	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
178	11	golden horseshoe	There is a road and a single track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	To address other issues (noise, user conflicts, etc.) these routes will be closed to motorized uses. This issue may also be addressed in a future travel management proposal for the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
292	1	golden horseshoe	<p>This firm represents Dry Gulch LLC and John Cooney (collectively the "Private Owner"). This letter comprises Private Owner's comments on the White River National Forest Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for its Travel Management (SDEIS). The comments set forth below relate to the Golden Horseshoe area in Summit County, Colorado.</p> <p>Private Owner is the owner of the private real property commonly referred to as "Dry Gulch Placer" and located in the Golden Horseshoe area of Summit County ("Dry Gulch") (See Color Map attached as Exhibit A hereto). The western side of Dry Gulch is traversed by a non-motorized public recreational trail easement, which includes a portion of the route 5-GH-19. A copy of the Recreational Trail Easement is attached as Exhibit B hereto (the "Trail Easement"). The Trail Easement is the only public access to Dry Gulch and authorizes and non-motorized use (See Exhibit B, Paragraph). All other public use of Dry Gulch is prohibited.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative (Alternative G) designates three additional routes crossing Dry Gulch. The Private Owner objects to and comments on these proposed routes are as follows:</p> <p>5-GH-35 Sidewinder Road. This route is designated as a motorized trail and enters Dry Gulch from the northeast and then joins 5-GH-36. There is no public easement for the portion of 5-GH-35 which enters Dry Gulch from the east to the intersection with 5-GH-36 on Dry Gulch. Accordingly, the portion of 5-GH-35 should be closed to all use and any traffic, motorized or otherwise, re-routed around Dry Gulch via 5-GH-24 and 5-GH-34. In order to provide ample opportunity for turn-around, 5-GH-35 should be closed at its intersection with 5-GH-24; otherwise users will be directed into Dry Gulch with no access and no alternative routing.</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind and in response to the comments from the owner of Dry Gulch, Alternative GM will reflect GH-35 "Sidewinder Trail" (from the junction of GH-22 northeast to Dry Gulch) as closed; GH 36 "Lightburn" as closed; and GH-19 "Jessie Road" - aka Backdoor, as open only to non-motorized use from the junction of GH-34 southeast to Dry Gulch. Those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in Alternative GM, may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	15	golden horseshoe	<p>Upper Blue River Basin:</p> <p>The Golden Horseshoe (GH) Oversight group, comprised of USFS, Town of Breckenridge, and County Staff, have reviewed all recommended routes in the 2006 Golden Horseshoe Travel Management Recommendations against the following three management filters: 1) private property/access concerns, 2) natural resource/sustainability concerns, and 3) management capacity/technical feasibility concerns. Based upon the outcome of these reviews, the GH Oversight Group reached consensus on route specific evaluations that allow approximately 82% of the routes to be designated open in the TMP. The route designations on Table 3: Golden Horseshoe Oversight Group Consensus failed multiple filters. These routes require future efforts (e.g. private property access an environmental and feasibility analysis) before being designated open to the public.</p> <p>The TMP proposes a 4,047 acre area it eh Boreas Pass, Indiana Creek and Pennsylvania Creek Area as an "open motorized area, allowing unrestricted snowmobile use in this area. We concur with the Town of Breckenridge in recommending this area be designated "motorized prohibited" for winter use for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Potential impact to sensitive environmental resources and wildlife habitat. -Lack of sufficient parking at the Boreas Pass Parking area. -Conflict with a nd displacement of non-motorized users -Loss of serenity and public enjoyment -Enforcement problems, especially considering the lack of identifiable topographic boundaries to this area. 	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
182	3	golden horseshoe	<p>We all know that there will always be a few bad apples in any group, and those seeking closure will use evidence of illegal riding to champion their cause. I believe it is wrong to punish the rest of us via closure for the acts of a few. The better tact would be to enforce the rules so that the violators would suffer the consequences.</p>	<p>Some closure decisions are made because the Forest Service does not have the resources to perform adequate law enforcement patrols. Other closures are based on eliminating opportunities that encourage illegal use.</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
107	2	golden horseshoe	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>5-GH-44 and 5-GH71 need become a shared route and connected.</p>	<p>Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
107	4	golden horseshoe	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>5-GH-67 (Moto Descent) should be designated a motorized trail. It is a very popular trail. The Flume Trail system 5-GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-3 is an excellent connection between the Golden Horseshoe and north Fork. 5-GH-73 should be designated single track motorized, as it is a very good trail and provides a good loop (i.e., the bookcase trail).</p>	<p>The Forest Service Alternative GM for summer travel in the Golden Horseshoe reflects the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County government as developed through the Golden Horseshoe consensus based planning group. The final travel system in alternative GM allows for both separate and shared use of roads and trails on sustainable routes while protecting the fragile natural environment and sensitive historic resources and respecting private property rights. With this in mind, not all of the recommended routes were approved in Alternative GM. With this in mind, the following decisions will be made related to the comment on specific trails:</p> <p>-GH-67 "Moto Descent" will be open to shared uses in alternative GM; The northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a motorcycle connection between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44; -The American Ditch/flume trail system GH-92 to 5-566.1 to 5.386.2A to 5-385.1. is open to non-motorized use only; and, -GH-73 is open to non-motorized use only. However, those routes included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations", that were not approved in GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
107	3	golden horseshoe	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>The west end of 5-G-44 via 5-GH-27 should connect to 5-G-22. Trails 5-GH-67, 5-GH-27, 5-GH-33, and 5-GH-17 should be designated as single track motorized.</p>	<p>GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
107	5	golden horseshoe	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>We'd like to see 5-GH-31 as single track motorized. It would also give us a loop trail.</p>	<p>GH-31 and GH-29 are to be closed in alternative GM due to environmental impacts and respect for private landowners rights. However, since the route was included in the "Golden Horseshoe Summer Travel System Recommendations" as a shared use trail it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
285	53	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-352.1, Summit Gulch Road. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be shown as open to winter motorized use, according to the Golden Horseshoe recommendations.</p>	<p>The comment supports alternative G.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	52	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-GH-35, Sidewinder Road. This route is identified as open to winter motorized use, in contrast to the desire of the owner of Dry Gulch, who requests that no winter or summer motorized access be allowed through his property. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that Sidewinder be removed from the list of winter routes open to motorized use.</p>	<p>GH-35 (Sidewinder Trail) and GH-34 (Traylor Way) as presented in the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" were intended to provide a loop experience for snowmobilers. However, because the routes cross predominately non-federal lands, on which landowners do not support motorized use, the Alternative GM will reflect GH-35 and GH-34 as closed to winter motorized use. Since the routes were included in the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	54	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-GH-90, Georgia Gulch Road. The map for Alternative G is inaccurate and should include this route as open to motorized use in both winter and summer, specifically from the open motorized use area west to Lincoln Park Road (5-567.3A). We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this designation be made clear according to the Golden Horseshoe winter recommendations.</p>	<p>Alternative GM will show the corrected location and reflect the route as open to winter motorized use.</p>	Mapping, GIS
285	51	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>5-GH-93 American Gulch Road. Although this is the primary road grade to the historic Town of Wapiti and Humbug Hill, this route near Parkville has been mislabeled as closed to winter use (or not labeled at all). We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend identifying American Gulch Road (5-GH-93), which accommodates FSV during the summer, as a designated winter route in addition to allowing winter motorized use on 5-GH-90 (Georgia Gulch). This would allow a winter motorized loop access to the open winter motorized area in Georgia Gulch.</p>	<p>This was a mapping error as it is the intent of Alternative G and the final decision to designate the route as open to snowmobile use as recommended by the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations".</p>	Mapping, GIS
285	55	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>The map shows winter motorized use on CR 484, which is plowed in the winter and was not indicated in the Golden Horseshoe Plan as a route that would be opened to snowmobile use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend this route be designated as "other routes and trails" and closed to snowmobile use.</p>	<p>This route is under County jurisdiction and will be corrected.</p>	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
285	56	golden horseshoe	<p>Winter</p> <p>Traylor Way (5-GH-34) and Sidewinder (5-GH-35) are shown to be open to motorized use, presumably making a loop with Lightburn Road (5-GH-36). Sidewinder and Lightburn both cross private property, for which the owner is not supportive of motorized use on his land. There is currently no other legal route that makes a connection between these two roads. Therefore, motorized use should not be allowed on either Traylor Way or Sidewinder unless such a connection is made, for both winter and summer use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that these routes be shown as closed to winter motorized use.</p>	<p>GH-35 (Sidewinder Trail) and GH-34 (Traylor Way) as presented in the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" were intended to provide a loop experience for snowmobilers. However, because the routes cross predominately non-federal lands, on which landowners do not support motorized use, the Alternative GM will reflect GH-35 and GH-34 as closed to winter motorized use. Since the routes were included in the "Golden Horseshoe Winter Travel System Recommendations" it may be presented as a separate proposal to the Forest Service for further evaluation and potential inclusion into the travel network in the future.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
471	22	hoosier	<p>Keeping the motorized winter use off of the west side of Hoosier Pass is a huge bonus for all winter non-motorized groups, but in particular the backcountry skier and rider who only recently has been displaced from this area from snow machines highmarking on their favorite pitches. The FS is further preserving the high alpine tundra which is often exposed on Hoosier Pass, and I have seen snowmobiles travel across the bare ground.</p>	<p>This comment supports Alternative G.</p>	General Support
354	25	hoosier pass	<p>Keeping the motorized winter use off of the west side of Hoosier Pass is a huge bonus for all winter non-motorized groups, but in particular the backcountry skier and rider who only recently has been displaced from this area from snow machines highmarking on their favorite pitches. The high alpine tundra is often exposed on Hoosier Pass and snowmobiles would travel across the bare ground.</p>	<p>This comment supports Alternative G.</p>	Designation of Lands
436	132	horse cr, cox cr	<p>Horse Creek/Cox Creek</p> <p>These two roads across from Green Mountain Reservoir don't hold much snow, but do see occasional snowmobile use and yet this is also a great destination for the summer and winter non-motorized user looking for easy access, and a short loop. It really doesn't provide access for the winter snowmobile user other than a mile or so, and so closing it to motorized winter is a sensible decision.</p>	<p>This comment supports Alternative G.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
350	4	horseshoe basin	<p>Another area of concern is the Horseshoe Gulch / Soda Creek area. While we think our local foresters have done an excellent job of identifying opportunities in these drainages, due to the vagary of the available maps, we are unsure if all the trails in the area have been included in the plan. We would stress that this is a very important area recreationally, and all trails need to be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Trails that are duplicate routes and do not provide for loop opportunities are not included in Alternative G.</p>	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
341	2	horseshoe basin	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>Please consider opening the upper Horseshoe Basin to motorized users as has been suggested by the local snowmobile club. This high alpine bowl offers some of the best snowmobiling in the county and is an area seldom used by cross country skiers because it is so far from the trailhead.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/M anagement</p>
233	9	illinois cr	<p>FS land on the west side of the mountain, which is the headwaters of Illinois Creek, is managed as an Urban intermix. The TMP shows most of this area as either allowing winter motorized use on designated routes or as prohibited. While SHA feels that eliminating snowmobile use completely from the Upper Illinois would provide the best possible experience for possible hut guests and the large number of non motorized day users of the area, allowing access to the large amount of private property in the area would make this problematic. Since the TMP shows no designated routes in the area, why not in cooperation with the various property owners in the area, gate Baldy road and allow access only to property owners? This would still allow property owners access, but would eliminate off route travel. It would also greatly reduce the amount of snowmobile traffic on Baldy Road which would greatly improve the road conditions for non motorized users who are the vast majority of users..</p>	<p>Alternative G does not allow for any snowmobile use in the area, therefore, there is no need to allow access to private property owners.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culvert s/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
477	8	implement	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need closure gates for snow machines: they will inevitable go further if there is only a sign. (Priority gates for all winter non-motorized users are: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch Roads, Spruce Creek Road, Pennsylvania Gulch Road, 'Middle Indiana'/Dyserville Road, Baldy Mountain Road, Mayflower Gulch Road, Sallie Barber Road, Miners Creek Trail, Wise Mountain Road).</p>	<p>Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. Installing and opening and closing gates is costly.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culvert s/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
354	8	implement	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need Closure gates for snowmachines: they will inevitably go further if there is only a sign. (Priority gates for all winter non-motorized users are: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch Roads, Spruce Creek Road, Pennsylvania Gulch Road, 'Middle Indiana'/Dysersville Road, Baldy Mountain Road, Mayflower Gulch Road, Sallie Barber Road, Miners Creek Trail, Wise Mountain Road).</p>	<p>Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. Installing and opening and closing gates is costly.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culvert s/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
477	13	implement	<p>I note that Black Gulch Road, French Pass, Little French Road are all popular non-motorized roads previously closed to winter motorized, but all of them see occasional illegal use. Please gate or sign. Since this gate could be effectively placed just past the Lincoln Townsite for a winter closure, please close this by November 1st. This winter we routinely had cars driving up French Gulch road and Sallie Barber, and getting stuck.</p>	<p>Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. Installing and opening and closing gates is costly. Because vehicles may get stuck is not a reason to install a gate.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culvert s/gates/signs, etc.)</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
69	2	indiana, pennsylvania gulch	<p>We are very concerned about the designation of the Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulch drainages for unrestricted motorized use. As residents of the Upper Blue, we ski and hike these areas frequently both summer and winter. Indiana Gulch is extremely popular with both cross country skiers and snowshoers. Pennsylvania Gulch which historically has also been a very popular area for back country skiing, in the last couple of years has been rendered increasingly dangerous and unpleasant for quiet users by the recent increase in motorized use. Both these drainages, while long enough to provide cross country or snowshoe outings of several hours, are so short that today's high powered snowmobiles can reach the designated boundaries of motorized use in just a few minutes. It seems to make little sense to encourage additional motorized use in an area that offers a great deal too quiet users and so little to motorized users.</p> <p>A shared use designation, i.e. available for both motorized and non-motorized use, seems, in practice, to result in the area becoming essentially a motorized use area. In the case of Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulches, the short, steep, narrow access roads become especially dangerous for cross country skiers after just a few trips by snowmobiles have packed all the powder and created unsafe bumps on steep, narrow trails.</p> <p>Encouraging motorized use in this area, which is especially convenient to the major population center of the Upper Blue, will create serious conflicts with quiet users. We are also concerned that encouraging motorized use will Winter</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Designation of Lands
285	62	iron springs, miners creek	<p>Iron Springs/Miner's Creek area (the winter open motorized area wrapping to the north of Ophir Mountain and along Miner's Creek). This open winter motorized area includes the Summit County recreation path and many non-motorized and closed routes on Iron Springs, and extends to Summit High School. The area also spans into the Rainbow Lake area Miner's Creek drainage, which contains multiple winter non-motorized trails (e.g. 5-45.1, the Peaks Trail) and routes closed to summer use. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the entire open motorized area be designated as a Restricted- Motorized Routes Only area, with Miner's Creek Road being the sole designated winter motorized route. This designation would reduce user conflict, prevent incursions into the conservation easement adjacent to the high school, limit unauthorized use of closed routes, and address existing illegal access concerns from Farmer's Korner.</p>	<p>A restricted motorized use designation for the winter would be unmanageable. The Miners Creek Road could not be a designated route because it is not groomed and the road profile is not discernable in many locations, therefore, snowmobile riders would not be able to tell if they were on the designated route. Regarding the proximity to neighborhoods, some user conflicts are inevitable. Additionally, there are many residents who use this area for snowmobile riding.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
233	7	janets cabin	Area around Janets Cabin. (Guller Creek, Searle Gulch and, Stafford Creek). SHA notes that the "high route" (5-n383.1) non motorized route from Vail pass is listed for closure. Is this closure meant to reflect only the elimination of what was formerly a designated motorized route, or does it include non motorized use? If the elimination of this route includes non motorized use, SH strongly opposes this closure as this has been a designated route to Janets Cabin since its construction in 1989. While this route gets significantly less use than the Guller Creek route (5-2108.2) it gives the public a more challenging and scenic alternative for more advanced skiers and snowshoers.	This route will still be open for winter non-motorized uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
25	1	keystone	I am a homeowner in Keystone. I am respectfully writing in objection to the proposal put forth by Summit County Off Road Riders. Why should all suffer the consequences of noise and air pollution for the recreation of a few? Keystone homeowners love this area for many reasons but mostly peace and quiet. Motorcycles would destroy these qualities of life. Keystone homeowners and visitors like to hike, ride horses, or sit on their porch and breathe fresh air, watch wildlife, and listen to the wind in the trees. This experience would no longer exist if the proposal is allowed. People would only experience engine noise, exhaust fumes, and no wildlife	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
25	2	keystone	I think Keystone Stables would have a huge problem with this [SCORR Proposal]. Motorcycles would essentially close their business.	The trails designated in Alternative GM for non-mechanized use only provides for the Keystone Stables use (separate from motorized use).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
26	8	keystone	I would appreciate your support in keeping the Summit County/Dillon/Keystone public lands under your jurisdiction as pristine and free from newly proposed motorcycle/motorbike trails.	In Summit County, the areas managed as pristine are in the Eagles Nest Wilderness. The White River NF has an obligation to provide for a wide variety of recreation uses (including motorcycle use on trails).	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
18	4	keystone	There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with a host of trails that would not disturb large communities.	There are no single-track motorized trails south of Keystone (only roads). This does not provide the same opportunity.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
73	4	keystone	We are long time residents of Keystone and are very much opposed to the proposed dirt bike extension. The reason for our objection [is]: If anything SCORR should be stopped from using the current trails which are close to populated areas. There is plenty of National Forest and private lands that do not abut populated areas.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distances from residential areas is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
73	2	keystone	<p>We are long time residents of Keystone and are very much opposed to the proposed dirt bike extension.</p> <p>The reason for our objection [is]:</p> <p>Noise. We have friends in Summerwood who overlook the existing trail area and they are upset with the noise that currently exists. We don't want any of that noise in the Keystone area. The new trails would be very close to existing condo and residential areas.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distances from residential areas is feasible.	Private Property
73	3	keystone	<p>We are long time residents of Keystone and are very much opposed to the proposed dirt bike extension.</p> <p>The reason for our objection [is]:</p> <p>SCORR has already put in trails through existing wetlands and have shown little concern for the environment.</p>	This claim is false and is not considered in the Travel Plan decision.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
73	5	keystone	<p>We are long time residents of Keystone and are very much opposed to the proposed dirt bike extension.</p> <p>The reason for our objection [is]:</p> <p>Some of the trails are on County property. However, as a practical matter the County would find it very difficult to police the area to make sure that SCORR abides by any regulations that get set forth.</p>	Trails on county property are not considered in this analysis.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
168	1	Keystone	<p>We have two homes in the Keystone area - 55 Wild Irishman Road in Keystone and 314 Penstemon Road in the Keystone Ranch. We chose this area for the beauty, solitude and peacefulness that will be adversely impacted by the proposed motorbike trails. Our enjoyment of a peaceful quiet walk along the nature trails does not include the noise of motorized vehicles nor the inherent danger associated with mixing pedestrians and motorbikes.</p> <p>Please consider these concerns when you make your recommendations on this proposal. We have discussed this issue with our neighbors who are also opposed to this change.</p>	These concerns are considered in the decision.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
436	134	keystone gulch	<p>Keystone Gulch Road (new designation?)</p> <p>Is this road also closed to ski area motorized use? It is now shown on your maps as closed to winter motorized, yet it does fall within a restricted motorized designation. This used to be a skate ski route because of the snowcats that traveled up it to North Peak.</p>	This road is used for motorized administrative use. It is closed to the public for motorized use. Skate skiing opportunities are provided nearby by Keystone Resort.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	135	keystone gulch	Keystone Gulch Road (new designation?) Oddly enough, we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] are guessing that a few skate skiers might miss the occasional grooming that occurred on this road. But we are also assuming that there are probably numerous winter non-motorized users who live close to this road and would love to see it open only to non-motorized use. Maybe this deserves a discussion with the residents of Keystone and Summit cove/Snake River planning commission.	This road is used for motorized administrative use. It is closed to the public for motorized use. Skate skiing opportunities are provided nearby by Keystone Resort.	Outreach/Education
22	1	keystone, saints john	The above trail is in the White River National Forest and there is a plan under consideration to extend motorcycle trails on it. There are any number of condominiums located at Keystone Resort with permanent summer residents along with paying guests that will be impacted negatively by the increase in both noise and dust. Most of us are out there for the peace and tranquility of the summer climate and seeing the elk behind us and to the west of our home in Sts John, plus a bear that moves along a path behind us. I suspect this will end if more motorcycle traffic is allowed. I hope you agree that any benefit is far out weighted by the adverse impact it will have on residents, wildlife and our environment.	Impacts to wildlife have been considered. The issues of noise and dust need further study to measure the impact to nearby residents.	Private Property
15	13	keystone, montezuma, saint john	There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with lots of exciting riding that would not disturb large communities. Use the State grant money to design and construct motorcycle only trails in an appropriate place accessible from the Montezuma or Saint's John area. Conflicts between motorized vehicles are much better than between motorcycles and pedestrians or horses.	The Montezuma and Saints John areas are not suitable for a motorized single track trail system because of the open terrain, high amount of private property, and mountain goat habitat.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
457	6	lands-columbine ranch	[ATT 1:] Previously letter of submitted comments from Charles B White, dated: October 25, 2006.	See comments relating to this letter.	See Attachment
457	4	lands-columbine ranch	Access to Columbine Ranch. The table of permitted uses for Alternative G shows a "Lower Harrigan Creek" section of route 5-1425W.1A that is to be "closed to the public" for all uses and decommissioned. This section of trail appears to be designated with a red line on the interactive map for this alternative. As noted above, we support this change as to that portion of the route within Columbine Ranch. However, as stated in our 2006 comments with respect to the "Columbine segment" of this trail, which connects the west gate of Columbine Ranch with the "Upper Harrigan Creek" trail, we cannot support closure and decommissioning if that action would prevent us from using that short section of trail to access the National Forest on foot and horseback. That trail was in use before the Forest Service acquired this land in the Columbine Ranch land exchange and is the only logical access from our property up Harrigan Creek. Moreover, it is also essential access to the headgates of the Wahlstrom No. 4 and Columbine Ditch headgates, for which we have easements recognized by the Forest Service. See the attached documentation. Motorized access is necessary and allowed in connection	The decision to close and decommission a route does not prohibit foot and horseback use on National Forest lands. Use of roads and/or trails necessary to operate and maintain authorized uses on National Forest lands (i.e. roads, utilities and ditches) are allowed subject to approved plans of operation for such uses.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
457	3	lands-columbine ranch	Alternative G trails. For the specific reasons set forth in our 2006 comments, we support the foot and horse designations that are included in Alternative G, subject to comments 1 and 2 above. [See letter 457 comment 1 and 2]	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
457	2	lands-columbine ranch	Motorized use. For the specific reasons set forth in our 2006 comments, we oppose any alternative that would allow motorized access on routes 5-1425W-1A and 5-1425.1 or other roads or trails in the vicinity of Columbine Ranch, except for access to private property on County Road 1425 through the locked gate at Highway 9 and on routes 5-N266.1, the far western segment of 5-N265.1, and portions of 5-1425W-1A for the purposes of management of our land and water rights, as identified in our 2006 comments. Subject to the foregoing, we support the non-motorized designations in Alternative G and oppose any general public motorized access along these routes as is shown under Alternatives A and F.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
457	1	lands-columbine ranch	<p>Routes on Private Property. For the specific reasons set forth in our 2006 comments, we strongly oppose the depiction in the SDEIS and related maps of any routes into or through Columbine Ranch private property. For example, portions of routes 5-1425W-1A and 5-1425.1 are shown as entering our property in the maps associated with Alternatives A and F. The interactive map for Alternative G shows route 5-1425.1 extending into the Ranch from the east. There is no right of public access into or through this property. Summit County Road 1425 provides access only to Columbine Ranch. The public has adequate foot and horseback access from Highway 9 up Harrigan Creek along our south boundary by way of route 5-N265.1. The depiction of public access into the property in the Travel Management Plan will only invite trespass and conflict between the landowners and the public.</p> <p>The interactive map and table for Alternative G do show the "Lower Harrigan Creek" section of route 5-1425W.1A as being "closed to the public" for all uses and as being decommissioned. We support this change as to the portion of the route within Columbine Ranch. However, as noted in paragraph 4 below, we use a short section of this route to gain access from our west gate up to route N-265.1.</p>	This mapping error will be corrected.	Private Property
457	5	lands-columbine ranch	Winter use. For the specific reasons set forth in our 2006 comments, we support the Alternative G winter use designation of "restricted" in the Bordeaux Gulch area adjacent to Columbine Ranch and oppose the "open motorized area" designation of this area that appears in Alternatives A and F.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
320	18	lower blue, corrections	Lower Blue Green Mountain Reservoir Winter Motorized Area: Mapping Errors. Area should be redefined to exclude east side of SH 9, and north and west side of Heeney Road (CR 30). SCG open space properties (South Cow Creek, Cow Camp, McDonald Flats) should be excluded from open motorized area.	The winter motorized area applies only to National Forest lands and begins at the Forest boundary and not on private land. The USFS will correct the mapping error.	Mapping, GIS

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	11	lower blue, mahan lake, elliot ridge	Lower Blue River Basin: We [Summit County] request that the USFS be sensitive to the proximity of motorized use in the Mahan Lake/Elliot Ridge area to the Eagles Nest Wilderness, and provide appropriate signage and law enforcement both summer and winter to prevent motorized encroachment into the Wilderness and other sensitive areas.	The USFS will use maps and other education tools to inform motorized users of open areas.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
320	19	lower blue, spring creek correction	Lower Blue Spring Creek Winter Motorized Area: Mapping Error. Area includes private property. Area should exclude Shadow Creek Ranch private property. SCG is holder of conservation easement that precludes public recreational access.	The winter motorized area applies only to National Forest lands and begins at the Forest boundary and not on private land. The USFS will correct the mapping error.	Mapping, GIS
285	8	lower peaks trail	Summer Routes; Upper Blue: The current inventory map is lacking an important existing trail known as the Lower Peaks Trail. The trail starts at the Peaks Trailhead, parallels the Peaks Trail (5-45.1) to the east, and ends at the junction of 5-3.1B (South Barton West Trail) and Ski Hill Road (CR 3). This trail offers an opportunity to disperse users from the Peaks Trailhead and can be used as a loop with the southern portion of the Peaks Trail (5-45.1) in both winter and summer. The trail is heavily used and currently has existing USFS signage at its northern terminus. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this route be included in the inventory map and designated for continued non-motorized use.	The trail can be identified for future opportunities, but since it was not inventoried for this process, it will be closed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	27	lowers peak trail	Upper Blue Lower Peaks Trail: Route not shown. Trail starts at Peaks Trailhead, parallels the Peaks Trail to the east and ends at junction of 5.31.1 (South Barton West Trail) and Ski Hill Road (CR3). SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data	The trail can be identified for future opportunities, but since it was not inventoried for this process, it will be closed.	Mapping, GIS
538	1	mahan lk	I am writing in response to Alternative G specifically concerning the Mahan Lake area in the Arapahoe National Forest. On the map of the new winter proposal I noticed that this area will no longer allow motorized vehicles. It seems to me as though this is a small push to eventually extend the Eagles Nest Wilderness. I feel this is an unfair restriction that I taking way my rights to use our public lands. I ride snowmobiles and this truly concerns me. I do not just ride snowmobiles, I also enjoy to cross country ski. Ifeel the national forest should be enjoyed by all users, motorized and non-motorized. There is already enough wildernesses in our areas to accommodate those who do not wish to be around motorized users.	The White River NF has not plans to extend the Eagles Nest Wilderness in this area. The National Forest is enjoyed by all users. To allow for enjoyable settings, some areas are closed to motorized uses.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
538	3	mahan lk	I observed on the summer map of this same area, that bicycles are allowed to ride all the way to Mahan Lake. Clearly this shows that the lake is still within national forest boundaries; therefore snowmobiles should be able to utilize the national forest in the winter to the same extent that bikers can in the summer.	Extending the motorized use within 1/4 mile of the wilderness boundary without clear geographic landmarks would very likely lead to illegal intrusions into the wilderness. The closure of this area to motorized use is required because the Management area prescription is 1.31 (Backcountry - Non-Motorized).	Road and Trail Classification/Management
538	2	mahan lk	I would like to point out that I see no reason why the Mahan Lake area should be off limits to snowmobiles. I have never once in my six or seven years of riding in the Elliot's Ridge and Mahan Lake area seen a cross country skier or anyone snowshoeing. We are not disturbing or harming anyone up there.	The closure of this area to motorized use is required because the Management area prescription is 1.31 (Backcountry - Non-Motorized).	Road and Trail Classification/Management
539	1	mahan lk	<p>In Alternative G, I noticed that the winter motorized use does not allow snowmobiles in the Mahan Lake area of the Arapahoe National Forest. Our family has been riding in this area for many years. In all the years we have been riding in this area we have never seen a cross country skier or snowshoer.</p> <p>The Arapahoe National Forest has plenty of wilderness for skiers and snowshoers to use. The map shows that anywhere around the Eagles Nest Wilderness that has motorized use will no longer allow motorized use up to the wilderness boundary. It seems to me that they are trying to expand the wilderness without the proper approval of Congress.</p>	The closure of this area to motorized use is required because the Management area prescription is 1.31 (Backcountry - Non-Motorized). Also, this area was formerly in the Arapaho NF, but has been part of the White River NF for over 10 years.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
341	9	mayflower gulch	Mayflower Gulch Road Please keep this area open to snowmobilers; it is one of the rare high alpine bowls available in the county and is a treat to ride.	The Mayflower Gulch Road is closed to motorized use because there is a high amount of concentrated non-motorized use and the area is too small to manage for a snowmobile area (limited terrain)	Road and Trail Classification/Management
471	23	mayflower gulch	Mayflower Gulch Road is another excellent nonmotorized area especially given how popular it is with Front Range skiers like me. There was evidence that snow machines were heading off road and onto the valley floor, destroying the willows and ruining the ski experience. Thanks for ending this problem.	This comment supports Alternative G.	General Support
354	27	mayflower gulch	Mayflower Gulch Road is another success story especially given how popular it is with not only locals but the Front Range. Again, snowmobiles only could go a couple miles up the road, but this is the perfect distance for the non-motorized user. Recently snow machines were heading off road and onto the valley floor, trashing the willows and ruining the ski experience. We are excited to see that this area is under the restricted motorized designation, and it appears that Mayflower Gulch Road will not allow motorized winter use.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
559	18	mayflower gulch	Mayflower Gulch Road is another success story especially given how popular it is with not only locals but the Front Range. It's my favorite trail for early and late season. Again, snowmobiles only could go a couple miles up the road, but this is the perfect distance for the non-motorized user. Recently snow machines were heading off road and onto the valley floor, trashing the willows and ruining the ski experience, especially in the spring when they really chunked up the road. I never saw them stay more than an hour because there was really nowhere for them to travel to. I am relieved to see that this area is under the restricted motorized designation, and it appears that Mayflower Gulch Road will not allow motorized winter use.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
316	2	mayflower gulch	Mayflower Gulch Road Please keep this area open to snowmobiles; it is one of the rare high alpine bowls available in the county.	The Mayflower Gulch Road is closed to motorized use because there is a high amount of concentrated non-motorized use and the area is too small to manage for a snowmobile area (limited terrain).	Designation of Lands
436	127	mayflower, humbug	MAYFLOWER GULCH AND HUMBUG GULCH (SOUTH OF COPPER MTN. (NEW DESIGNATION) Mayflower Gulch and Humbug Gulch are both extremely popular for the winter non-motorized user because of its easy access, gorgeous scenery, and great snow conditions and flat to moderately steep terrain. In winter this area is some of the best gentle backcountry ski terrain in the county and is probably one of the foremost destinations for Front Range skiers and snowshoers. In the spring, this region lends itself to great corn skiing up its wide valley floor and steep couloirs.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	128	mayflower, humbug	MAYFLOWER GULCH AND HUMBUG GULCH (SOUTH OF COPPER MTN. (NEW DESIGNATION) Over the last few years, unrestricted illegal snowmobile use has extended over the entire valley floor, damaging the willows, all the way high into the basin, as well as over to Humbug Gulch and even up Pacific Creek. This was very disturbing for the non-motorized winter community who had never seen this kind of intrusion until recently.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	129	mayflower, humbug	MAYFLOWER GULCH AND HUMBUG GULCH (SOUTH OF COPPER MTN. (NEW DESIGNATION) This is yet another example where short and easy accesses should be given to the non-motorized community. Because Mayflower falls within the 1.31 Forest Plan Prescription which is non-motorized, and because it is imperative to protect the natural resources and wildlife habitat of the western side of the Tenmile, we believe that closing this to motorized use falls totally within the goals of this area.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	126	mayflower, humbug	MAYFLOWER GULCH AND HUMBUG GULCH (SOUTH OF COPPER MTN. (NEW DESIGNATION) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] realize that the management of Mayflower gulch road might be excluded from the TMP since much of it travels through private property, but we are very excited to see that it now is surrounded by a closed to motorized prescription and it appears that this road is not recognized as a winter motorized restricted route.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
341	8	mccullough gulch, blue lakes	McCullough Gulch Road Blue Lakes Road Please reconsider allowing Snowmobiles on Blue Lakes road and McCullough roads. These roads provide much needed access for my friends to travel to my house without using trailers.	These areas provide a small amount of snowmobile terrain. Unfortunately, travel management designations are not made that benefit only a few people.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
377	2	mccullough gulch, blue lakes	McCullough Gulch Road Blue Lakes Road This area is not an area that I ride all the time, but the area is a place where motorized and non motorized users must be able to coexist due to the infrequency of motorized users. With the local ability to not use trailers it is a key area to keep open so that riders can ride from their houses and not need the expansion of the trail head areas. In addition, this area is a great snowmobile assist skiing area that is not known by lots of people because of the technical difficulty of the terrain. It is a great area in the spring time for access via snowmobile for ski lines that are inaccessible all season until the spring time when the avalanche danger is low for steep long vertical terrain. In this area as well I think that it is clear where motorized use is restricted and snowmobilers honor those postings. With this being a great area to access without tailoring snowmobiles it is key to maintain coexistence between non motorized and motorized users because more people use this area for quick non motorized activities on lunch breaks, before and after work needing parking. This area is great and provides minimal impact to trail head and snowmobiling is restricted to the trail.	The Mayflower Gulch Road is closed to motorized use because there is a high amount of concentrated non-motorized use and the area is too small to manage for a snowmobile area (limited terrain). The Blue Lakes Road also small with limited terrain.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
316	3	mccullough gulch, blue lakes	McCullough Gulch Road/Blue Lakes Road Please reconsider allowing Snowmobiles on Blue Lakes road and McCullough roads. These roads provide much needed access for snowmobilers to travel to different riding areas without using trailers.	The Mayflower Gulch Road is closed to motorized use because there is a high amount of concentrated non-motorized use and the area is too small to manage for a snowmobile area (limited terrain). The Blue Lakes Road also small with limited terrain.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
471	18	miners cr	Miner's Creek Trail: This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	For the Miner's Creek area and trail, based on available terrain, public input, managability, and other considerations the Ranger District recommended not having the area open to snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
489	8	miners cr	The Miners Creek Road Open Motorized Area will create conflicts with skiers on the Peaks Trail. The Open Motorized Area should be moved further to the north closer to Frisco.	For the Miner's Creek area and trail, based on available terrain, public input, managability, and other considerations the Ranger District recommended not having the area open to snowmobiles.	Designation of Lands
559	13	miners cr	Miners Creek Trail This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1,2,3, and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	For the Miner's Creek area and trail, based on available terrain, public input, managability, and other considerations the Ranger District recommended not having the area open to snowmobiles.	Designation of Lands
433	16	miners creek	MINERS CREEK TRAIL This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	For the Miner's Creek area and trail, based on available terrain, public input, managability, and other considerations the Ranger District recommended not having the area open to snowmobiles.	Resource Protection Designations (e.g., Class 1 Air, AIZ, etc.)
354	21	miners creek trail	MINERS CREEK TRAIL This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	For the Miner's Creek area and trail, based on available terrain, public input, managability, and other considerations the Ranger District recommended not having the area open to snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
150	4	Montezuma	From reviewing your Alternative G, I would point out the short dead-end route near Montezuma that extends up to the Hall Canyon overlook from the top of the Middle Fork of the Swan Road. This is an established road and leads up to a spectacular view of South Park, and I use this road all the time. I would very much appreciate a second look at this route.	Although the road does provide for a nice scenic overlook, most short-dead end roads will be closed to reduce maintenance costs.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	16	montezuma	<p>MONTEZUMA</p> <p>The entire Montezuma area is a huge snowmobile riding area with most of the motorized traffic heading toward Webster Pass and Deer Creek Road. This area has potential for some long rides if you connect with the drainages of the Swan.</p> <p>PERU CREEK ROAD, CHIHUAHUA GULCH, WARDEN GULCH, CINNAMON GULCH, HORSESHOE BASIN, MORGAN GULCH (new designations) SAINTS JOHN ROAD (275.1) (new restrictions) HUNKIDORI MINE ROAD (276.1) (new designation)</p> <p>As the majority of our members ride elsewhere in Montezuma, the loss of these areas does not impact us that much.</p>	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
231	6	montezuma	<p>Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Montezuma: Open in all alternatives. Thank you for retaining the motorized recreational gateway between the Upper Blue Basin and the Snake River basin. I keep reading non-motorized users asking for an exclusive area around Montezuma in the Snake River valley. I would like to point out to this audience that the old keystone Nordic ski area located DOWNHILL WEST of Peru Creek trailhead for many miles toward keystone resort river run and including Jones gulch is exclusive non-motorized use. Also, the area behind keystone between tiger road and summit cove is a huge area of non-motorized use. The motorized/non-motorized boundary in this Snake River valley is the peru creek trailhead. Additionally, there are countless acres of exclusive use terrain north of I-70 and south of Heeney for this purpose. I just can't believe that the non-motorized appetite for exclusive use cannot be satisfied in this entire federally designated wilderness. Just to mention a few exclusive winter destinations, there is north Tenmile Creek, Meadow creek, and Ptarmigan. Please add federally designated wilderness trails to the list of non-motorized exclusive winter use, and leave Montezuma and Swan valley to become the next [An] issue that most negatively impact[s] the area [Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma] in the winter [is]:</p> <p>The impact the snowmobiles have in the creek beds and rivers and tundra is negative. For there to be no regulation as to where off-road vehicles can drive is seriously negligent to our environment. We have moose, lynx, Boreal toads, fox, elk, deer, and many other animals (we have been lucky to have seen them all) that are getting directly affected by this.</p>	Thanks for the comment and the information.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
460	3	montezuma basin	<p>[An] issue that most negatively impact[s] the area [Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma] in the winter [is]:</p> <p>The impact the snowmobiles have in the creek beds and rivers and tundra is negative. For there to be no regulation as to where off-road vehicles can drive is seriously negligent to our environment. We have moose, lynx, Boreal toads, fox, elk, deer, and many other animals (we have been lucky to have seen them all) that are getting directly affected by this.</p>	There is a regulation that there must be sufficient snow on the ground for snowmobile travel. Effects to plants and wildlife were considered in the determination.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
460	2	montezuma basin	<p>[An] issue that most negatively impact[s] the area [Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma] in the winter [is]:</p> <p>The most important one is the parking issue. There is nowhere to park. Deer Creek is privately owned. There is not enough room for cars with trailers to turn around when there are cars parked up there. When the area gets full of cars people start parking on the road. They will line the road with cars and trailers and if there were a fire, (as there recently was) a fire truck would in no way be able to access our home because of parked cars on the road. The county simply does not enforce their "no parking law" up in Montezuma.</p>	The Dillon Ranger District is working with the Town of Montezuma and the Summit County Sheriff to resolve this issue .	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
460	4	montezuma basin	<p>[An] issue that most negatively impact[s] the area [Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma] in the winter [is]:</p> <p>The snowmobile use in Deer Creek is a free-for-all right now and this causes dangerous situations for the people using the area. The snowmobiles are high pointing on high avalanche terrain. Much of this terrain is above a trail or parts of an area where people snow shoe and ski.</p>	There is a regulation that there must be sufficient snow on the ground for snowmobile travel. Effects to plants and wildlife were considered in the determination.	Traffic Control and Safety
469	2	montezuma basin	<p>As the former mayor and current Montezuma Town Council member we have tried to work with Summit County, Summit Sheriff's Dept., the Forest Service and town residents to address the problems concerning parking and trailheads. We have been told repeatedly there is no funding for increasing the parking. The County has no money, the Town certainly has no money and the Forest Service continues to deny funding or future funding for these intended uses. Even with funding it would only be appropriate to have limited parking. The valley is steep and narrow not wide and open. It seems that the Montezuma will be the default area because other areas are taking a stand against motorized uses in their communities. Funneling all motorized traffic into the Montezuma area cannot be the solution. We respect the fact that we have a beautiful environment and that motorized traffic has a right to use it but there needs to be limits on what the area can sustain and a plan to accommodate these limits.</p>	The Dillon Ranger District is working with the Town of Montezuma and the Summit County Sheriff to resolve this issue .	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
458	3	montezuma basin	<p>Fact is, motorized recreation of all forms is the fastest growing and one of the largest forms of recreation on White River National Forest, and roads such as Montezuma Basin Road are essential resources for motorized recreation as well as backcountry access.</p>	Many routes in the Montezuma area are still open to motorized uses in both the summer and winter.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
458	2	montezuma basin	<p>I encourage the USFS to improve the parking area at road end, but to cease all but minimum upkeep and grading on the road so it remains a rough 4-wheel-drive recreation amenity as is its historic and traditional state.</p>	The road will continue to be maintained for high clearance four-wheel drive vehicles.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
469	1	montezuma basin	I would like to post our comments concerning the White River National Forest Travel Management Plan. The plan to expand and improve the motorized trail system around the Town of Montezuma is completely short sighted. We are opposed to this expansion for many reasons. The area cannot support the kind of motorized traffic outlined in the plan. The number one issue is that there is NO parking for any of these motorized vehicles. As the Town of Montezuma emphasized at a meeting with the Forest Service in September of 2008, there is NO public parking at the Sts. John area, the Morgan Creek area or the Webster pass area. There are about 10 spaces at the Deer Creek area, part or all of which is privately owned. Outlining these areas for motorized use is irresponsible and the fact that there is no funding to increase parking or facilities (toilets, signage, trash facilities, etc) further increases the irresponsibility. All of the drainages surrounding Montezuma access extremely steep and avalanche prone terrain. None of these areas have proper trailheads and proper signage to inform users of the peril. The drainages are all home to fragile wetlands and unique animal species such	The Dillon Ranger District is working with the Town of Montezuma and the Summjit County Sherrif to resolve this issue .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
458	1	montezuma basin	I'm writing to support continued management of Montezuma Basin Road as open to all vehicles, all seasons. I would like this road to remain open for all vehicle traffic to the traditional upper parking area near the base of the permanent snowfield and pond. I would like the road remain open to snowmobiles during snow seasons. Montezuma road is a historical amenity and resource that's been in use for mechanized transport for more than a century. It's a traditional motorized access route for backcountry recreation, and unique in that it allows motorized access to summer skiing on a permanent snowfield, as well as close access to climbing 14er Castle Peak for individuals less physically adept than those capable of longer hikes and climbs.	Many of the routes in the area will remain open to motorized uses in both winter and summer. The tailhead mentioned is not on the National Forest (private property)	Designation of Lands
554	1	montezuma basin	I'm writing to support continued management of Montezuma Basin Road as open to all vehicles, all seasons. I would like this road to remain open for all vehicle traffic to the traditional upper parking area near the base of the permanent snowfield and pond. I would like the road remain open to snowmobiles during snow seasons. Montezuma road is a historical amenity and resource that's been in use for mechanized transport for more than a century. It's a traditional motorized access route for backcountry recreation, and unique in that it allows motorized access to summer skiing on a permanent snowfield, as well as close access to climbing 14er Castle Peak for individuals less physically adept than those capable of longer hikes and climbs. More, I encourage the USFS to improve the parking area at road end, but to cease all but minimum upkeep and grading on the road so it remains a rough 4-wheel-drive recreation amenity as is its historic and traditional state. Fact is, motorized recreation of all forms is the fastest growing and one of the largest forms of recreation on White River National Forest, and roads such as Montezuma Basin Road are essential resources for motorized recreation as	Many of the routes in the area will remain open to motorized uses in both winter and summer. The tailhead mentioned is not on the National Forest (private property)	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
552	1	montezuma basin	I'm writing to support continued management of Montezuma Basin Road as open to all vehicles, all seasons. I would like this road to remain open for all vehicle traffic to the traditional upper parking area near the base of the permanent snowfield and pond. I would like the road remain open to snowmobiles during snow seasons. Montezuma road is a historical amenity and resource that's been in use for mechanized transport for more than a century. It's a traditional motorized access route for backcountry recreation, and unique in that it allows motorized access to summer skiing on a permanent snowfield, as well as close access to climbing 14er Castle Peak for individuals less physically adept than those capable of longer hikes and climbs. More, I encourage the USFS to improve the parking area at road end, but to cease all but minimum upkeep and grading on the road so it remains a rough 4-wheel-drive recreation amenity as is its historic and traditional state. Fact is, motorized recreation of all forms is the fastest growing and one of the largest forms of recreation on White River National Forest, and roads such as Montezuma Basin Road are essential resources for motorized recreation as	Many of the routes in the area will remain open to motorized uses in both winter and summer. The tailhead mentioned is not on the National Forest (private property)	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
553	1	montezuma basin	I'm writing to support continued management of Montezuma Basin Road as open to all vehicles, all seasons. I would like this road to remain open for all vehicle traffic to the traditional upper parking area near the base of the permanent snowfield and pond. I would like the road remain open to snowmobiles during snow seasons. Montezuma road is a historical amenity and resource that's been in use for mechanized transport for more than a century. It's a traditional motorized access route for backcountry recreation, and unique in that it allows motorized access to summer skiing on a permanent snowfield, as well as close access to climbing 14er Castle Peak for individuals less physically adept than those capable of longer hikes and climbs. More, I encourage the USFS to improve the parking area at road end, but to cease all but minimum upkeep and grading on the road so it remains a rough 4-wheel-drive recreation amenity as is its historic and traditional state. Fact is, motorized recreation of all forms is the fastest growing and one of the largest forms of recreation on White River National Forest, and roads such as Montezuma Basin Road are essential resources for motorized recreation as	Many of the routes in the area will remain open to motorized uses in both winter and summer. The tailhead mentioned is not on the National Forest (private property)	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
460	5	montezuma basin	We are not opposed to off-road vehicle use in our area [Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma] but it does need to be restricted. There needs to be some sort of regulation so the integrity of the area is not ruined.	This comment was addressed in Alternative GM by closing many routes in the area while providing sufficient routes for motorized use.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
460	1	montezuma basin	We own the Radical Jr. Mill site in Montezuma. The impact we have seen in over 20 years of living there are major. Snowmobiles during the winter and off-road motorized vehicle in the summer have increased immensely.	Snowmibile use has increased. Social and resource impacts were considered in allowing for this use to continue.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
349	5	montezuma, deer creek, webster pass	<p>The following is concerns and recommendations for the Montezuma, Deer Creek and Webster Pass area from a homeowner and full time resident of Webster Pass who this plan will directly affect.</p> <p>The other major problem in our area is parking. There is currently no trailhead parking in this area that is not on private property. The Dillon ranger district in Silverthorne directs the public to park for this area on private land which puts on average in a weekend 10 to 30 snowmobiles revving engines and parking vehicles on my neighbor's property. No matter what you decide about GREEN or PINK for motorized use in our area the 1st priority is to create a trailhead that is not on private property.</p>	<p>The Dillon Ranger District is working with the Town of Montezuma and the Summjit County Sherrif to resolve this issue . The District will discontinue encouraging parking on private property. Construction of trailheads is not part of this proposal.</p>	<p>Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)</p>
349	1	montezuma, deer creek, webster pass	<p>The following is concerns and recommendations for the Montezuma, Deer Creek and Webster Pass area from a homeowner and full time resident of Webster Pass who this plan will directly affect.</p> <p>The snowmobile use in our area has already increased to a level that has gotten out of control in the last 15 years due to the advances in snowmobile technology and increased population.</p>	<p>Snowmibile use has increased. Social and resource impacts were considered in allowing for this use to continue.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
349	2	montezuma, deer creek, webster pass	<p>The following is concerns and recommendations for the Montezuma, Deer Creek and Webster Pass area from a homeowner and full time resident of Webster Pass who this plan will directly affect.</p> <p>This area is a beautiful fragile environment that has a diverse ecosystem both plant and wildlife. The alpine and subalpine plant life, wildlife and watersheds rival that of any wilderness area in the state of Colorado. We realize there was tremendous mining activity in the late 1800s that have left many old 4x4 roads that allow opportunity for motorized use but I do not think that opens the door for motorized use off the roads that are not only damaging to the environment but also to the people who like to enjoy these areas with non-motorized activities. This area is deep in the process of healing from the mining era and under your plan would be a GREEN open motorized use area. I ask you to consider making this area around Deer Creek and Webster Pass PINK limited motorized use and limit snowmobile (and other motorized vehicles) only to designated roads.</p>	<p>Snowmibile use has increased. Social and resource impacts were considered in allowing for this use to continue.</p>	<p>Designation of Lands</p>
349	3	montezuma, deer creek, webster pass	<p>The following is concerns and recommendations for the Montezuma, Deer Creek and Webster Pass area from a homeowner and full time resident of Webster Pass who this plan will directly affect.</p> <p>We have seen wildlife such as lynx and a family of moose move into the area and also noticed an increase in fox, coyotes, and elk. The use of snowmobiles up the roadless part of the valleys are extremely damaging to the beaver population that is trying to survive in the watersheds of Deer creek and Webster Creek.</p>	<p>Snowmibile use has increased. Social and resource impacts (including wildlife) were considered in allowing for this use to continue.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
349	4	montezuma, deer creek, webster pass	<p>The following is concerns and recommendations for the Montezuma, Deer Creek and Webster Pass area from a homeowner and full time resident of Webster Pass who this plan will directly affect.</p> <p>You are currently reducing the amount of GREEN use area by about 30% in the Dillon Ranger District and directing them to this area which we believe should be protected more. This area is a prime and fragile High alpine environment that needs more protection not more motorized use. This area is truly a jewel and if you are not familiar with it you should come visit it before making a decision. The continental divide runs though here and is home to 3 ridgelines 12000'-13000. I am a registered snowmobile owner and would welcome limited motorized use to designated roads in this area to protect this environment. I am also a backcountry skier and would love to enjoy this area skiing without the constant buzz of snowmobiles all around me. I think the PINK limited use designation to the roads would be a tolerable compromise to the snowmobilers, skiers and environment.</p>	Snowmibile use has increased. Social and resource impacts (including wildlife) were considered in allowing for this use to continue.	Designation of Lands
342	2	morgan gulch, 5-264.1	<p>The town [Montezuma] feels it to be extremely urgent that the Morgan Gulch drainage be left out of the plan. There is no access and parking for this area today and there is no history of winter-motorized use on this road except for property owners. This drainage is also the town's water supply. We feel that strict management of the area is needed to protect this irreplaceable resource. Collier Mountain is an isolated mountain with no connecting ridges to other winter-use areas. The only access is through the town to the east and there has never been legal winter access in the 29 years I have lived here. Therefore the town asks that no motorized winter use be allowed on Morgan Gulch Rd. (5-264.1)</p>	The areas open to snowmobile use have already been significantly reduced in the area. The proposal to close the Morgan Gulch area would make the area even smaller and make management more difficult.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	47	mount baldy	<p>Winter</p> <p>The Breckenridge Town Council strongly supports the designation of the western face of Mount Baldy (a.k.a. Bald Mountain) as non-motorized in the winter months. This area is a safe, nearby, historically non-motorized winter access that has recently been overrun by snowmobile use. We [Town of Breckenridge] strongly support the Alternative G recommendation as non-motorized for safety and user experience reasons.</p>	The comment supports alternative G.	Designation of Lands
432	5	mt. baldy	<p>Breckenridge: I strongly support the Alternative G designation of the west face of Mt. Baldy as non-motorized during winter. This area has always been heavily used by the non-motorized user groups due to its proximity to numerous neighborhoods, low avalanche risk, historic qualities and high alpine setting. In the past few years the area has been inundated with snowmobiles, which have greatly degraded the non-motorized experience both from an aesthetic and safety perspective.</p>	The comment supports alternative G.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
435	8	mushroom trail	<p>HORSESHOE GULCH/SODA CREEK ZONE</p> <p>There are important and missing trails in the Horseshoe Gulch area in the Swan River Drainage.</p> <p>The second missing trail is called the Mushroom Trail. It is located on the northwest flanks of Swan Mountain, connects from routes 5-132W.2 and 5-132.2, and is located on an old ditch, making it a sustainable trail that receives considerable use out of the Keystone Ranch area. Numerous comments were given on the Blair Witch Trail and the Mushroom Trail and they should have been added to the USFS inventory.</p>	Mushroom Trail - This route was not inventoried and therefore will not be considered in this process.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
285	60	north of southfork, swan	<p>Winter</p> <p>An open motorized use area is designated to the west of the Continental Divide from just north of the South Fork of the Swan River drainage north to Tiptop Peak in the Swan River drainage. This area is very large and has no definable topographic or geographic boundaries to the west and north. Instead of being confined to the ridgeline terrain above treeline, this use designation encompasses many areas of wildlife habitat, including riparian areas, wetlands, stream drainages and forested hillsides that are inappropriate for unrestricted winter motorized use. Most of this area would be considered lynx habitat by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and inappropriate for unrestricted motorized travel with the resultant snow compaction. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that this open motorized bubble be reduced in size and restricted to areas with lesser habitat values, including the above treeline area on the Continental Divide.</p>	The areas open to snowmobile use have already been significantly reduced in the area. The proposal to close the Morgan Gulch area would make the area even smaller and make management more difficult. The US Fish and Wildlife Service will be consulted in this decision to determine impacts to Lynx habitat.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
231	2	old dillon, lake dillon, campgrounds	<p>Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Old Dillon Reservoir, Heaton Campground, and Giberson Day Use Area: This area is closed in ALT G, but considered open in other alternatives. I note with interest that a vocal local member of the Backcountry Snowsports Alliance would like this area delisted from non-motorized acreage because no one skis there. This area to the north of Lake Dillon is a good place for snowmobiling. The Swan Mountain Recreation Area on the Southeast side of Lake Dillon which includes the Lowery and Prospector Campgrounds have been closed to snowmobile use and has had a significant effect on the downside for neighboring Summit Cove snowmobile users. A good trade out for the Swan Mountain Recreation Area loss of terrain is to reopen Old Dillon Reservoir, Heaton Campground, and Giberson Day Use Area to snowmobile use. Snowmobile users would gladly use it and the nearby towns of Dillon and frisco would benefit from the taxes that it derives. Not to mention that the Dillon dam road is getting less traffic now with the federally influenced dam road restrictions.</p>	This area is managed for elk and deer winter range where snowmobile use is discouraged. The WRNF Forest Plan allows for motorized use on designated routes, however, there are insufficient routes in the area for a trail system and no other motorized system to connect to.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	26	other OHV areas	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Maintain winter and summer OHV access to Wise Mountain, Red Mountain, Webster Pass, Montezuma, Saint Johns, French Pass, Georgia Pass.</p>	OHV access to all of these areas will be maintained, except for French Pass. This route leads to a non-motorized route on the adjacent Forest.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
301	40	outside golden horseshoe, tenderfoot (all listed in other letters)	<p>Summit County (General- outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mtn. areas)</p> <p>-Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreass Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track.</p> <p>-Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track.</p> <p>-Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities.</p> <p>-Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible.</p> <p>-Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end.</p> <p>These routes offer unique and sustainable recreational opportunities and a better network of connected access facilitating both motorized and non-motorized activities.</p>	<p>N6013.1 originates on the Boreas Pass Road which is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads. Only routes on the map are considered in this process. N962.1, N364.1, and 611.3A: These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood. The Peak 10 road will be designated as open to OHVs in Alternative GM. 2950.5A and 2950.1: The connector proposed would involve private property.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
566	7	outside golden horseshoe, tenderfoot (all listed in other letters)	<p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Summit County (General- outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mtn. areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. -Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. -Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. -Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. -Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end. <p>Again, these routes offer unique and sustainable recreational opportunities and a better network of connected access facilitating both motorized and non-motorized activities.</p>	<p>N6013.1 originates on the Boreas Pass Road which is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads. Only routes on the map are considered in this process. N962.1, N364.1, and 611.3A: These routes are not in the same area of the Forest, therefore, the intent of this comment is not understood. The Peak 10 road will be designated as open to OHVs in Alternative GM. 2950.5A and 2950.1: The connector proposed would involve private property.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
502	11	outside golden horseshoe, tenderfoot (all listed in other letters)	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Summit County (General- outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mtn. areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Designate 5-N6013.1 connecting Boreas Pass Road with Indiana Gulch Road as motorized single-track. -Designate the single-track trail (not on the map) that exists to connect the southern ends of 5-597.1 and 5-611.1 as motorized single-track. -Designate all the trails connecting and including 5-N962.1 (currently slated to be for mountain bikes but is too steep on its north end) to connect to 5-N364.1 and 5-611.3A for loop opportunities. -Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. -Designate a motorized connector for 9-2950.5A and 5-2950.1 between Haystack Mountain and Williams Peak and a way out on the southeast end. <p>Again, these routes offer unique and sustainable recreational opportunities and a better network of connected access facilitating both motorized and non-motorized activities.</p>	<p>Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal. N6013.1 originates on the Boreas Pass Road which is closed to unlicensed vehicles. Motorcycle and ATV use has occurred in the past, but unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
350	3	overlook	While great effort has been taken to identify all the travel ways on the forest, several important areas have been omitted. Of particular concern to those of us in the Dillon Ranger District, is the multi-use trail system commonly known as the "Overlook" which is in the Ten Mile Creek drainage. Additionally, several trails to the east of Ten Mile Creek have also been omitted. We would like to see these trails either be included in the final plan, or a mechanism identified in the plan to address bringing these trails, and others, into the system in the future.	Only those trails inventoried are considered in this process. Any needs for additional trails may be presented to the Dillon Ranger District in the future as a proposal	Road and Trail Classification/Management
505	3	peabody placer, preston, gold run	I strongly urge maintaining Peabody Placer and the Preston trails as non-motorized continuation of the Gold Run Nordic Center. It is simply not safe to allow high speed motorized usage on the same trail used by so many skiers - and so many younger skiers and dogs also on the trail.	The Peabody Placer trail will be designated as winter non-motorized in Alternative GM. Preston Trail will remain open to motorized as determined in a collaborative process with the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
191	14	peak 9 to peak 10	Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	16	peak 9 to peak 10	Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
398	12	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
281	14	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
510	13	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	21	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
219	20	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
468	15	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
415	15	peak 9 to peak 10	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
404	13	peak 9 to peak 10	Summit County - outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
125	14	peak9-peak10 singletrack	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
109	14	peak9-peak10 singletrack	<p>The general Summit County area outside Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot.</p> <p>Designate the route thru the Breckenridge Ski Area Peak 9 to the weather station near the peak of Peak 10 as OHV accessible. This would provide access to the snowfields on Peak 10 for summer skiing as well as provide unparalleled views.</p>	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
107	11	peak9-peak10 singletrack	<p>We suggest that Alternative G is the best plan. A few specifics should absolutely be included such as:</p> <p>We'd like the route thru Breckenridge Ski area peak 9 to the weather station and snowfields on Peak 10 to be designated motorized single track.</p>	This route will still be open to OHVs in Alternative GM.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
433	13	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous for the numerous skiers after these routes have seen snowmobile tracks. It only takes a few snowmobiles to ruin the experience on these popular winter ski trails.</p> <p>Given how popular this area is with the non-motorized winter user, the motorized community should not be allowed unrestricted use.</p>	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Road and Trail Classification/Management
432	6	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Breckenridge: The Pennsylvania/Indiana Gulch area is of major significance and concern to non-motorized winter users. Both gulches provide some of the County's best nordic touring and backcountry turning. I oppose the open motorized zone that runs from the southern flanks of Mt Baldy, through Indiana Gulch and south into Pennsylvania Gulch. Within this area are many popular non-motorized trails like Baker's Tank. The proposed motorized bubble has no logical and clear boundary and so it will (and is) easy for motorized users to encroach on the designated non-motorized areas on Mt. Baldy and Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulches. There are significant problems with the access points in Indiana Gulch and Pennsylvania Gulch in that they are either closed to motorized or have no room for vehicles towing snowmobile trailers, and this will become even more problematic as use increases due to the large motorized area that allows for "open" use. This open use will also encourage the already increasing unauthorized motorized use into sensitive areas like Horseshoe Basin at the head of Pennsylvania Gulch. Due to the hard-to-identify boundaries of the motorized bubble, use into non-motorized and environmentally sensitive regions will be very difficult to manage and</p>	CABIN TRAIL In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
505	1	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>I applaud the BOCC vote recommending PA Gulch winter non-motorized use. Please accept their recommendation and make this area non-motorized winter use. There are numerous other roads, trails and areas open to snowmobiles, while there is very limited Nordic only terrain.</p> <p>While it might sound workable in theory to share the same area, quiet back country ski sports such as snow shoeing and Nordic skiing are not compatible with loud, exhaust fume spewing snow machines that race along the trails, the very essence of their activity. In addition, last winter when snowmobiles were encountered a few times on the Gold Run Nordic trail up to the old town of Preston, it created a very unsafe situation. Two times in particular, we were skiing with children when we encountered speeding snowmobiles around the trail's blind curves. The snowmobiles could not see around the curves, yet they never slowed down - and they were on GROOMED Nordic trail! Fortunately, our group was able to get out of the way quickly, or it could have been tragic with the number of small children skiing.</p> <p>In addition to the speed and noise, it is hardly enjoyable skiing trails when exhaust fumes from snowmobiles still lingers in the air long after the snowmobiles have passed. Those who enjoy the sport of Nordic skiing are out to enjoy a healthy workout. Being passed by an exhaust spewing snow machine when skiers are breathing deeply working hard uphill, is a very unpleasant and sickening experience inhaling so much exhaust. The</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, and no legal winter access, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p> <p>The mangement of the groomed trails of the Gold Run Nordic area is mostly on non-federal lands or on National forestt lands under permit to the Town of Breckenridge.</p>	Designation of Lands
499	2	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>I recommend dedicating Pennsylvania/Indiana Gulch non-motorized for your winter plan. This area is enjoyed by a large number of non-motorized recreationalists whom like to travel to an area close to Breckenridge that affords solitude, beauty and easy access. Right now the winter motorized traffic here has increased greatly in the past couple of years and has not been managed effectively.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
433	14	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	I'd suggest a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch. This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
499	3	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	In Alternative G, the south side of PA Gulch Road is closed to motorized, yet this is where snow machines often travel off-route. How will this be managed? Please weigh the cost of the large number of signs and enforcement this road will need, versus closing the road entirely to winter motorized since most of the winter motorized use was to illegally access Horseshoe Basin. At the very least, put a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch (611W.3A). This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
433	12	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Parking at the cul-de-sac of PA. Gulch Road is limited, and trailers aren't feasible.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
377	1	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Road</p> <p>For me one of the major concerns is the Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch roads. This area is very important for me as I live in Blue River and access the trail directly from my house. As concerns have been addressed by other residents this area can be used with no extra efforts put forth for more parking because of direct access from our houses. I, in addition, provide parking at my house for friends that want to come ride in the area so the trail head can remain open for non motorized users. another comment from other residents of blue river who I know and use the area for non motorized use say that snowmobilers in the area have always been courteous and stop on the trail when they are present for them to pass. Our use of the trails helps to pack down and maintain the trail for those users. They have actually asked me last winter why I hadn't been up to pack down the trail for them after fresh snow. The Pennsylvania gulch road is also a key for longer trail rides up through Indiana gulch road and onto Boreas pass road. this provides great opportunities for us long people to take more novice riders up on a long trail ride so that more experienced riders can help teach novices through</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
341	3	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>For many of the local residents in the area like me, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch continue to offer some of the best riding in the county conveniently and legally accessed from our back door.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails for motorized summer use in the area specified. .</p>	Private Property
341	4	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>I access this area from my house, eliminating the need for increased parking or trailhead improvements.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails in the area specified. .</p>	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
341	5	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>I like connecting to different trails from Pennsylvania Gulch, areas like Boreas Pass.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails in the area specified. .</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
433	11	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. This area needs to be changed from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>For many years, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch was some of the most popular terrain for the Nordic skier as well as backcountry skier. In the last few years, Pennsylvania Gulch road has seen an increase in snowmobile traffic, mostly to illegally enter Horseshoe Basin for highmarking, playing and some hybrid use.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
341	6	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads Thank you for giving much of this area the unrestricted motorized use designation. Please extend this unrestricted boundary to the upper ridge of Red Mountain allowing us to legally ride in Horseshoe Basin.	The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands
341	1	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for me since they are located ½ mile from my house. I frequently use the area for snowshoeing, cross country skiing and snowmobiling. Please keep open Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads to winter motorized use.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
316	7	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads For many of the local residents in the area, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch continue to offer some of the best riding in the county conveniently and legally accessed from their back door.	Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails for motorized summer use in the area specified. .	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
316	6	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>Please consider opening the upper Horseshoe Basin to motorized users. This high alpine bowl offers some of the best snowmobiling in the county and is an area seldom used by cross country skiers.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
316	10	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>Thank you for giving much of this area the unrestricted motorized use designation. Please extend this unrestricted boundary to the upper ridge of Red Mountain allowing us to legally ride in Horseshoe Basin.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
316	5	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for me. Please keep open Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads to winter motorized use.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated and respected. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
316	9	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>These areas allow for longer rides connecting to trails like Boreas Pass.</p>	Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails for motorized summer use in the area specified. .	Designation of Lands
316	8	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>These residents access the area from their house, eliminating the need for increased parking or trailhead improvements.</p>	Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails for motorized summer use in the area specified. .	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
354	16	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous for the numerous skiers after these routes have seen snowmobile tracks. Snowplowing down a snowmobile's deep narrow track is extremely challenging and almost impossible for most Nordic skiers. Uphill travel on whoop-de-doos and snow machine tread often down to the dirt on PA Gulch, makes ski touring miserable. The non-motorized winter user has been displaced from this area, despite the low percentage of snowmobiles who use this area. Please realize how few snowmobiles it takes to totally degrade the skiing experience here.</p>	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands
354	13	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>For many years, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch was some of the most popular terrain for the Nordic skier as well as backcountry skier. This area sees heavy non-motorized use and the winter motorized use is minimal, but destructive. This region is a favorite due to great snow conditions, loop opportunities, easy glade skiing, beautiful scenery, solitude and proximity to the town of Breckenridge.</p>	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	18	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>In Alternative G, the south side of PA Gulch Road is closed to motorized, yet this is where snow machines often travel off-route. How will this be managed effectively? Please weigh the cost of the large number of signs and enforcement this road will need, versus closing the road entirely to winter motorized since most of the winter motorized use was to illegally access Horseshoe Basin. Signage has not been proven effective; the snowmobilers have removed all signs indicating the non-motorized status. At the very least, put a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch (611W.3A). This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
354	14	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>In the last few years, Pennsylvania Gulch road has seen an increase in snowmobile traffic, mostly to illegally enter Horseshoe Basin for highmarking, playing and some hybrid use.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
354	17	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>Most of this region in the Travel Management Plan has been given the unrestricted motorized use designation. This unrestricted motorized boundary extends from Pennsylvania Gulch Road's north side, and includes Middle Indiana Creek, Dysersville Road to Boreas Pass and Main Indiana Gulch Road to Boreas Pass. This boundary also extends along the ridge between Pennsylvania and Indiana, and all of Hoosier Ridge from PA Gulch north to Boreas Pass. Much of this terrain has rarely seen motorized winter use and Hoosier Ridge only sees light non-motorized use. Please re-evaluate this boundary. Too much of this terrain never sees motorized use. Given how popular this area is with the non-motorized winter user, the motorized community should not be allowed unrestricted use.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	15	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>Parking at the cul-de-sac of PA Gulch Road is limited, and trailers aren't feasible.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	<p>Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)</p>
354	19	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads</p> <p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>We would like to at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes the Middle Indiana Creek road, also called the Cabin road. It is not on your maps. This road dead ends at a cabin, which is also where the 'Dyersville singletracks' begin. This road is part of a great nordic ski or snowshoe loop and snowmobiles would not lose much by closing the short mile or so they can travel on this road. We would also like the Dyersville Road to be winter non-motorized.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	<p>Designation of Lands</p>
489	3	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch</p> <p>I oppose the Open Motorized Area in Indiana and Pennsylvania Gulches. The area should be designated Motorized Prohibited. Boreas Pass trailhead is heavily used by non-motorized users. Trailhead parking is very limited and often full. The narrow road from Rocky Point up one mile is too narrow to accommodate both user groups. The road has a precipitous drop-off on one side and a steep hillside on the other side. Mixed use would expose both users groups to unsafe encounters endangering the public.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/M anagement</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
489	4	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch The Section House and Ken's Cabin at the top of Boreas Pass would see an increase use from Park County access to Indiana Gulch completely degrading the backcountry hut experience. The motorized noise pollution would carry throughout the entire valley eliminating any tranquility and wilderness experience.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
471	12	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.' Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous to ski after it has seen snowmobile tracks. Snowplowing down a snowmobile's deep narrow track is extremely challenging and almost impossible for most Nordic skiers. Uphill travel on whoop-de-dooos and snow machine tread often down to the dirt on PA. Gulch, makes ski touring miserable. The non-motorized winter user has been displaced from this area, despite the low percentage of snowmobiles who use this area.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands
471	11	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.' For many years, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch was some of the most popular terrain for the Nordic skier as well as backcountry skier. It was the locals' favorite due to great snow conditions, loop opportunities, easy glade skiing, beautiful scenery, solitude and close to the town of Breckenridge. In the last few years, Pennsylvania Gulch Road has seen a huge increase in snowmobile traffic, mostly illegally entering Horseshoe Basin for hybrid use as well as highmarking. This creates conflict and danger in terms of avalanches and frozen trails possibly causing injury to the backcountry or nordic skier.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
471	15	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>In Alternative G, the south side of PA Gulch Road is closed to motorized, yet this is where snow machines often travel off-route. How will this be managed effectively? Please weigh the cost of the large number of signs and enforcement this road will need, versus closing the road entirely to winter motorized since most of the winter motorized use was to illegally access Horseshoe Basin. At the very least, put a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch (611W.3A). This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
471	14	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>Most of this region in the Travel Management Plan has been given the unrestricted motorized use designation. This unrestricted motorized boundary extends from Pennsylvania Gulch Road's north side, and includes Middle Indiana Creek, Dysersville Road to Boreas Pass and Main Indiana Gulch Road to Boreas Pass. This boundary also extends along the ridge between Pennsylvania and Indiana, and all of Hoosier Ridge from PA Gulch north to Boreas Pass. Much of this terrain has rarely seen motorized winter use and Hoosier Ridge only sees light non-motorized use. Please re-evaluate this boundary. Too much of this terrain never sees motorized use and putting it on the map as motorized will surely destroy the solitude that many human powered users have come to enjoy.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
471	13	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'</p> <p>Parking at the cul-de-sac of Pennsylvania Gulch Road is limited, and trailers aren't feasible. Most of the snow machines travel illegally on County roads to reach this trail.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
471	16	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>Pennsylvania/Indiana roads: Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized."</p> <p>We would like to at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes the Middle Indiana Creek road, also called the Cabin road. It is not on your maps. This road dead ends at a cabin, which is also where the 'dysersville singletracks' begin. This road is part of a great nordic ski or snowshoe loop and snowmobiles would not lose much by closing the short mile or so they can travel on this road. We would also like the Dysersville Road to be winter non-motorized.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
436	53	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>PLEASE ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNRESTRICTED MOTORIZED WINTER USE IN THIS REGION</p> <p>A few miles up Pennsylvania Gulch, where going straight enters the 'non-motorized boundary' your prescription still allows motorized use to climb east to the top of road 611W.3A. This is the 'ridge road" where PA. Gulch is below to the west and Indiana is to the east. Although we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] can understand why you would allow winter motorized to the top of 611W.3A from Indiana Creek, we cannot understand why you would continue to allow unrestricted winter motorized use to continue on this ridge road all the way to the saddle next to x11851. We rarely, if ever, have see winter motorized use on this section of 611W.3A. This section of road is usually too windblown for snow machine travel, and it doesn't hold great snow due to its southern exposure. Opening this route for unrestricted winter motorized use will increase your enforcement nightmares because it will make it that much easier to descend to the west and into the non-motorized region close to Horseshoe Basin and play in what is considered an area rich in natural resources and one of the last remaining areas in the Upper Blue which should be protected and conserved. We</p>		Designation of Lands
436	52	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>PLEASE ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNRESTRICTED MOTORIZED WINTER USE IN THIS REGION</p> <p>Please switch this entire "unrestricted motorized" designation from to restricted for this area between the northern ridge of Pennsylvania Gulch all the way to Boreas Pass road. Although this boundary seems to follow the Forest Plan's 3.31 designation, it doesn't make sense from an on the ground enforcement perspective, especially for winter.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	55	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	PLEASE ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UNRESTRICTED MOTORIZED WINTER USE IN THIS REGION Why should the majority of users, the non-motorized, be displaced for the sake of a few snowmachines accessing terrain they are not allowed in?	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
505	4	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Please include PA Gulch, Boreas Pass and Indiana Gulch as no snowmobiles and ORVs as well.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
389	2	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	Please keep open Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch Roads to winter motorized use.	The comment is appreciated and respect. However, in the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
559	12	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>The Pennsylvania/Indiana Roads are a major concern for me. Please consider closing Pennsylvania Gulch to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized" to "restricted motorized". Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous for the numerous skiers after these routes have seen snowmobile tracks. It only takes a few snowmobiles to ruin the experience on these popular winter ski trails. Snowplowing down a snowmobile's deep narrow track is extremely challenging and almost impossible for most Nordic Skiers. Uphill travel on whoop-de-doos and snow machine tread often down to the dirt on PA. Gulch makes ski touring miserable. The non-motorized winter user has been displaced from this area, despite the low percentage of snowmobiles that use this area.</p> <p>I would like to at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes the Middle Indiana Creek road, also called the Cabin Road. It is not on your maps. This road dead ends at a cabin, which is also where the 'Dyersville single-tracks' begin. This road is part of a great Nordic ski or snowshoe loop and snowmobiles would not lose much by closing the short mile or so they can travel on this road. We would also like the Dyersville</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Designation of Lands
463	2	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>We request that Indiana Gulch Road be closed to all motorized use in the winter. Again, Snowmobile use in the winter has made this are unusable by skiers.</p> <p>Most of this region in the TMP has been given the unrestricted motorized use designation. Much of this terrain has not seen motorized use in the winter. This is a popular area for non-motorized users, and we feel the motorized community should not be allowed unrestricted use in this area.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
463	1	pennsylvania, indiana gulch	<p>We request that Pennsylvania Gulch Road be closed to all motorized use in the winter. Snowmobile use in the winter has made this area unusable by skiers.</p>	<p>In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	25	Pennsylvania Gulch	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Maintain OHV trails in Pennsylvania Gulch that provide access to historical mines and mountain views.	Thanks for the comment. Alt GM does address connecting different trails for motorized summer use in the area specified. .	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
471	24	peru	Thanks for Peru Creek road and all of its side roads that are proposed to be closed to winter motorized. Since so much of Montezuma is popular with snow machines, this balance is necessary for the health and protection of the natural resources in this area. Peru Creek never saw heavy snow machine use, yet this was the most popular destination in Montezuma for the non-motorized skier and rider.	This comment supports Alternative G.	General Support
433	18	peru cr	Thanks for Peru Creek road and all of its side roads which are proposed to be closed to winter motorized. Since so much of Montezuma is popular with snow machines, we believe that this is the balance necessary for the natural resources in this area. Peru Creek never saw heavy snow machine use, yet this was the most popular destination in Montezuma for the non-motorized skier and rider.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	116	peru cr, chihuahua, warden, cinnamon, horseshoe, morgan	PERU CREEK ROAD, CHIHUAHUA GULCH, WARDEN GULCH, CINNAMON GULCH, HORSESHOE BASIN, MORGAN GULCH (new designations!) Great news that all of these roads are now part of a winter non-motorized network. Much of these have never seen heavy winter motorized use, so we suspect this won't be a huge loss. It is difficult to tell on your map if Morgan gulch is included in this list, but we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] included it since it is the primary backcountry ski access point for some of the most popular terrain in Montezuma.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	117	peru cr, chihuahua, warden, cinnamon, horseshoe, morgan	PERU CREEK ROAD, CHIHUAHUA GULCH, WARDEN GULCH, CINNAMON GULCH, HORSESHOE BASIN, MORGAN GULCH (new designations!) We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] appreciate that there is now one drainage for the non-motorized user to go and find the peace and solitude and great trail conditions which they desire. Many folks from the Front Range will be thrilled to see this, since it is one of their favorite haunts. We have been displaced from much of Montezuma's incredible terrain, and this one new non-motorized zone seems to make sense, since it already sees the most winter non-motorized use in Montezuma.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	28	peru creek	Thanks for Peru Creek road and all of its side roads which are proposed to be closed to winter motorized. Since so much of Montezuma is popular with snow machines, we believe that this is the balance necessary for the health and protection of the natural resources in this area. Peru Creek never saw heavy snow machine use, yet this was the most popular destination in Montezuma for the non-motorized skier and rider.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
231	4	rainbow lk, dillon res	Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Rainbow Lake: Open in all alternatives. Thank you for retaining the 1990 SN-107 Rainbow Lake Winter Recreation Area. This area has seen quite a bit of development as a result of federal land swaps. The new local hospital is where the old snowmobile trailhead was. The non-motorized users in this area have exclusive access to all of Ophir Mountain and peaks trail. The snowmobile user has no exclusive access. Furthermore what is nearby is designated wilderness areas closed to snowmobiles but open to non-motorized/non-mechanized. As a result the history of summit county recreation in this area is Skiers north of Frisco and I-70, snowmobile south of Frisco and I-70. I request that the forest service strongly consider relocating the snowmobile trailhead for this area to Farmers Korner, specifically county road 951 which is the old co hwy 9 that disappears into Lake Dillon. it was a boat ramp until Denver water closed it in 2008 due to zebra mussel concerns. In 1990 Arapahoe national forest service references, it was identified as Access # 1 Blue River Inlet of SN-104 Dillon Reservoir. Snowmobilers would then use the abandoned bike path alignment to cross CO Hwy 9 to iron springs road. This route was identified as acceptable to the 2002 Summit County Winter Travel Management Task	The trailhead proposed is on Summit County property and not considered in this process.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
436	2	rec-implement	HOOSIER PASS WEST (new winter non-motorized designation) The initial jeep road from the west side of Hoosier Pass seems to fall on the border between Pike and White River National Forest, and so it is difficult to tell if its closed or open to motorized. To eliminate management issues, we hope that a winter-only gate is placed across this initial road from the Hoosier Pass Parking Lot, despite its designation being unclear. We would recommend closing this to winter motorized by mid-October when the snow has arrived to this high altitude location where skiers gravitate. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] also hope that Pike National Forest will close the roads to the south to winter motorized (which all link to the north and west roads which are subject to becoming non-motorized.) This will reduce management headaches of mixing use.	Education of motorized users will be accomplished with maps. Gates will not be installed.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
232	3	rec-implement	We would like to help in a volunteer effort to keep the White River Forest open to multi-use like the other forests. We have joined the Friends of the Dillon Ranger District at the steward level and participated in their work days, we have joined SCORR and worked with a variety of folks on their volunteer work days. We are members of COHVCO.	Thank you for your efforts.	Meetings/Collab oration (Public)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
316	1	rec-mixed users	I have lived in Summit County for almost 20 years and have enjoyed both the motorized and non motorized amenities that summit county and surrounding areas offer. I would like your consideration of both users when determining the designation of these areas, realizing that they are enjoyed responsibly by many different types of snow enthusiasts.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
281	1	rec-motorized	I am writing as a resident, taxpayer and lover of nature in Colorado and elsewhere. I live in boulder Colorado and as a NM Native I have enjoyed the CO, NM Utah region for... 38 years on bicycles, kayaks, foot, motorcycle, Skis, horseback, hang glider, even on all fours before I learned to walk. I think the proposed closure by certain groups of parts of the trails and regions to certain types of travel are a shame. When I ride motorcycle I am polite and respectful or others just as when I am on horseback I hope others will be. It's not your mode of transportation that makes the big difference it's the way you conduct yourself. I have considered myself an active environmentalist for my whole life and enjoy the diversity our forests and trails offers and appreciate being able to enjoy the outdoors how I like. To reiterate it's not what you ride or do its how you act when you are doing so, we need to encourage acting responsibly not one group pointing fingers at another. Its easy to point the finger at the other group, i.e., the guys on the pavement pint their finger at the guys walking out of their cars, who point their finger at the people on horses who point at bicycles, who point at motos, who point at 4 wheelers, who point at 4X4's and on and on. I encourage you to leave the forests open, closing trails and limiting use encourages more chaos not less. It's not black and white. people are always going to complain about someone, let it be, open the trails to be enjoyed by everyone, most of the time when I'm out on my I participate with Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) and the Friends of the Dillon Ranger District (FDRD) to maintain trails. I believe in responsible use of our National Forest and in educating all motorized users how to respect the land and other recreation users.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
219	2	rec-motorized	It seems very apparent to the motorized community that the White River National Forest Travel Management Plan has not provided motorized recreation any resemblance of a balanced use of the White River National Forest for recreation purposes. The loss of roads and trails thru wholesale closures by Alternative G does nothing but create an environment that does not meet the best use of the public lands in the White River National Forest.	Thank you for your efforts.	Outreach/Education
187	2	rec-motorized	Hopefully the powers to be will come to their senses and realize this land is for all of us to use and manage. Responsible management is what is needed, not closures.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
171	11	rec-motorized	Rerouting trails to avoid private land seems to make sense or purchasing vital pieces of land to make trails work. Who know how much money was spent on the Accent organization during the consensus based planning process and now it appears these efforts are being ignored with concerns to single track shared use trails. If you look at the mileage open to the various users groups you will see how unfair alt. G is in accommodating our needs here in Summit County.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
533	1	rec-motorized	Residents in the Dillon and Keystone area are opposed to the motorcycle/dirt bike trail proposed by SCORR that would bring a substantial increase in dirt bike traffic too close to residential neighborhoods. There would be increased noise and pollution, increased fire danger, habitat degradation, and a waste of taxpayer money to fund the SCORR request for almost \$500,000 for the proposed trail. Summit County has miles and miles of old logging and mining roads – Frey Gulch, Peru Gulch, Sts. John, Webster Pass, Deer Creek, Swan River, French Creek, and lots more. There are a number of loop trails. The proposed new trail is totally unnecessary.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
171	13	rec-motorized	<p>SCORR has 6 volunteer days last summer alone and hundreds of man hours of trail work have been removed from WRNF to do list. I personally really enjoy working and the camaraderie with my fellow users; however they prefer to use the trail.</p> <p>Allocating trails with multi use designation will build upon this volunteer base of labor and nurture a symbiotic relationship with the community and the WRNF. Obviously the WRNF is an incredible natural and wildlife resource I hope you also see the need for a community resource also.</p>	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses, however, further study is needed to identify additional single-track motorized opportunities.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
171	12	rec-motorized	Shared use trails concept. All user groups benefit and forest service dollars are also used the most effectively. Volunteer groups' efforts are also concentric. SCORR's efforts benefit biker, hikers and horses and other groups' efforts benefits the motorized community in the shared use arena. This team work really leads to a sense of community, not segregation.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses, however, further study is needed to identify additional single-track motorized opportunities.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
330	4	rec-motorized	Thanks for opening new areas to motorized use in Summit County.	You're welcome, however, further study is needed to identify additional single-track motorized opportunities.	General Support
533	2	rec-motorized	There is the enforcement issue [with the proposed SCORR trail].	Alternative GM does not include very many motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
105	2	rec-motorized	To counter the argument, if it is made, that some users are better forest citizens than others, I'd like to point out that my wife and I work several days a year on trail maintenance projects in Summit County (and have started to do the same in Moab). We carry trash bags and usually finish our outings with trash we picked up along the way. And, of course, we stay on the trails.	Thanks for your efforts.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
175	6	rec-motorized	We are at the tipping point of losing a critical mass of OHV trails in Summit County which will have an adverse impact on local recreation as well as our county's tourism business. Through the current system of multiple-use trails that exist in the Golden Horseshoe, the three forks of the Swan River, French Pass, Red Mountain, Pennsylvania Gulch, Sallie Barber, Bald Mountain and the Tenderfoot area, we have a system that offers a good OHV experience. It is a system that attracts a significant amount of tourism to Summit County. It is a system that has just enough routes that there are few user conflicts. The thousands of Colorado registered OHV users consider the WRNF in Summit County a prime destination for recreation. With what I can make of the maps, legends, layers, strategies, prescriptions, areas and routes in the current TMP, a number of these are being considered for closure or a change in usage. I request that rather than closing these trails to OHV users, you plan re-routes where needed.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
175	8	rec-motorized	Your decisions in this TMP will either move us all toward working together or working at odds with one another. Why not make the choices that put us all on the same path of responsible recreation and in alignment with the interests of the broader public? Please keep the existing trails open to multiple-use. In Summit County in particular, maintain a critical mass of winter and summer OHV routes.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
499	1	rec-nonmotorized	As a local business owner and enthusiastic recreationalist for over 10 years, I am writing in regards to the Alternative G for the White River National Forest Plan. In your plan you have dedicated quite a few parcels of land for non-motorized recreation (i.e. Spruce Creek, Mayflower Gulch, Baldy Mountain, and Peru Creek), for which I thank you immensely. As a local resident in Breckenridge I have watched this town grow beyond its resources and lament that it will continue to do so until there are no more resources. A big reason for our high quality of life in the mountains is simply, the mountains.	You're welcome.	General Support
433	4	rec-nonmotorized	Backcountry skiers need below tree line skiing since often Summit County's winds make skiing above treeline difficult, yet tree skiing is sparse in Summit County.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
433	5	rec-nonmotorized	Backcountry skiers need moderate above tree line skiing, since much of it is too wind effected or too dangerous.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
436	4	rec-nonmotorized	HOOSIER PASS WEST (new winter non-motorized designation) As the DEIS states, "Average snowmobilers travel 50 miles in a day, most cross country skiers stay within three miles of a winter access point." Easy access and short distances of travel in a particular region should first be granted to non-motorized since motorized has the benefits of utilizing regions where access is much longer. Hoosier Pass west fits this description.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	5	rec-nonmotorized	HOOSIER PASS WEST (new winter non-motorized designation) Despite this being such small acreage for the winter motorized, in the last few years, the backcountry skiers have been displaced from snowmobiles illegally going 'off-road' and highmarking, as well as the disturbing signs of snowmobiles crossing bare tundra in this windy zone with their tracks seen to the final ridge of North Star.	The comment supports alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	3	rec-nonmotorized	HOOSIER PASS WEST (new winter non-motorized designation) This area is extremely popular with winter non-motorized folks because the access is easy, it offers great terrain for backcountry turns on decent snow and gentle slopes with gorgeous views, and also offers numerous snowshoe/ski trail loop options.	The comment supports alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
432	9	rec-nonmotorized	I want to thank the FS for recognizing the significance of Summit County's extensive network of nonsystem routes and for keeping many of these routes open. I realize the FS has a limited budget for maintenance of trails and that some nonsystem routes do need improvement (although most are in much better shape than the system trails) and so, it is hard for you to justify bringing new routes into the system. But, due to the lack of sufficient system trails in our area, these nonsystem routes have become the backbone of our trail system. I know that many residents of Summit County are very appreciative of the FS's willingness to accept nonsystem trails and we, including myself, are committed to participating in local volunteer trail maintenance days to bring these trails up to a sustainable standard. And, thank you also for recognizing the growing needs of mountain bikers by leaving the majority of the non-motorized trails open to this popular activity.	You are welcome and thank you for your efforts.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
559	15	rec-nonmotorized	I want to thank you for all the new areas which have become winter non-motorized; Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch road, Baldy Mountain, spruce Creek Road, Crystal Lakes Road, Wheeler flats, Mayflower Gulch road, Peru Creek and all its side routes, Burro Trail, Wise Mountain.	The comment supports alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
424	7	rec-nonmotorized	<p>No motorized travel should be permitted in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pennsylvania Gulch - Bemrose Ski Circus - Fredonia Gulch - Indiana Gulch - Boreas Pass Road - Bakers Tank Area - Bald(y) Mountain - French Creek - Monte Cristo Gulch - McCullough Gulch - Mohawk Lakes - Crystal Creek <p>□ □ □</p> <p>The above areas represent traditional hiking and ski touring destinations that are: close to Breckenridge thus reducing travel impacts, have been extremely impacted in recent years by motorized users, and as non-motorized areas, attract tourism to Breckenridge.</p> <p>Winter travel further complicates the issue since the condition of the trails can be rendered unusable for non-motorized by even a single pass of a snowmachine.</p>	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses. Most of the routes identified will be open to non-motorized uses only.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
563	2	rec-nonmotorized	Our beautiful Summit County trails have been developed for hikers, mountain bikers, horses, and not for motorized traffic.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses. Motorized use is appropriate on the National Forest in some areas.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
505	2	rec-nonmotorized	Thank you for consideration of silent sports in the management travel plan. When areas like Summit County are becoming so crowded, and so much of our forests are dying, we need to preserve more areas for quiet use - and not have every area despoiled by noise, vehicles traveling at high speeds and exhaust smog further destroying our forests. Snowmobiles in winter can be heard for MILES, and their exhaust fumes linger to endanger the health of all who are forced to ski through the foul fumes long after they have passed.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses. Motorized use is appropriate on the National Forest in some areas.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
471	20	rec-nonmotorized	THANKS so much for the areas which have become winter non-motorized: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch road, Baldy Mountain, Spruce Creek Road, Crystal Lakes Road, Wheeler Flats, Mayflower Gulch Road, Peru Creek and all its side routes, Burro Trail, Wise Mountain.	The comment supports alternative G.	General Support

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
499	5	rec-process	From a personal perspective, I have to say your plan has taken quite a bit hard work. Both from the Forest Service and from the town of Breckenridge. We, the Town of Breckenridge, has volunteered quite a bit of our time to help you become familiar with the trails and roads in this plan. I have done it to help preserve the quality of life in a mountain town. That quality of life is defined in part by the health of our forests and the use of them. I sincerely hope that all the comments and volunteer hours that have been dedicated to this plan will be taken seriously.	All comments will be taken seriously.	General Support
390	1	rec-roads	Please let's keep as much of the forest free from roads as possible. Machines have enough of America, let nature have its share.	Alternative GM will provide for a balance of all recreation uses. Motorized use is appropriate on the National Forest in some areas.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
471	7	rec-ski and ride	Backcountry skiers and riders need closure gates for snowmachines: some snowmobilers will inevitably go further if there is only a sign. And unfortunately, one bad apple does spoil it for all the human powered backcountry users. (Priority gates for all winter non-motorized users are: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch Roads, Spruce Creek Road, Pennsylvania Gulch Road, 'Middle Indiana'/Dyersville Road, Baldy Mountain Road, Mayflower Gulch Road, Sallie Barber Road, Miners Creek Trail, Wise Mountain Road).	Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
471	3	rec-ski and ride	Backcountry skiers and riders need glade skiing since often Summit County's winds make skiing above treeline difficult, yet tree skiing is sparse in Summit County.	The entire Dillon Ranger District, outside developed ski areas, is open to glade skiing when such terrain is available.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
285	24	rec-special uses, ski area	Summer Routes; Upper Blue: The various summer trails under special use authorization within the Breckenridge ski area boundary also deserve consideration. The commercial horse use on the ski area has done measurable damage to these trails over the years, and there has been no discernible effort to improve or reroute these trails to accommodate this heavy use. We request that the Forest Service work with the equestrian concessionaire to maintain, improve or close these trails, focusing particularly on the trails on Peak 8. Current trail conditions preclude reasonable public access and violate the Forest Service's natural resource protection mandates. Also, as outlined the Town of Breckenridge Trails Plan, we recommend that the Lehman Trail on the Breckenridge Ski Area receive additional maintenance and attention because it is an important and mostly sustainable route on the Breckenridge Ski Area.	The Dillon Ranger District and the Friends of the Dillon Ranger District has initiated a maintenance program for these trails. Maintenance for the Lehman Trail is the responsibility of the Breckenridge Ski Area (permittee).	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
471	5	rec-trailheads	Backcountry skiers and riders need a place to park. Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs, the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated need.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy mountain via CR 520, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pulloffs alongside I-70 and more.	The Dillon Ranger District will address trailhead management on a case-by-case basis, but separate from this planning effort.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
433	6	rec-trailheads	Backcountry skiers need parking Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs, the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated need.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy mountain via CR 520, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pull offs alongside I-70 and more.	The Dillon Ranger District will address trailhead management on a case-by-case basis, but separate from this planning effort.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
389	9	rec-volume	I would like the White River National Forest to keep looking toward the future and to keep existing trails and look towards opening and connecting other areas.	This is good advice, however, the White River NF has limited maintenance resources and cannot keep all existing trails.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
477	15	rich gulch	For Rich Gulch, this road is still open to winter motorized via the Lincoln Townsite Parking Lot Winter motorized use is infrequent on Rich Gulch, because Humbug Hill, directly from the parking lot, is the main access to Lincoln Meadows. I think it makes more sense to close this route to winter motorized. Allowing snow machines to travel along that short section of French Gulch road might attract illegal use further down this road (already happening) where non-motorized use is prevalent Snowmobiles already have access to Lincoln Meadows via Humbug Hill, American Gulch, Galena Gulch, Rock Island Gulch and Prospect gulch. Skier access is limited to mostly sun baked routes such as Humbug Hill and Upper Sidedoor while Rich Gulch offers better snow conditions. Because snowmobile tours no longer pass through Lincoln Meadows, this area is often untracked and not used. Instead Snowmobilers use the quick Humbug Hill access to reach their play area as well as circumnavigating the eastern side only of Lincoln Meadows. There are plans to build a new unsustainable trail paralleling Rich Gulch Road to Lincoln Meadows. In turn this new access route could replace Rich Gulch RYAN GULCH, SALT LICK GULCH (new designation)	Rich Gulch will be closed to motorized	Designation of Lands
436	130	ryan gulch, salt lick	Glad to see that in this new draft, none of this area has any allowed winter motorized use, despite it falling within a zone where motorized restricted use could be considered. This area seems inappropriate for mixed use, since it has only seen non-motorized use and is heavily used by the surrounding homeowners.		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
26	1	saints john	As an owner of STS John (Unit 2537) in Keystone, CO I request that you support the closing of the existing trailheads adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery, and at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road to motorcycle use.		General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
72	2	saints john	As one who resides in Keystone (Sts. John Condominium for a significant portion of the year including summer and early fall months I would personally be impacted and strongly oppose expanded motorcycle use in the area. Sts John condominium would [be] significantly exposed to noise and dust from the motorcycle activities and hiking trails in the natural area directly behind the condominium would be virtually destroyed by the activity. The proposed trail is within 200 vertical feet of my condominium. Motorcycle trails should not be allowed in this or any other urban interface.		Private Property
34	7	saints john	Bikers and hikers commonly use the trail above Sts. John, and this is an appropriate form of enjoyment for people visiting Summit County. Motorcycles are not appropriate for this environment and proximity to residences.		Private Property
148	1	saints john	I am a condo owner in the Sts. John Condos at Keystone Resort; we actually have two properties in that building. Based on the information we have received regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system we are quite concerned. This proposed trail appears that it will negatively affect our area for both people and wildlife.		General Opposition (suspend/stop)
37	1	saints john	We are homeowners at Sts. John Condos in Keystone, Colorado, and are greatly concerned about the proposed plans to expand and facilitate use by motorcycles of trails in the immediate area of our property. The feature that attracted us to Sts. John was the fact that it backed up onto the National Forest, thus would not be developed. Our sixth floor unit's dining area looks out over the trail above the Sts John building. Our view of this area is most commonly shared with only crows, hawks and an occasional red fox or black bear. The limited human use of the trail is by hikers and bicyclists. We periodically use that section of the trail for hiking back in the direction of the power line ROW and beyond. We intentionally purchased property away from the crowds and noise experienced with Keystone developments in the immediate proximity of the ski area.		Private Property
34	6	saints john	We have enjoyed viewing the black bears (mother and two cubs), fox and elk behind Sts. John. They will be forced deeper into the mountains.		Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
37	2	saints john	We understand the use of this single path trail could be impacted by the White River National Forest (WRNF) Proposed Travel Management Plan and that the preferred alternative allows for continued use of Tenderfoot Mountain trails by motorcycles, closes some "social trails" and adds about 5 miles of new trails behind the Keystone area. As we understand it, approving the plan does not in itself expand the trail immediately adjacent to the Sts John Condos to make it a motorcycle accessible trail, but it certainly could form the basis for the subsequent processing of the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) State Trail Grant Application to the Colorado State Parks system which could make this trail part of its proposed expansion of the Tenderfoot Trail System of motorcycle trails. The advocates of this proposal claim the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail system will be managed for multiple uses, but concede motorcycle riding will be the primary use. Such action would have a significant negative impact of the quality of life for those of us adjacent to the trail. We understand that the national forest area that abuts our property is a "land of many uses", but motorized vehicles in such proximity to existing		Private Property
34	5	saints john	Wildfires are of a heightened concern and introducing increased use in Dillon and new trails to the East will increase the probability of fires. And again, Sts. John is extremely close to the proposed trail expansion.		Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal Designation of Lands
477	16	sallie barber	As for the Sallie Barber Road, this could be the most popular winter ski and snowshoe route in the Upper Blue. Because it faces north this is one of the first routes to ski every winter, yet every fall vehicles attempt to drive up this route and get stuck. The road is wide enough for strong beginner skiers, and the distance to the top is an achievable goal for an hour or two ski tour. Sallie Barber is so close to town, and it also offers numerous loops into the adjacent national forest lands for the non-motorized community. Most of the side routes off of Sallie Barber are non-motorized, and yet winter motorized primary objective is to use these non-motorized routes to get to Baldy Mtn. If Baldy Mountain does because non-motorized, it makes even more sense to close this road on each end to winter motorized use. BSA surveys noted that very rarely did they see trailers at the parking lot. Despite the limited motorized use, their tracks still occasionally ruined the skiing experience, especially after a period without much new snow. Often though, you will see numerous skiers and snowshoers on this route. Why should one or two motorized users destroy the experience for hundreds of skiers and	Sallie Barber Road (GH-54) is under county jurisdiction under easement from the Forest Service. As such the county has the authority to decide which uses are appropriate on the road.	
175	23	Sallie Barber	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Maintain OHV access through Sallie Barber area and up to Bald Mountain.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	30	sheep mountain, elk ridge, searle	Area 8 – Sheep Mountain/Sheep Gulch/Elk Ridge/Searle Gulch areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]		Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
501	10	sheep mtn, sheep gulch, elk ridge, searle	Sheep Mountain/Sheep Gulch/Elk Ridge/Searle Gulch areas: These areas provide access for popular snowmobiling areas. They must remain designated as Open to winter motorized use.		Designation of Lands
285	57	siberian loop	Winter 5-01452, 5-01458, the Siberian Loop. There are two connections between these trails that are not reflected on the winter maps. One connects them in the middle, near the huts (Siberian Cutoff), and the other connects the northern ends via a trail called "Jeffrey's Biff." Jeffrey's Biff also exists as a summer route. We [Town of Breckenridge] recommend that the mapping errors be corrected and the routes be identified for use under winter special use authorization.		Mapping, GIS
320	23	snake river, cooper, ruby mtn	Snake River Various Winter Motorized Area polygons on/near Cooper/Ruby Mountain: Areas were shown on map in error, per USFS staff. Remove from TMP.		Mapping, GIS
320	22	snake river, sapphire pont	Snake River Winter route along Sapphire Point area of Dillon Reservoir: Route shown on map in error. DRRcC rules and regulations prohibit recreational snowmobile use within Dillon Reservoir Recreation Area. Route should not be included in TMP.		Mapping, GIS
320	21	snake river, soda cr corrections	Snake River Soda Creek/Whispering Pines (5+120W.3, 5-120W.3A, 5-120W.3B, 5-120W.4): Inaccurate line work: Trails may not match SCG non-motorized trail easements. SCG staff will work with USFS staff to correct data.	ZZZ validate with SCG	Mapping, GIS
172	2	South County rec path	Our comment pertains to the Winter Travel Map G: The Town [of Frisco] recommends a motorized access point to cross the Summit County Recreation Path at South 7th Avenue and continue south to the proposed unrestricted area (the Town recognizes other access points may also be included, i.e. Miners Creek Trailhead).		Road and Trail Classification/Management
172	3	South County rec path	Our comment pertains to the Winter Travel Map G: We recommend a reasonable buffer area be provided between the proposed unrestricted motorized area (in green on the map) that is located South of the Recreation Path and the adjacent residential properties, to ensure motorized users do not trespass on private property and avoid safety and noise conflicts with homeowners.		Resource Protection Designations (e.g., Class 1 Air, AIZ, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
455	26	south fork, middle fork, spraddle	Area 4 – South Fork/Middle Fork/Spraddle Creek areas: This large complex is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which provides important snowmobiling opportunities. It must remain Open for winter motorized use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
501	7	south fork, middle fork, spraddle	South Fork/Middle Fork/Spraddle Creek areas: This large complex is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which provides important snowmobiling opportunities. It must remain Open for winter motorized use.		Designation of Lands
471	19	south frisco	<p>South of Frisco: All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention due to their proximity to an urban environment. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously overused by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. It seems that Frisco user groups could help devise with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.</p> <p>The small play area off of Miners Creek Road and to the north of Rainbow Lake seems too close to town. I recommend this should be switched to restricted motorized use because this road is used by all users, and unrestricted motorized is not appropriate for shared use.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
342	5	south of Montezuma, access	The vast area south of town has snowmobile history but has mostly been accessed from the Swandyke area of Summit County and the base area was at the end of Tiger Road. This area can also be accessed from Park County with a much wider array of landscapes and spaces to explore. Accessing the area from around the Town of Jefferson is a much safer way. Montezuma Rd. is narrow and twisting for 5.5 miles into a narrow valley with no practical way of providing enough access to those who would use it. I believe the citizens of Jefferson would welcome the extra revenues from users. They certainly are more prepared with commercial facilities to cater to them.		Designation of Lands
231	7	spring cr	<p>Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Spring Creek Winter Recreation Area: Open in all alternatives.</p> <p>Thank you for retaining 1990 SN-109 spring creek snowmobile area which is a snowmobile destination created as a result of the 1984 forest plan by the Mile-Hi snowmobile club with snowmobiler's dollars.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
480	78	Spring Creek	<p>Dillon Ranger District:</p> <p>In general (Spring Creek Road part of Dillon Ranger District including Elliot Ridge to Mahan Lake, Piney Peak and USFS North and East of Piney Ridge including McPhee Gulch) the main, established roads should all remain open to current use. 202, 1831 (Mahan Lake), 1832 (Lower route to Mahan Lake), 1333, 753 (Each of the above allows access to wilderness areas or joins one large tract to another)</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
559	17	spruce cr, crystal lakes	I am also thankful that Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road are now winter non-motorized. Neither of these routes received much traffic from snow machines, because they couldn't go very far, yet this is one of the busiest areas for snowshoers and skiers.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
433	17	spruce cr, crystal lakes	I'm delighted that Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road are now winter non-motorized. Neither of these routes received much traffic from snow machines, because they couldn't go very far, yet this is one of the busiest areas for snowshoers and skiers.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
489	5	spruce cr, crystal lakes	Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road The Restricted-Motorized Routes only is a welcome relief to non-motorized users. This area is heavily visited by skiers, snowshoers and Francie's Hut users. I commend the USFS for recognizing the necessity for limiting any motorized access to this highly regarded non-motorized area.		Designation of Lands
354	26	spruce creek, crystal lakes	We are excited that Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road are now winter non-motorized. Neither of these routes received much traffic from snow machines, because they couldn't go very far, yet this is one of the busiest areas for snowshoers and skiers.		Designation of Lands
544	5	straight cr	The Town of Dillon is concerned that the recent pine beetle epidemic has increased the potential for catastrophic wildfire events that could threaten the Town's watershed (Straight Creek drainage) and local residential properties. A catastrophic wildfire event in the Straight Creek watershed, immediately adjacent to the Tenderfoot Mountain Area, could seriously affect the Town's ability to provide treated water to its residents. Any additional motorized recreational activity in the Tenderfoot area would increase the potential for a wildfire that could jeopardize the Straight Creek drainage.		Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
231	3	straight cr, frey gulch	Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Straight Creek and Frey Gulch: Frey gulch and CR65 was considered closed in other alternatives. Thank you for retaining Frey Gulch and Straight Creek trails including the connector route between the two snowmobile areas. These areas have been designated snowmobile areas without trails since the 1984 Forest Plan. The connector route is county road 65 which is not plowed in winter. One used area by over the snow vehicles that is omitted from the mapping is what is referred to as a non-system trail to the peaks east of Frey Gulch and west of porcupine gulch with peak elevations 12106 and 12382 on USGS Topo quadrangle maps. The forest service should have received info in 2002 from summit county government as an existing snowmobile trail to be retained. Please consider marking a trail to peaks 12106 and 12382. I GPS'ed this route for the forest service in 2002. You should have that on file.		Designation of Lands
129	7	summit county	Did I mention the counties [county] in- ability to police the current status of recreation!		Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
222	1	summit county	<p>I say no to OHV's in Summit County and Dillon to Keystone. I say no to OHV's on ALL public lands.</p> <p>OHV's destroy land, topsoil and nearly always cause erosion. OHV's cause quicker and more wear and tear on existing dirt roads. I know of no land parcel that is better off because ATV's and motorcycles run around on it. Just because someone buys an OHV doesn't mean the government or the public in general, is obligated to provide those folks with a place to drive them on.</p> <p>I say no to ATV's and motorcycles on all public lands, they are too destructive and too disruptive to wildlife and people.</p>		General Opposition (suspend/stop)
129	8	summit county	<p>If, in the future, the plan named "G" is not accepted and modified, there will be a major problem that will most likely start to appear, that is the disrespect for closures and a respect for acceptable user groups will be a major conflict in the National Forest back country in the years to come.</p>		Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
129	6	summit county	<p>Summit County has been named "Colorado's Playground". Skiers, hikers, and horse back people can live by that theme, as for mountain bike, ATV, motorcycle, four wheeler and winter time snowmobilers - we are continually being cut off from the "Playground".</p>		Activities on Public Lands (General)
320	2	summit county, general	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Genesis of Comments and Recommendations</p> <p>A great deal of effort was put forth by the County to review the TMP. Particularly, the County Manager's Office, Open Space and Trails, GIS, Road and Bridge, Planning, Sheriff and Engineering Departments worked together to evaluate the DEIS in 2006. In 2008, the County advertised and held public meetings with each of its four Planning Commissions. The results of these efforts are incorporated in this letter. Maps identifying the specific roads, trails and routes the County discussed herein has been presented to Dillon Ranger District Staff.</p> <p>The majority of the County's comments and recommendations in the attached matrices are based on County Significant Summer and Winter Route/Trails Maps. These policies and maps serve as a starting point from which the County's extensive recreational trail and road network and respective access points can be planned for and protected. The County considers significant routes to be routes that provide important recreational or transportation access. Moreover, it is felt significant routes offer high quality recreational experiences to County residents and visitors, serve the greater</p>		Public Involvement Process

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	1	summit county, general	The County's [Summit] recommendations are based on analysis and review of Alternative G. NO other alternatives were evaluated, because USFS Staff identified this as the best starting point for comments. As provided by Preferred Alternative D in 2006 and improved upon in 2008 Alternative G. The County agrees that the Travel Management Plan should emphasize, to the extent possible, reducing recreation conflicts among users and providing sustainable routes in the long term.		Traffic Control and Safety
320	3	summit county, jurisdiction	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Jurisdiction Over County Roads and Prescribed Uses</p> <p>It is in the interest of the County to provide appropriate access (e.g., FSV), to the designated travel routes identified in the Travel Management Plan on County Roads or thoroughfares under County jurisdiction. The County is willing to work with the Forest Service to continue to identify routes or public thoroughfares under our jurisdiction, forward appropriate data on prescribed uses, and clarify County Road maintenance and use regulations. In any event, the comments and recommendations contained herein are not intended and shall not operate as any waiver, abandonment, vacation, termination or other limitation whatsoever of any (1) public highway or (2) other public or private easements, licenses, U.S. Forest Service Special Use Permits or rights-of-way, including without limitation any claim, cause or action or inchoate rights related thereto. At a minimum, all routes previously designated as County Roads are potentially open to public highway uses.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	4	summit county, parking	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>This proposal is likely to concentrate uses and drive up demand for parking at numerous locations in Summit County (e.g. Town of Montezuma). Parking is very limited and not allowed on County Roads. The Forest Service should provide and maintain parking on National Forest Lands for all additional demand that is anticipated as a result on this travel management plan.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
320	62	summit county-attachments	[ATT 1]: Letter of previously submitted comments on White River NF DEIS, from Summit County Colorado Board of County Commissioners, Date: October 24, 2006.		See Attachment
320	63	summit county-attachments	[ATT 2]: Letter of previously submitted comments from Summit County & the Town of Breckenridge, Date: October 24, 2006.		See Attachment
320	64	summit county-attachments	[ATT 3]: Letter on travel management issues in the Golden Horseshoe area, from Summit County and Town of Breckenridge, Date: May 3, 2007.		See Attachment

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	65	summit county-attachments	[ATT 4]: Letter on SDEIS from Summit County Open Space Advisory Council, Date: January 5, 2009.		See Attachment
320	5	summit county-corrections	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Correct Errors in Data sets for Route Data</p> <p>When examining the detailed 2008 TMP GIS maps and data obvious corrections need to be made. These were discussed with Dillon Ranger District Staff and are identified in the attached Table 1: Errors and Omissions. The County requests Forest Service staff to correct these inaccuracies to ensure that future information regarding these routes and uses is correct.</p>		Mapping, GIS
320	8	summit county-lands	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Seamless Management with County-owned Property Interests</p> <p>For over twenty years the County has worked aggressively to maintain and legally secure appropriate public access to National Forest System lands. Seamless management between National Forest System lands and County-owned property interests is promoted in county master plans, and is implemented through both the County's procedure for reviewing development applications and the Summit County open space protection program. The Dillon Ranger District has been a regular referral agency on development applications and Open Space management activities to ensure appropriate access to National Forest System lands is created or maintained to meet the Countywide Comprehensive Plan goal to "develop and manage a complete network of interconnected and multi-use trails in cooperation with other public and private entities, and to work with the Forest Service in a cooperative manner to develop and maintain trails, trailheads, and support facilities." The Dillon Ranger District and County's open space protection program have worked closely to ensure that recreational trail improvements and allowed uses on County open space properties matches with management of</p>		Other (Non-NEPA) Processes (e.g., leasing, permitting, acquisition, ROW)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	7	summit county-lands	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>The ability to protect, maintain and manage existing private and public infrastructure needs to be recognized. Legitimate and legal rights or claims should be honored, such as 1) allowance for appropriate access to maintain diversion ditches, irrigation structures, fences, and water storage/reservoirs; and 2) allowance for activities such as timber or noxious weed management. Additionally, the Travel Management Plan should not preclude or encumber access possibilities to develop additional water storage/reservoirs or advanced communication systems/new technology in the future.</p>		Other (Non-NEPA) Processes (e.g., leasing, permitting, acquisition, ROW)
320	16	summit county-process	<p>Presentation of Data</p> <p>The short time frame allowed for public comment limited our ability to provide site-specific maps, or review the multiple alternatives provided. If the enclosed recommendations regarding Alternative G are insufficient or unclear, the County [Summit] can provide feedback in whatever format is most effective for Forest Staff. County staff has the tools and ability to provide our comments in written form, tables, electronic format, maps; revised GIS layer files, etc.</p>		Public Involvement Process
320	17	summit county-process	<p>Summit County is defined in large part by National Forest System lands. The availability and use of designated Forest Service roads, trails and routes in the County is a critical asset to the community, and is the reason why we expended substantial resources in the review of the 2008 TMP. Our interest in the Travel Management Plan goes beyond the current review of the DEIS. As the final plan is updated and project level decisions are made, we extend an offer for continued participation, dialogue and involvement in working with the Forest Service to aid in sound decision making and implementation.</p> <p>We realize the daunting task the Forest Service has undertaken in developing the Travel Management Plan. We hope the recommendations herein provide assistance to the Forest Service in balancing public desires with National Forest goals. We appreciate the opportunity to offer these recommendations. Please contact us if you have any questions or need clarification of these recommendations.</p>		Public Involvement Process

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	6	summit county-property rights	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Respect Existing Rights/Maintain Private and Public Infrastructure</p> <p>It is not clear in the Travel Management Plan how legal rights of access are addressed or through what mechanisms. It is clear that site-specific information regarding property rights was overlooked in the development of recommended uses for road or trails (i.e., easements, access to: head gates, diversion structures, private property/inholdings, property boundaries, utilities, established rights-of-way, prescriptive rights, etc.) The Travel Management Plan decision document should not supersede, preclude or disregard the legal rights or claims established or associated with the existing road or trail easements on National Forest System lands. The short comment period did not afford the County the opportunity to compare Alternative G again legal rights, so comments herein should not be interpreted as support for infringing upon legal rights of any individual or entity.</p>	ZZZ- property rights.	Other (Non-NEPA) Processes (e.g., leasing, permitting, acquisition, ROW)
320	10	summit county-site specific	<p>Site specific recommendations</p> <p>Site specific recommendations on routes and modes of recreation are provided in attached Table 2: Conflicts with Master Plans Designations. As stated earlier, the items in Table 1 were identified as errors and omissions in discussions with USFS Staff. The recommendations in these tables are based upon conflicts with master plans identified by Staff, reviewed by the four Basin Planning Commissions, and recommended by those bodies to the Board of County Commissioners. We [Summit County] request that these changes be include din the final Travel Management Plan.</p>		Update, Change, or Add Data to Existing Studies

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	9	summit county-veg management	<p>In the event of conflict between direction in this letter and the previous letters, we [Summit County] request that the final alternative adopt the direction provided below.</p> <p>Recognize the Ongoing Need for Vegetative/Forest Management</p> <p>According to the WRNF planning staff, the TMP does not restrict access associated with administrative, emergency, permitted, or private property uses. The ability to conduct vegetative management, improve forest health, and effectively respond to and fifth fires is important to the safety and welfare of the entire County. In the wake of the Pine Beetle epidemic, it is critical to manage forests to ensure the potential negative effects of severe wildfire, and additional insect and disease activity, are addressed. The DEIS should clearly recognize the ability to use Forest Service roads and trails, at the discretion of the Forest Service, to access land for timber management, weed management, administrative access, or wildland fire situations. County or other public roads and trails would be available for such purposes as may be authorized by local regulations.</p>		Other (Non-NEPA) Processes (e.g., leasing, permitting, acquisition, ROW)
54	1	summit cove	<p>I am 100% opposed to the following proposed trail closures: 5-316W.1B, 5-1029.1, 5-N6031.1, 5-1029.1D, 5-120W network, and 5-316W.1E.</p> <p>These trails are one of the main reasons myself, and many others, bought homes in the Summit Cove neighborhood. The recreational opportunities for hiking, skiing, running and biking are great. Eliminating these trails removes nearly all access to the National Forest and I don't understand the logic behind the suggestions. Especially these days where obesity, especially childhood, is at an all time high why would you try to take away recreational opportunities? These trails are critical to maintaining a healthy community. The benefits of keeping these trails open to all current uses far outweigh the impacts. If more trail maintenance is needed, put out the word to increase volunteerism in the neighborhood being impacted. These are public lands! Please do not take away our right to access them!</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	24	Swan River	<p>General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas:</p> <p>Maintain OHV single-track trails between the North, Middle and South forks of the Swan River to give motorcyclists a route that doesn't require getting back on the more congested gravel 4x4 roads.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
231	5	swan valley	Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Swan Valley: Open in all alternatives. Thank you for retaining the 1990 SN-105 Swan Valley Winter Recreation Area. This area has seen quite a bit of development as a result of federal land swaps. The non-motorized users in this area have few exclusive areas because the history of summit county winter recreation is skiers west of Breckenridge, snowmobiles east of Breckenridge.		Designation of Lands
436	37	ten mile	TENMILE RANGE – east side Hoosier Pass to Peak 7's eastern sides sees heavy winter use, on every drainage, basin and summit. Peaks 2-6 are the last remaining areas which see few humans. We [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] are asking the WRNF to give special attention in management decisions which would affect the health and natural resources of our crowded Tenmile Range. Please recognize that every drainage from Hoosier Pass down to Peak 7 has reached its tipping point. We know that Summit County and its WRNF has been given a 'recreation niche' focus, but even this decision needs to be balanced with preserving and protecting the little areas that we have left.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
436	38	ten mile	TENMILE RANGE – east side Winter trailheads are often overflowing. Our eastern side of the Tenmile is just too crowded. Peak 6 is the first relief in site. Please consider that there must be some sort of balance preserved in the Tenmile between the heavily impacted southern end, to the relatively untouched lands of Peak 6 all the way to Peak 2 and the higher elevations of Peak 1. The health of our forests is closely related to the health of our community. Please protect pockets of our Tenmile Range from any kind of disturbances. Peak 6, 5, 4, 3 and 2 are all we have left for relatively untouched backcountry. Our last remaining elk herd in the Upper Blue resides in the high basins of Peak 6 and 5. This is also prime Lynx habitat, and a healthy higher forest of old growth spruce and fir.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
320	12	ten mile, climax mine	Ten Mile Basin: Five routes in the Climax Mine area are identified as Significant Routes and transect some portion of properties owned as part of the Climax Mine. Alternative G of the TMP identifies these routes as "other routes" while on Climax Property and either closed or managed under special use permit when they hit the Forest. We [Summit County] request that the portions of these routes are located on the Forest be designated as open, pending the County's ongoing efforts to obtain landowner approval to provide public access to some of these routes. These routes provide access to significant public recreational resources outside the Climax property.		Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	13	ten mile, miners creek	<p>Ten Mile Basin:</p> <p>Alternative G of the TMP identifies an approximately 747-acre area stretching from Seventh Street to the High School property and 3 miles up Miners Creek Road as an "open motorized area." We [Summit County] are concerned how this might impact Summit County and Frisco area residents and visitors to this area, particularly impacts to wetlands, concerns about noise, conflicts with non-motorized Recpath use, and enforcement. As such, we request that the area either be designated as "travel restricted to designated routes", or the "bubble" should be redefined to ensure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the area below the Frisco jump hill, the nearby wetlands, and Frisco property are excluded; -Buffers (minimum 200 feet) are created to provide separation between the open motorized area and residential properties in Bills Ranch and Frisco, the Recpath, Summit County Open Space properties, the Summit High School, and Summit County Commons and Hospital properties. -the Recpath through Frisco remains designated as non-motorized, (per existing Recpath regulations); -barriers be created to restrict snowmobiles from non-motorized trails and areas. 		Road and Trail Classification/Management
527	10	tenderfoot	<p>[ATT 1]: Article about some Homeowners in San Diego Country Estates dealing with motorcycle track problems nearby, as featured in the "San Diego Union Tribune" (March 21, 2008) http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20080321/news_1m21barona.html</p>	<p>A motorcycle track was not proposed in the area. A motorcycle trail system is proposed. A motorcycle track is a very small area with intense, concentrated use. There has been a "motocross" area on Summit County property adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery. This area is not on the National Forest and management is not included in this plan.</p>	See Attachment
33	5	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern of the proposed Motorcycle Trail System by SCORR is]:</p> <p>□</p> <p>The Western part of the county landfill property shows evidence of substantial erosion where new trails have been cut through the wetlands. Now noxious weeds are abundant to an area that was weed free a few[.]</p>	<p>The Western part of the county landfill property is not included in this proposal.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
33	2	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern of the proposed Motorcycle Trail System by SCORR is]:</p> <p>I am sure you have been alerted to our lodgepole pine problem in Colorado. Basically every mature lodgepole pine is dead in the proposed area. This surely presents a very serious problem with the likelihood of starting a wildfire. Use of dirt bikes that have no spark arresters on single track trails, immediately adjacent to forest vegetation presents an overwhelming risk.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, all motorcycles operated on National forest Land are required to have Forest Service approved spark arresters. Use of motorcycles without spark arresters has not been proposed.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
33	3	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern of the proposed Motorcycle Trail System by SCORR is]:</p> <p>The area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. Other wildlife would be affected such as the lynx and many endangered and sensitive species of animal and plants.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Tenderfoot area is not managed for summer elk habitat. A motorcycle trail system will not effect winter elk habitat nor elk calving as the all roads and trails are closed to motorized use in the spring. Effects to Lynx habitat were considered in this proposal.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
33	4	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern of the proposed Motorcycle Trail System by SCORR is]:</p> <p>The noise level alone, would present problems to animals and residents, of which I understand is already a problem to the members of the Summerwood homeowners.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.</p>	Private Property
33	1	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern of the proposed Motorcycle Trail System by SCORR is]:</p> <p>Trails would be used by hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders, and if passed, dirt bikes/motorcycles. This would present a dangerous safety issue.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
148	2	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System is]:</p> <p>Important deer and elk summer and winter refuge in the area that would be accessed this would cause great harm to them.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however the Tenderfoot area is not managed for summer elk habitat. A motorcycle trail system will not effect winter elk habitat nor elk calving as the all roads and trails are closed to motorized use in the spring.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
148	6	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System is]:</p> <p>Noise and dust pollution - Close proximity of trails to the Keystone community and the very narrow valley means the noise will be heard by everyone.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.</p>	Private Property
148	4	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System is]:</p> <p>Safety - All trails would be shared among hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders and motorcycles/dirt bikes.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
148	3	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System is]:</p> <p>The 500 acre Dillon Bay Fen (peat) area would be disturbed. More proliferation of noxious weeds carried in from non-native areas than has already occurred.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
148	5	tenderfoot	<p>[Our concern regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System is]:</p> <p>Wildfire potential - hot engines and mufflers on dry grass, with no spark arrestors; this is a very significant issue.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, all motorcycles operated on National forest Land are required to have Forest Service approved spark arresters. Use of motorcycles without spark arresters has not been proposed.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
70	5	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Environment – The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat. We have always enjoyed seeing wildlife behind our unit.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Tenderfoot area is not managed for summer elk habitat. A motorcycle trail system will not effect winter elk habitat nor elk calving as the all roads and trails are closed to motorized use in the spring. Effects to Lynx habitat were considered in this proposal.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
70	3	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, any increase in wildfire risk would be negligible. Human-caused wildfire sources are much more commonly from campfires, smoking, and chainsaws.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
70	6	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.</p>	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
70	4	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
71	5	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Environment – The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
71	3	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Fire Danger – Use by dirt bikes even with spark arrestors, (if the requirement were to be enforced) increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential communities. The other fire danger exists from careless use of smoking materials.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
71	4	tenderfoot	<p>[Proposed Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System]:</p> <p>Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for the daytime and 50 dba for night. We understand there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dba at some unknown time in the future. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the owners of the Enclave homes.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. The 96 decibel requirement is currently in effect.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
281	10	tenderfoot	<p>[Tenderfoot Mountain – North of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone]:</p> <p>There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.</p>	<p>These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
281	9	tenderfoot	<p>[Tenderfoot Mountain – North of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone]:</p> <p>There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p>	<p>These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
60	9	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>High potential of unauthorized trail development (illegal user created roads) beyond the existing trails.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
60	10	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Lack of suitable law enforcement (too few law enforcement officers; little opportunity to patrol or control use).</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
60	3	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Likelihood of unacceptable engine noise and dust levels.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
60	5	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Negative impact on wildlife, including elk calving areas.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
60	2	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Proposed motorcycle trails too close to the urban interface (within 200 vertical feet or less of some Keystone condos and homes, including the Sts. John Condominium).</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
60	7	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Safety problems (fast moving motorcycles encountering hikers, bikers and stock users).</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
60	4	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Social trails cut through sensitive fen flora/wetlands.</p>	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
60	8	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>User conflicts (goal interference conflicts and social values conflicts) between motorcycle riders and non-motorized users.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
60	6	tenderfoot	<p>[The] Following problem [is] likely [to] be created if off-road motorcycle use is allowed on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone, Colorado:</p> <p>Wildfire danger near populated areas (grass and timber fires caused by hot mufflers or engines).</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
49	4	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Enforcement: Neither the County, the Town of Dillon or the Forest Service have the resources to deal with enforcement problems caused by increased usage near residential areas.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use. No additional enforcement assistance has ever been expected of the Town of Dillon or Summit County.</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
49	6	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Financially wasteful: Because of the reasons cited above, the expenditure of public (i.e. taxpayer) funds to support this project is totally unwarranted, especially in a time when funds are increasingly limited.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service was counting on almost exclusively grant funding and volunteer assistance to manage an OHV program in the area.</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
49	2	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Fire Danger: Much of the proposed trail goes through areas with large numbers of beetle-killed lodgepole pines. Fire danger is already high. Dirt bikes with faulty spark arrestors, cigarette butts, or other causes could ignite a serious forest fire that would threaten the nearby residential communities.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
49	3	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Habitat degradation: There is a significant elk herd in the area of the proposed trail system. No doubt other animals depend upon the area for habitat. The proposed trail system with its dirt bikes would threaten this habitat.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
49	1	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Public Nuisance: The noise and pollution from increasing numbers of dirt bikes would exacerbate a public nuisance and cause hardship to all of the residents who live near the proposed trail system. The proposed system is much too close to residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. The 96 decibel requirement is currently in effect.</p>	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
49	5	tenderfoot	<p>[The] reason why this project is undesirable and should not be allowed to proceed [is]:</p> <p>Unnecessary: In the Snake River Basin there are scores and scores of miles of existing old logging and mining roads. Frey Gulch, Peru Creek, Sts. John, Webster Pass, Deer Creek, and other areas have lots of roads available for dirt bike use. Some of these roads systems extend for many miles, into Park County or to Breckenridge. Other parts of Summit County have even more scores of miles of old logging and mining roads – in the Swan River and French Creek drainages, and in many other areas. Building a new trail, especially close to residential neighborhoods, when so many other roads already exist is totally unnecessary.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, none of the areas suggested were found to be feasible for introducing a new motorized single-track trail system.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
23	3	tenderfoot	<p>[W]ill increase the risk of wildfire danger near populated areas resulting from hot mufflers or engines.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
87	1	tenderfoot	<p>[We] are residents of the Town of Dillon, Corinthian Hill Subdivision. Our home sits 300 yards from the Tenderfoot Trail Road.</p> <p>We were disappointed to learn that formal planning steps have been taken to promote, extend and develop an off-road vehicle system – essentially a terrain park or “motor cross” – on the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorized use on the Tenderfoot Trail Road. No terrain park or motorcross was ever proposed in any alternative.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
218	6	tenderfoot	<p>A reason we oppose “Alternative G” is the detrimental effect of the increased noise on our quality of life and our home values. We actually owned the lot closest to the trail at the top of Ensign Drive, but sold it a several years ago, choosing not to build on it mainly because of the (already) increasing motorized usage and close proximity to the trail (less than 200’). Instead, we decided to remodel our existing home which is further from the trail. It is a known fact that off-road motorcycles are louder than stock street bikes and sound travels further in the summertime. Increased noise from heavy motorcycle usage will echo down the hill throughout our entire subdivision and across the highway down to the lake and along the bike path.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. The 96 decibel requirement is currently in effect.	Private Property
519	11	tenderfoot	<p>According to the maps we’ve been shown there will be sanctioned trails even on top of Tenderfoot Mountain in a designated Elk Calving Area.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, any trails proposed would be closed to motorized use until after the elk calving season (June 20).	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
526	11	tenderfoot	<p>According to the maps we’ve been shown there will be sanctioned trails even on top of Tenderfoot Mountain in a designated Elk Calving Area.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, any trails proposed would be closed to motorized use until after the elk calving season (June 20).	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
527	5	tenderfoot	Active use of lands inviting the dumping of garbage or leftover trash from the activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, no trail users are ever invited to dump garbage.	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
455	19	tenderfoot	<p>Additional Summer Trail Miles Should be Included in the Decision or A New Alternative.</p> <p>The following trails and 4wd roads are critical in providing suitable and sustainable opportunities for motorized recreation.</p> <p>Tenderfoot Mountain</p> <p>-There is a road and a singletrack that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down .</p> <p>-There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting singletrack northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H.</p>	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
526	4	tenderfoot	All of us, especially on those pleasant summer weekends when we wish to sit on our decks and enjoy the Summit outdoor experience, are accosted by intense engine revving and cycling through the gears and then the decelerating "pop-pop-pop" as the motorcycles race up the hills and circle back for another run. Some even continue to ride into the night.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
519	4	tenderfoot	All of us, especially on those pleasant summer weekends when we wish to sit on our decks and enjoy the Summit outdoor experience, are accosted by intense engine revving and cycling through the gears and then the decelerating "pop-pop-pop" as the motorcycles race up the hills and circle back for another run. Some even continue to ride into the night.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
24	5	tenderfoot	<p>An even greater environmental concern than noise in general is the specific propensity for harm to the wildlife in the area proposed by SCORR for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. It is not without reason that our street is named Elk Crossing Lane. I understand that Amir Pambechy has addressed this issue in his letter to you of November 29, 2008, and I would assume his source information is correct:</p> <p>Our next concern is for the environment. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern half of this area is also excellent lynx habitat according to the Department of Wildlife. Also, according to a 1995 U.S. Forestry Service report (Biological Evaluation for the Proposed Oro Grande Trail – Tenderfoot Mountain Area) wildlife biologist Kathleen Phelps identified potential habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species of plants and animals. In 1997, The Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500-acre Dillon Bay fen site that ranges in elevation from 9,070 to 9,600 feet and extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Therefore, your information is not correct. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
312	1	tenderfoot	<p>An organization of off road riders, Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR), is proposing that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle use. A plat has been submitted in support of their proposal.</p> <p>We are the owners of a town home at 23099 US Highway 6, (The Enclave) in Keystone, Colorado. The Enclave is a large complex which is in close proximity to the proposed trails.</p> <p>Our property line abuts the National Forest and the planned trail is unacceptably close to our back yard and that of many others. We unquestionably will hear the cycles, and possibly may see them from our rear deck.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that the USFS and/or the Colorado Parks System would even consider, much less allow, motorized trails so close to heavily populated areas.</p> <p>One of the major reasons for purchasing at our location is to escape from the very annoyances that this proposal, if approved, would create. Not to mention the real possibility of a diminution in property values and the undeniable disruption to wildlife, such as deer, elk and fox.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine what is "too close" to populated areas.</p>	Private Property
525	4	tenderfoot	<p>Animal protection, there are herds of elk and deer in the designated area and the traffic and noise will obviously effect their habitat.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
68	5	tenderfoot	Another safety concern is the closeness of the trails to Highway 6 in the Keystone area. The motorcycle riders will have easy access to the highway to get to restaurants and bars creating a serious risk to area residents as they will certainly create unauthorized "shortcuts" through private and public property.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study would be needed to validate this claim.	Traffic Control and Safety
277	3	tenderfoot	As a citizen of Summit County and a resident of Summit Cove, I have concerns regarding the plan to add motorcycle trails to our area [because]: As we are approaching build-out in Summit County, we have already negatively impacted the natural environment. Adding trails with loud vehicles will only continue to push our wildlife out of the area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
277	2	tenderfoot	As a citizen of Summit County and a resident of Summit Cove, I have concerns regarding the plan to add motorcycle trails to our area [because]: Besides the noise pollution, increased motorcycle use would also contribute to our air pollution. As we are all aware, we need to reduce our pollution and emissions and adding motorized trails does not accomplish this goal.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study would be needed to validate this claim.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
277	4	tenderfoot	As a citizen of Summit County and a resident of Summit Cove, I have concerns regarding the plan to add motorcycle trails to our area [because]: It has been difficult as it is to keep the area around the shooting range free of trash and debris. I wonder who will be responsible for keeping the practice area and trails clean? I do not think this is the right area in which to add more motorcycle trails.	The large amount of trash and debris in the vicinity of the shooting range is blown by wind from the landfill immediately adjacent to that area.	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
277	1	tenderfoot	As a citizen of Summit County and a resident of Summit Cove, I have concerns regarding the plan to add motorcycle trails to our area [because]: The noise from the shooting range already echoes into our neighborhood and can be heard on the trails as far away as the Back Ranch. The creation of additional motorcycle trails would only add to the noise pollution.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
308	1	tenderfoot	As a homeowner at Corinthian Hill, I would like to express my major concerns of off-road usage on the Tenderfoot Mountain Proposal. I have lived in the Corinthian Hills Subdivision for 5 years. I love the open and natural area as it is now. My one exception is the existing use of dirt bikes on Tenderfoot trail. They ruin the hiking experience. The awful noise and the unsafe speed they go around blind curves. The probability of hitting hikers if they don't jump out of the way is inevitable. I moved to Corinthian Hill to be able to view wildlife and enjoy the natural serenity offered by the trails here. This is my favorite hiking trail of the entire summit area, due to the best views of Lake Dillon from anywhere.	The Tenderfoot Trail is closed to motorcycles, If the comment is referring to the Tenderfoot Road Trail (aka the Oro Grande Trail), Alternative GM does not include motorized use on that trail.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
132	1	tenderfoot	As a homeowner in Keystone I am strongly opposed to allowing motorized vehicles on Tenderfoot Mountain. These trails are too close to the condos and to the homes in the area. People come to the mountains for peace and quiet, not to hear engine noise of motorcycles. I can't imagine what the value of the homes will be if they are surrounded by the noise and dust for them to of motorcycles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
204	1	tenderfoot	As a homeowner in Summerwood, I am strongly opposed to motorized travel on Tenderfoot Mountain. The noise and environmental destruction from such traffic are a major concern. I also have a plot in the Dillon Cemetery and do not want to hear this noise while visiting my mother's grave.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. A motorcycle ridden on a trail is NOT "environmental destruction."	Private Property
527	1	tenderfoot	As a homeowner, and enjoyer of the natural beauty of Colorado, I have some concerns as to why these trails should not be permitted in this local. While motorcycle riding can be fun, I personally do not think the Tenderfoot Trail Corridor is the right location for this activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
514	1	tenderfoot	As a homeowners and taxpayers in the summerwood residential neighborhood, we wish to register our strong opposition to the allowance of the use of county property for trailheads for motorcycle trails that have developed in near proximity to our neighborhood. Over the last few years the noise and dust produced by the motorcycle activity has increased and greatly affected our ability to enjoy our home. In earlier years, the noise was enough to send us indoors in the summer months, but more recently can motivate us to close our windows to help mitigate the noise.	The use of County trailheads is not considered in this process.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
102	1	tenderfoot	As a long time homeowner in Summit County, I am shocked to think that there will be motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain. I am in extreme opposition to approval of this mistake.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
192	1	tenderfoot	As a long time property owner of a unit in the Enclave at Keystone and a licensed Real Estate broker in the state of Colorado, I am writing you to express my concern that the implementation of any dirt bike and motorcycle trails would have a serious impact on the valuation of our Summit County properties. The peace and quiet of our mountain getaway would be seriously impacted by the roar and ping of new visitors and this new intrusion would definitely affect the tax base and resale values of mountain homes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study would be needed to validate this claim (valuation). Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
521	1	tenderfoot	As a nearby resident of the proposed motorcycle trails on Tenderfoot Mountain, I want to go on record as opposing this project. I feel that it would mean the end of peace in our neighboring home. There are just too many affected residences in this corridor, and I feel this is not the place for this nature of development.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.	Private Property
247	1	tenderfoot	<p>As a resident of keystone, and a Snake River Planning commissioner, I strongly object to increasing the availability of trails for motorcycles along this corridor. In fact I'd like to see the existing trails (legal and illegal/ social) closed to motorized use.</p> <p>I understand the Forest Service intends to increase the number of available trail miles for use by off-road motorcycles, and agree with that objective. However, it should not be done in the 5 mile long corridor above and between Dillon and Keystone, CO.</p> <p>Last summer was the worst it has been for motorcycle noise extending from the valley side where these trails now exist, to the other side of the valley, where I live.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
515	2	tenderfoot	As a resident of the Summerwood community, I am immediately across the highway from the Dillon Cemetery and the county trailhead. I am extremely concerned about current as well as increased motorcycle activity directly across from my home and community. We have suffered the continuous noise generated by what appears to be constantly increasing levels of activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
29	2	tenderfoot	<p>As a second homeowner in Keystone, I am a frequent user of the trails in the local area, particularly in the summer. I am a frequent user of hiking trails throughout the country and I make it a practice to avoid, trails that permit co-use by motorcycles. It's unsafe and unpleasant. Furthermore, I try to also avoid trails that permit use of bicycles for the same reason.</p> <p>Opening up these trails for motorized and bicycle use would drastically limit the amount of trails that would remain suitable for nature hiking in Summit County. That would do a disservice to hikers, homeowners in the area and the country in general. Please do not approve this trail system.</p> <p>Please do not approve this trail system.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.</p> <p>Alternative GM proposes to add over 40 miles of hiking trail to the Dillon RD system.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
18	1	tenderfoot	As a Summerwood homeowner, in Dillon, Colorado, this letter serves as my severe objection to the Plan relating to trail use by motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
147	7	tenderfoot	<p>As an avid hiker and skier in Summit County for the past 40 years, I have a strong desire to maintain the environment and aesthetics of the area.</p> <p>I trust that the Summit County Commissioners will take these objections seriously.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible. Summit County Commissioners are not the decision makers In this process.</p>	<p>General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)</p>
94	1	tenderfoot	<p>As an owner of property in the Summerwood subdivision of Dillon, Colorado; we wish to be put on record that we are strongly opposed to motorized trails and the expansion of them on Tenderfoot Mountain.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.</p>	<p>General Opposition (suspend/stop)</p>
218	3	tenderfoot	<p>As frequent users of this trail for hiking and walking the family dog over the past 13 years, we would like to provide some practical reasons why designating the trail for heavy motorcycle use in addition to non-motorized uses won't work. The trail itself is dirt and very narrow in most places along the hillside behind our subdivision. Whenever a motorized vehicle comes zooming down the trail, it raises a dust cloud and emits toxic exhaust that gets inhaled and into the eyes of other users of the trail. This forces hikers and bikers off the narrow trail for health and safety reasons. (Many are already breathing heavily trying to get a physical workout on the trail.) By approving the trail for heavy motorcycle use you are effectively forcing other users off the trail whenever motorcycles are present. The notion that this could be a shared trail when motorcycles are present is not realistic. Perhaps some Forest Service employees could spend a weekend jogging back and forth along the dusty trail while hundreds of motorcycle riders ride past them to experience this problem firsthand.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle use on the trail described. One Forest Service employee has indeed spent several weekends jogging on the trail</p>	<p>Traffic Control and Safety</p>
181	4	tenderfoot	<p>As full time residents of the Enclave, please register our adamant opposition to the proposal.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.</p>	<p>General Opposition (suspend/stop)</p>
28	4	tenderfoot	<p>As in the case with the U.S. Forestry Service, the Summit County Sheriff's department is under funded and understaffed. There would be no practical way that the noise levels from these motorized vehicles could be enforced.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Summit County Sheriff's department was never expected to enforce noise levels.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
56	4	tenderfoot	<p>As is in the case with the U.S. Forestry Service, the Summit County Sheriff's department is under funded and understaffed. There would be no practical way that the noise levels from these motorized vehicles could be enforced.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Summit County Sheriff's department was never expected to enforce noise levels.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
62	4	tenderfoot	<p>As is in the case with the U.S. Forestry Service, the Summit County Sheriff's department is under funded and understaffed. There would be no practical way that the noise levels from these motorized vehicles could be enforced.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Summit County Sheriff's department was never expected to enforce noise levels.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
32	4	tenderfoot	<p>As is in the case with the U.S. Forestry Service, the Summit County Sheriff's department is under-funded and understaffed. There would be no practical way that the noise levels from these motorized vehicles could be enforced.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Summit County Sheriff's department was never expected to enforce noise levels.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
18	3	tenderfoot	As one who has grown up in Colorado, and from first hand experience, folks riding motorized vehicles rarely display real concern for those non-riders around them. I experienced twice, last summer, motorized vehicles on clearly posted 'no motorized vehicle' trails in Summit County.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails.	Traffic Control and Safety
154	1	tenderfoot	As owners in the Sts. John Condominium complex since 1986, we would be opposed to the plan to allow motorcycle traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain. There's plenty of room in less densely populated areas for this kind of activity. As much as possible, open space close to Keystone, Breckenridge, and Copper Mountain should remain pristine. We go to Keystone from St. Louis for a release from noise and pollution. We enjoy the privacy of hiking on quiet Tenderfoot trails. Please turn down the motorcycle trail development-plan.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible.	Designation of Lands
8	1	tenderfoot	As tax payers and home owners in the Tenderfoot area of Dillon, Colorado, we are strongly opposed to this proposed motor cross expansion on the Tenderfoot Trail.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible. A motocross (small, intense motorcycle course) was never proposed.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
298	1	tenderfoot	As the owner of a home located on the Snake River in the eastern part of Keystone, Colorado, I am writing to express my strong objection to allowing motorcycles or motorbikes to use the paved trail at the east end of Keystone on the north side of U.S. Highway 6. As a regular walker on that trail, it is inconceivable to me that any kind of motor vehicle would be permitted on the trail. The most obvious reason to continue the prohibition of motorcycles and motorbikes on the trail is the issue of safety to the many runners and walkers who have utilized this trail for years.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
15	2	tenderfoot	As we [Summerwood Homeowners Association] understand the plan the Forest Service intends to increase the number of available trail miles for use by off-road motorcycles between Dillon and Keystone. As residents of Summerwood, we are extremely concerned about current as well as increased motorcycle activity directly across from our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
214	3	tenderfoot	Aside from the environmental disturbance of having motorized vehicles off road...there is a parking issue. As in, there is none. Unless the Forest Service plans to buy land to create parking, there is little space for parking cars, let alone trucks with trailers.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
317	1	tenderfoot	At the November 1, 2008 Board meeting of the Corinthian Hill Property Owners Association, the Board unanimously objected to the above proposal by corresponding with the Dillon District Forest Service and the Town of Dillon. Since that time we have been inundated by requests from our 166 property owners to further voice our objections to any increase in motorized recreational traffic on adjacent Tenderfoot Mountain, and in most instances have requested cessation of all motorized use. We are well aware that several other citizen groups and communities are also strongly opposing the proposals. This memorandum is to again place our strong opposition to the proposals.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. This process is not a vote. If it was, the people who want motorcycle trails in the Tenderfoot area would have more votes than the nearby local residents.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
199	6	tenderfoot	Bottom line is nimby. Not in my Backyard. Summit County just doesn't have the kind of land appropriate for heavy motorcycle use.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
147	2	tenderfoot	Close proximity of the trail to the Keystone community will create unreasonable noise and potential dust pollution.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Private Property
74	7	tenderfoot	Consider spending the money on the pine beetle problem. I do worry about a fire being started by the motor cycles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
8	4	tenderfoot	Considering the number of neighborhoods and wildlife impacted by the noise, we are really surprised such a decision was made to allow the motorized vehicles to continue.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
210	2	tenderfoot	Creating a special large area for off-road use would draw untold numbers of very noisy bikers. This is unconscionable very near many Summit County neighborhoods. There must be a better location for this activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. No other locations in Summit County were found to be feasible.	Designation of Lands
147	5	tenderfoot	Deer and elk have refuge in the area that would be accessed, and as biologist who was trained in Colorado I find this most objectionable.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
432	14	tenderfoot	Dillon/Keystone: Regarding the trail system around Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch, only a few suitable routes should be open to motorized use. I am very concerned because the DRD is currently moving ahead with implementation of a large-scale motorized trail system, prior to doing sufficient environmental, recreation, and community scoping to determine the impacts. A large grant, that is supported by the DRD, has already been submitted by a local dirt bike advocacy organization to the Colorado State Trails Committee. A requirement of use of this grant money is that the DRD and the advocacy group must actively promote the new trail system through signage, maps and brochures. While some motorized use in this area is acceptable, development and marketing of a large motorized trail system will bring in a volume of motorized users that is unsustainable, both environmentally and socially. Although the FS has identified this area as appropriate for extensive development of motorized trails, I do not support designating this area as suitable for increased trail development for motorized use, due to the reasons listed below. Because of its location Disturbance of the Dillon Fen area would be biologically unacceptable.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
147	6	tenderfoot		Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
527	3	tenderfoot	Dust will be excessive due to motorcycle activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
245	1	tenderfoot	Enough is enough. We are totally against the proposed motorcycle trail extending east from Dillon to Keystone. We purchased our home to relax and enjoy Colorado with our children and grandchildren, not to listen to (the valley is very narrow) the noise of motorcycles nor to worry about our grandchildren hearing or biking on one of the trails that motorcycles might use. Let them get a driver's license and drive on our main highways. Again, I stress the importance of safety on all of Summit County's trails that are currently shared by bikers and hikers. Please vote against this proposal.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. This process is not a vote.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
201	7	tenderfoot	Environment – The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
180	5	tenderfoot	Environment – The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat. We have always enjoyed seeing wildlife behind our unit.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Designation of Lands
293	6	tenderfoot	Environment - The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
252	5	tenderfoot	Environment - The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat. We have always enjoyed seeing wildlife behind our units.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
527	2	tenderfoot	Erosion is probably the biggest fear of landowners. This will create visible scaring of the mountain slope.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
527	7	tenderfoot	Exhaust is an issue. Many motorcycles are 2-cycle engines, which are terrible in terms of pollution production. http://www.naturaltrails.org/issues/factsheet_pdfs/POLLUTION-703.pdf	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study would be needed to validate this claim.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
34	3	tenderfoot	Expanding the miles of trails will increase the noise level in the existing trail area and introduce very loud noises in the expanded area. Sts. John is approximately 200 vertical feet from the trail that is now used by hikers and dirt bike riders. The loud noise will negatively affect the quality of life of the residents, especially when the windows are open or while sitting on our decks.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Private Property
15	5	tenderfoot	Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation including: All of us, especially on those pleasant summer weekends when we wish to sit on our decks and enjoy the Summit outdoor experience, are accosted by intense engine revving and cycling through the gears and then the decelerating “pop-pop-pop” as the motorcycles race up the hills and circle back for another run. Some even continue to ride into the night.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
15	7	tenderfoot	<p>Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation including:</p> <p>Homeowners who hike the trails leading up Tenderfoot Mountain have reported frightening encounters with the motorcycles and have found the area despoiled with discarded trash.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
15	8	tenderfoot	<p>Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation including:</p> <p>The elk herd regularly viewed from our homes over the years seems to visit less frequently. Are they being impacted by the motorcycles and noise?</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
15	6	tenderfoot	<p>Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation including:</p> <p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] have watched as the number of trails visible to us from our homes, especially on particularly exciting terrain, have proliferated repeatedly and undoubtedly without sanction. Our sense of the situation is that too many of the riders have abused the area and have even encroached on the Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands. This leads us to believe that no one is enforcing the existing trail system. Why should we expect any better enforcement of an expanded system?</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has several resources for managing a motorized trail system. The system on the ground currently is not in our managed trail system and therefore, we have not tried to manage it.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
180	3	tenderfoot	<p>Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threaten our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
201	5	tenderfoot	<p>Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
399	4	tenderfoot	<p>Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
252	3	tenderfoot	Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
293	4	tenderfoot	Fire Danger – Even with spark arrestors, such use increases the risk of wild fire and threatens our residential community. Fire danger also will exist from careless use of smoking materials by the increased utilization.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
33	6	tenderfoot	Fire, safety, environment concerns, noise pollution, and for preservation of the beauty of Tenderfoot Mountain, we strongly oppose the Tenderfoot motorcycle trail system proposed by SCORR, and hope this proposal will not pass.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. All trail users who smoke introduce a wildfire risk if cigarettes are not disposed of properly. Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
219	16	tenderfoot	Here are a couple bullet points for trails that were not included in Alternative G: There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
515	6	tenderfoot	Hikers on the trails leading up Tenderfoot have reported frightening encounters with the motorcycles and have found the area despoiled with discarded trash.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Traffic Control and Safety
526	6	tenderfoot	Homeowners who hike the trails leading up Tenderfoot Mountain have reported frightening encounters with the motorcycles and have found the area despoiled with discarded trash. Some homeowners actually take trash bags to pick up some of the trash.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
519	7	tenderfoot	Homeowners who hike the trails leading up Tenderfoot Mountain have reported frightening encounters with the motorcycles and have found the area despoiled with discarded trash. Some homeowners actually take trash bags to pick up some of the trash.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
24	1	tenderfoot	I am a homeowner in Keystone, Colorado and a motorcycle rider. I know of a proposal for a Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System from the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) that, if approved by the U.S. Forest Service, would open about 36 miles of trails to motorcycle use between the water tank at the West end of the Oro Grande trail in Dillon to the east end of Keystone. While I am not opposed to off-road motorcycle use in appropriate areas, I am opposed to this proposal for a variety of reasons.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
196	1	tenderfoot	I am a part time resident in Summit County and am writing you today to strongly oppose any expansion to the motorized trail system on Tenderfoot Mountain in Summit County, Colorado. An expanded trail system will have a major negative impact on us residents living along Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
197	1	tenderfoot	I am a resident of Summit County and although I do not live in Dillon I do travel Highway 6 occasionally. I do not approve of having motorized trails in the area at all for the environmental reasons, the neighboring homes, and the inappropriateness of the proposal.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Designation of Lands
308	2	tenderfoot	I am also concerned, as a Retired Fire Fighter, of the danger of fire that would result from these vehicles, especially when you consider the heavy fuel load in this area, due to the pine beetle infestation.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest..	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
201	1	tenderfoot	I am an owner at the Enclave in Keystone, Colorado. I strongly oppose the institution of the SCORR proposal to allow for motorcycle and off road vehical use on the trails directly behind my home and complex community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
144	1	tenderfoot	I am astounded by the indiscretion of any such proposal as allowing motorized vehicular traffic onto the Tenderfoot Mountain trail. Does Summit County not have enough, if not too much, motorized vehicular traffic negatively impacting the county's accessible and relatively small area – think Highways 9 and 6 and the monster corridor Interstate 70. Relatively few residents of Summit County would utilize Tenderfoot Mountain trail for motorized 'sport', that's a given. The people who would mostly utilize the trail using motorized vehicles would come from outside the county. And after they had imparted their environmentally unfriendly impacts upon those of us who reside in Summit County, they would depart blissfully to their own domiciles. And once back at the peace of their home, I ask, would they tolerate that I repeatedly motor down their street or ally with a two stroke, screaming machine?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
24	4	tenderfoot	I am concerned about the increase in noise that motorcycle use would bring to the U.S. Highway 6 valley. Despite state law and enforcement of those laws on truck noise, traffic noise is significant on both sides of Highway 6 from Dillon East through Keystone and all the way to Arapahoe Basin. Those of us that live in that corridor along the Snake River also get noise from the shooting range by the landfill. The noise from dirt bikes is significantly higher than most road bikes and, when added to the existing noise level, really degrades the environment and the reasons that most of us chose to purchase homes and enjoy the trails in that location in the first place.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
24	3	tenderfoot	I am concerned with the individual safety of historical trail users (hikers, mountain bicycle riders, horsemen) should the proposal be approved. There is, of course, some competition already between persons on foot and those on two wheels, but the addition of two-wheeled, motorized vehicles using the trails at higher speeds than any of the other users subjects the two-footed users to more potential harm than is now the case.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
23	1	tenderfoot	I am extremely concerned about the negative impact the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) State Trail Grant will have on native wildlife. Adding 36 miles of motorcycle trails to prime elk, mountain lion, and endangered lynx territory is unacceptable. Having lost one endangered lynx in this area just last summer to a vehicle strike makes this issue even more critical.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
556	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am extremely concerned about the negative impact the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) State Trail Grant will have on the quality of life here in the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor. Adding 36 miles of motorcycle trails to this sensitive land is unacceptable. The trails will encroach on wetlands, destroying flora, and will increase the risk of wildfire danger near populated areas resulting from hot mufflers or engines in dry grass and timber areas.</p> <p>The proposed trails are too close to urban interface, sometimes within 200 vertical feet or less of some Keystone condos and homes. This will cause disturbing engine noise, dust levels, and trash in this beautiful natural setting. The negative impact will also be seen with our wildlife since this is a prime elk calving area and home to native mountain lion populations and possible habitat for endangered lynx.</p> <p>I urge you to deny this grant proposal. Preservation of our natural corridors, our wildlife habitat, and our quality of life is much more important to me than adding 36 miles of noise pollution and environmental damage.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
557	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am extremely concerned about the negative impact the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) State Trail Grant will have on the quality of life here in the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor. Adding 36 miles of motorcycle trails to this sensitive land is unacceptable. The trails will encroach on wetlands, destroying flora, and will increase the risk of wildfire danger near populated areas resulting from hot mufflers or engines in dry grass and timber areas.</p> <p>The proposed trails are too close to urban interface, sometimes within 200 vertical feet or less of some Keystone condos and homes. This will cause disturbing engine noise, dust levels, and trash in this beautiful natural setting. The negative impact will also be seen with our wildlife since this is a prime elk calving area and home to native mountain lion populations and possible habitat for endangered lynx.</p> <p>I urge you to deny this grant proposal. Preservation of our natural corridors, our wildlife habitat, and our quality of life is much more important to me than adding 36 miles of noise pollution and environmental damage.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
558	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am extremely concerned about the negative impact the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) State Trail Grant will have on the quality of life here in the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor. Adding 36 miles of motorcycle trails to this sensitive land is unacceptable. The trails will encroach on wetlands, destroying flora, and will increase the risk of wildfire danger near populated areas resulting from hot mufflers or engines in dry grass and timber areas.</p> <p>The proposed trails are too close to urban interface, sometimes within 200 vertical feet or less of some Keystone condos and homes. This will cause disturbing engine noise, dust levels, and trash in this beautiful natural setting. The negative impact will also be seen with our wildlife since this is a prime elk calving area and home to native mountain lion populations and possible habitat for endangered lynx.</p> <p>I urge you to deny this grant proposal. Preservation of our natural corridors, our wildlife habitat, and our quality of life is much more important to me than adding 36 miles of noise pollution and environmental damage.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
192	5	tenderfoot	<p>I am in favor of establishing new trails for mountain bike recreation but not in proximity to residential communities. Please give consideration to the property owners who love and enjoy their mountain homes and retreats and who have been supporting the county tax base through their annual real estate tax assessment. In order to avoid the fire risk, the safety issues, the many environmental concerns and noise pollution, we strongly object to the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR and urge you to reject same.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
97	1	tenderfoot	I am one of the owners of a home in Dillon, Colorado in the Corinthian Hills Subdivision. I have learned through the property owners association, that there is a proposal to increase motorized off-road usage on Tenderfoot Mountain. I am against this proposal for many reasons, including the negative impacts for residents, visitors, wildlife, hikers, snow shoers, cross-country skiers, and the environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
100	1	tenderfoot	I am opposed to the continued use of Tenderfoot Mountain trails by motor driven vehicles and adamantly opposed to an increase in the number of trails. Please protect our neighborhood and the surrounding community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
309	3	tenderfoot	I am opposed to the use of the existing Tenderfoot Trail and Ore Grande Trail by snowmobiles and motorcycles, or any other motorized vehicles (currently there are ATVs, trail bikes, and motorbikes using that trail).	Alternative GM does not include motorized use on these trails.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
136	1	tenderfoot	I am opposed to this proposal as a Keystone resident and as a Board member of The Keystone Citizen League. [Because:] Important deer and elk summer and winter refuge in the area that would be accessed.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
136	5	tenderfoot	I am opposed to this proposal as a Keystone resident and as a Board member of The Keystone Citizen League. [Because:] Noise and dust pollution - Close proximity of trails to the Keystone community and the very narrow valley means the noise will be heard by everyone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Private Property
136	3	tenderfoot	I am opposed to this proposal as a Keystone resident and as a Board member of The Keystone Citizen League. [Because:] Safety - All trails would be shared among hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders and motorcycles/dirt bikes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
136	2	tenderfoot	I am opposed to this proposal as a Keystone resident and as a Board member of The Keystone Citizen League. [Because:] The 500 acre Dillon Bay Fen (peat) area would be disturbed. More proliferation of noxious weeds carried in from non-native areas than has already occurred.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
136	4	tenderfoot	I am opposed to this proposal as a Keystone resident and as a Board member of The Keystone Citizen League. [Because:] Wildfire potential - hot engines and mufflers on dry grass, with no spark arrestors.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Spark arresters are required on all OHVs.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
98	3	tenderfoot	I am quite disappointed that the board of the homeowners' association decided to claim that they represent all of the owners, and elected to speak on our behalf, when they are actually acting autonomously. I must ask you to disregard their letter as a false representation, and to take it only for what it is: an effort to distort reality by pretending to represent a group of people considerably smaller than claimed.	Thanks for the comment and the information.	Public Involvement Process

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
434	9	tenderfoot	<p>I am saddened by the ongoing need to fight to keep motorized recreation opportunities available (especially singletrack) and disillusioned by the idea that closing trails is so quickly adopted as a preferred alternative. I visit Summit County not only to ski in the winter, but to ride my motorcycle in the summer. If this plan goes through it is probable that riding opportunities in White River National Forest will be minimized to the point that we will no longer visit in the summer. This will not only be disappointing to my young family, but also to the businesses losing money due to our absence.</p> <p>I don't understand why we can't share the forest and allow clubs like SCORR and the TPA to work with the USFS to maintain and create a top notch responsible recreation area.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
300	2	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on any trails in Summit County [because of]:</p> <p>Environmental Issues – you know these even better than I do.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
300	4	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on any trails in Summit County [because of]:</p> <p>Noise levels – we moved to the mountains to enjoy their beauty and peace, not to have a noisy environment which would definitely be created with allowing motorcycles on our trails.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
300	3	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on any trails in Summit County [because of]:</p> <p>Safety Issues – first our kids and now our grandchildren enjoy these trails. I would be very reluctant to allow my young ones on the trails if there was a chance of encountering motorcycles.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
300	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on any trails in Summit County [because of]:</p> <p>Wildfire Danger.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest..	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
547	3	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain trail system Dillon – Keystone, Colorado. Because:</p> <p>It will cause a potential fire hazard which is particularly bad with all the dead trees in the area.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest..	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
547	4	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain trail system Dillon – Keystone, Colorado. Because:</p> <p>It will lead to trail destruction.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, motorcycles on well-built or reconstructed trails does not lead to trail destruction.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
547	2	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain trail system Dillon – Keystone, Colorado. Because:</p> <p>It will, of course, lead to noise pollution.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
547	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain trail system Dillon – Keystone, Colorado. Because:</p> <p>Of the inherent nature of a motorcycle it will lead to animal disruption. I have seen elk herds move from that area as I pass on Highway 6.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
547	5	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to allowing motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain trail system Dillon – Keystone, Colorado. Because:</p> <p>There are horseback riders in that area. I think it will be a real hazard to the horses and riders if motorcycles are on the same trail system.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
334	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am strongly opposed to the expansion of any motorized activity on Tenderfoot Mountain. There has already been significant erosion and too much noise pollution by motorized vehicles. The wildlife and forest would be significantly impaired with the proposed activity and the engine noise, unacceptable.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerned position and I seriously hope the proposal is denied.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
384	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am very strongly opposed to the approval of motorized use on Tenderfoot Mountain. It is a personal favorite running trail used by many hikers with dogs, runners and mountain bikers. It gets a lot of sun exposure so it often is the first "dry" trail of the season. Opening this area to motorized use with its impact of noise and speed in that area would greatly diminish the quality of the area and create a negative impact on the environment. The surrounding communities of homeowners would be negatively impacted as well. The expansion of the trailhead at Dillon Cemetery for trailers would create an eyesore and a negative presence in an area that holds historical and spiritual significance.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
171	9	tenderfoot	<p>I am very thankful to have the additional trails in the Tenderfoot area. Thank you for including some non-system trails into alt. G I would also like to see 96db limit on all motorized travel in WRNF. This will help significantly with adjacent landowner and users.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
176	1	tenderfoot	I am writing about my concerns on the proposed motorcycle trail. As a member of the keystone community in the seasons condos, I have many occasions to use the trail which is now restricted to walkers and mountain bikers. Even with this restriction there are many near misses and some accidents with the mountain bikers and walkers. In fact some mountain bikers travel at a rate of speed that is dangerous to the walkers. If motorcycles were involved I hate to think of the damage that will be done to walkers and bikers that get in the way.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
212	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed updates to the Tenderfoot Mountain trail systems in the WRNF.</p> <p>I strongly urge the USFS to close all trails in this area to all motorized vehicle use. The unintended and irreparable impacts of any continued or increased use will prove to be severely detrimental to the enjoyment of this area by the majority of users, by the neighboring homeowners and to the wildlife currently existing in the area.</p> <p>I understand that the USFS strives to allow for multiple uses in many areas, but this particular area of Summit County and the WRNF is not the proper place for motorized use any longer. Sadly, too many off road riders have failed to respect the regulations put in place by the USFS and this is evident by the sheer miles of un-approved trails currently in use on Tenderfoot.</p> <p>We in Summit County feel that the highest and best use of this section of the WR is for non-motorized use only. Please let us have the beauty, the quiet and the wildlife that should be an inherent quality to this area of the WRNF.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Further study is also needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
31	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express my objection to continued use of motorized vehicles on the Tenderfoot Mountain trails, as contained in the White River National Forest Travel Management Plan. As an owner of a property in Keystone, I find the noise generated by the motor cycles to be very annoying. It often intrudes upon and ruins my enjoyment of the natural beauty of the area - as a large part of that enjoyment is derived by the peace and quiet of the area. Hearing the whine of motorcycles destroys that peace and quiet.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
309	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express my opposition to the planned addition of new trails to the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail (Trails identified as Route #5-N290.1 and Route #5-65W.1A).	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
309	2	tenderfoot	I am writing to express my opposition to the use of the current Tenderfoot Trail and/or any new trails to be used by Snowmobiles and Motorcycles between the water plant the Dillon Cemetery.	Alternative GM does not include any snowmobile or motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
42	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express my opposition to the use of the current Tenderfoot Trail and/or any new trails to be used by Snowmobiles and Motorcycles between the water plant the Dillon Cemetery. I am also opposed to the use of the existing Tenderfoot Trail by snowmobiles and motorcycles, or any other motorized vehicles (currently there are ATVs, trail bikes, and motorbikes using that trail).	Alternative GM does not include any snowmobile or motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
146	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express my strong concern about and opposition to the creation of the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System, a motorcycle and dirt bike trail proposed to be located north of Highway 6 in Keystone, Colorado. The planned trail is to run behind the residential area known as The Enclave, approximately one mile east of the Keystone Lodge and just prior to the point at which Highway 6 heads up toward Loveland Pass.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
289	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express opposition to the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system that would increase the biker traffic in this wildlife area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Further study is also needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
516	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to express our strong opposition to any extension or growth in usage in the motorcycle/motorized trail area on Tenderfoot mountain. We have been in the county for the last few days and have read and heard extensively about this proposal and find it completely inappropriate and not in keeping with how the county has done its land use planning over the years.	Alternative GM does not include any snowmobile or motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
199	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to oppose the sanctioned motorized use of Tenderfoot Mountain. As a Property Owner of 2 properties in Summerwood and one in Silverthorne, I am opposed to the proposed motorcycle uses anywhere in Summit County and specifically on Tenderfoot.	Alternative GM does not include any snowmobile or motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
244	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to strongly disagree with the "Tenderfoot motorcycle trail proposal" I feel this is a very poorly thought out plan that includes motorized bikes. It is a gross misuse of land management. This is not the place for a motorcycle trail! Disruption of deer and elk, noxious weeds intruding, dust, noise, etc! I trust the commissioners will make the right decision!	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
21	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am writing to voice our concerns regarding the possible plans to expand motorcycle use along the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor from Dillon to Keystone.</p> <p>We purchased our Keystone condominium specifically because of its location. We spend a considerable amount of time in our condominium and allowing motorcycle traffic will severely impact the quality of life for all residents. Additionally, it will negatively impact our property values.</p> <p>We request that you stop the expansion of motorcycle trails and offensive motorcycle use on public lands contiguous with communities along the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
279	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am writing to you as a member of the Summit County Community and as a representative of the Keystone Neighbourhood Company (KNC) to voice objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. (While I was not able to contact all KNC board members (including those with Vail Resorts) in time to send this letter, I am expressing five of the eight Board of Directors opposition to the new trails.)</p> <p>We would like to express our opposition to the proposal by the Summit County off Road Riders (SCORR) to open thirty six miles of off- road trails for motorcycle/dirt bike use in the Dillon/Keystone communities.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
62	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am writing to you as a resident of the Keystone, Colorado, to voice my strong objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Of this total, 25 miles of trail represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horse back riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders would be shared with dirt bikes/motorcycles. This presents a serious safety issue.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
56	1	tenderfoot	<p>I am writing to you as a resident of the Keystone, Colorado, to voice my strong objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Of this total, 25 miles of trail represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders would be shared with dirt bikes/motorcycles. This presents a serious safety issue.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
32	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to you as the president of the Keystone Citizens League, a community organization with over 350 members, to voice our strong objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Of this total, 25 miles of trail represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails which are shown on the attached project map in black. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders would be shared with dirt bikes/motorcycles. This presents a serious safety issue.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
28	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to you as the President of the Keystone Citizens League, a community organization with over 350 members, to voice our strong objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Of this total, 25 miles of trail represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails which are shown on the attached project map in black. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders would be shared with dirt bikes/motorcycles. This presents a serious safety issue.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
524	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to you concerning the proposed expansion of the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. I am a home owner in Sts. John condominiums and spend two winter months and two summer months in my unit each year. During the summers I have been fortunate to enjoy hiking in and around Summit County. Since Tenderfoot is in my back yard I often hike the area and enjoy the peaceful scene and the beauty of the natural area. It would be a very grave mistake to subject this beautiful natural area to the grinding noise and environmental damage that off road motorcycles, dirt bikes, would bring. It cannot be in the interest of Summit County to support such destruction.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
29	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to you to voice strong objection to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
11	1	tenderfoot	I am writing to you today to stop the decision to allow access to The Tenderfoot Trail in Dillon to motorized vehicles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
430	2	tenderfoot	I appreciate the efforts of SCORR on Tenderfoot Mtn and other areas of Summit County. I think what they are doing is great.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Support

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
49	7	tenderfoot	I ask that the proposed dirt bike trail system too close to residential areas in Dillon and Keystone not be allowed.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
312	2	tenderfoot	I can attest that you can hear off road vehicles for great distances. The engine and exhaust bounces across hills and valleys.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
180	1	tenderfoot	I certainly recognize the need for recreational opportunities for others who share our love for the area. But I strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. Several miles of the new trails will run behind and extremely close to our Enclave community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
308	4	tenderfoot	I deeply believe the valley and lake views would be ruined by the addition of trails to this area. [Tenderfoot Mountain]	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
11	4	tenderfoot	I do hope you will decide to leave the[Tenderfoot] trail alone and let people enjoy this wonderful experience without the fear of being killed or injured. Those of us who have lived here for over fifteen years have earned our right to walk on that trail without fear.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
74	6	tenderfoot	I encourage you eliminate the trails so the landscape recovers and the wildlife returns.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat Further study is also needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
202	1	tenderfoot	I find myself compelled to write a comment about the White River Travel Management Plan given recent editorials in the Summit daily and I presume other papers calling for action. Please ignore these shrill cries for last minute changes to increase prohibition of motorized trails given that, according to my reading, Alternative G closes or decommissions the highest number of trails. At least it is a well considered plan and if it makes everyone somewhat unhappy it is probably a reasonable compromise.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Support
193	4	tenderfoot	I have experienced first hand deer being chased by motorcycles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, one experience with one irresponsible rider, does not mean that all motorcycle riders would chase deer.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
308	5	tenderfoot	I have great respect for the NFS. I am sure you will come to the decision that this proposal [adding Tenderfoot Trail] would be better in an area that would cause less impact on its surrounding.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
74	2	tenderfoot	I have lived near Tenderfoot Mt. I hike and snow shoe it regularly, as well as enjoy watching the elk. My observation has been that since motorized vehicle traffic has grown, the elk are rarely seen. It used to be rare for me not to see them, now it's rare to see them. I find this sad. That was a big appeal to living here.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
247	7	tenderfoot	I have personally observed very young people riding their dirt bikes on the shoulder of the road to get to the Tenderfoot trailheads. Those bikes do not appear street legal and certainly are a hazard to the riders.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
138	1	tenderfoot	I have recently become aware that there is serious consideration being given to increasing access to motorcycle traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain. I am writing to voice my opposition to giving motorcycles, ATVs, etc. access to the mountain trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
193	6	tenderfoot	I have seen also where the motorcycles are creating their own trails in the forest. They could care less about maintaining a pristine setting.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in this area, however, mountain bikers, horseback riders, and hikers have also created their own trails. Many miles of those trails will be adopted into the trail system. Very few miles of trail created by motorcycle rider will be adopted.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
30	3	tenderfoot	I hope you can find another place for this kind of recreation [Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System].	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
530	3	tenderfoot	I object o the plans because: The increased motorcycle traffic will increase the risk of wildfires that may threaten nearby home such as mine.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
530	4	tenderfoot	I object o the plans because: The increased use of the trailhead near the Dillon Cemetery will only exacerbate the current noise pollution that is wholly inconsistent with what was intended when the cemetery was established.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle use originating form the Dillon Cemetery.	Private Property
530	2	tenderfoot	I object o the plans because: The proposed motorcycle trails are too close to residential areas that are already suffering from unacceptable engine noise and dust levels, particularly impacting wildlife in the area and hikers using the trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
363	2	tenderfoot	I object to the plans because the proposed motorcycle trails are too close to residential areas that are already suffering from unacceptable engine noise and dust levels, particularly impacting wildlife in the area and hikers using the trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
309	4	tenderfoot	I oppose the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail because: The impact of motorized traffic on the wildlife in this area. We frequently see elk, coyote, and deer, on the Tenderfoot Trail and in the surrounding area. When hiking the trail I see abundant elk scat all winter and fall. These vehicles will negatively impact the wildlife area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
309	6	tenderfoot	I oppose the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail because: The safety of hikers on the trail. This trail is used extensively by hikers. I hike that trail at least once a day, and often two to three times a day. The safety of hikers is at risk now but is minimal compared to what we will face if motorcycles and snowmobiles are allowed on any of these trails. This trail is often touted by the Forest Service as an excellent beginner trail for visitors, as well as a great hike for the young or older hiker.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
309	5	tenderfoot	I oppose the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail because: Visual, noise, and air pollution will accompany the use of motorized vehicles. As a resident in close proximity to these trails, I already see, smell, and hear pollution from the current motor vehicle users.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise, smell, and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
204	2	tenderfoot	I respectfully request that you deny funding for Project 23.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
72	3	tenderfoot	I strongly object to motorcycle use and expansion of motorcycle trails on public lands contiguous with the communities along the Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor. If possible I would like to see all existing trails and trailheads closed to motorized use. I make this request based on the environmental damage, noise and wildlife impact that I have personally observed on the existing trails near the landfill.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property
146	7	tenderfoot	I support the creation of recreational opportunities for those who wish to enjoy the beautiful outdoor environment offered by Colorado's extensive mountains. But the provision of such opportunities should not be at the expense of or danger to wildlife, vegetation and residents who do not share in the enthusiasm for noise and high speed. Surely there are other areas, further removed from those threatened by such a trail, where its impact would be far less, if not completely eliminated.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
225	2	tenderfoot	I support the movement to develop sustainable trails in the Tenderfoot MTN area of Dillon.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Support
225	3	tenderfoot	I support the use of quiet exhaust spark arrestors and personally use a trials tire to reduce trail impact.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
101	1	tenderfoot	<p>I thought it was a joke when I heard that the motorcycle trails not only were legitimate, but were going to be expanded! I wrongly assumed the motorcycle riders were poaching, as who would consciously allow motorcycle trails by a cemetery? What happened to "Respect for the dead?" And you're now thinking of expanding the trails?? Maybe this money could be better spent on education... or removing some of the dead trees... or... or... Why are we paying our current tax rates if this is how the money is being spent?</p> <p>Now let's talk about respect for the people living along Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone. I doubt that you live in the immediate area, otherwise you'd say "enough!" If you're trying to drive all of us out, this is one way to lower your tax base. I love sitting on our deck to read during the nice weather, but there are times the noise level drives me inside where it's quieter (you can still hear the noise when the windows are open). Forget taking a walk to the cemetery when there are bikes revving up - - you risk life and limb while the riders are "testing their skills". They're certainly not testing their consideration for other people. You also risk deafness, and lose the ability to talk at a normal level.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
524	4	tenderfoot	I understand that the off road riders need an area for recreation but surely there are more suitable areas than in the back yard of those of us who live and play on the slopes of Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
199	5	tenderfoot	I understand the "land of many uses" concept and I do support Federal Lands being used for hunting and motorcycle riding in general. It's just that this particular part of the forest is not appropriate for motorized uses. I would recommend that you work with the BLM and designate some of their Sagebrush lands near Kremmling for the Motorcycle trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Designation of Lands
23	5	tenderfoot	I urge you to deny this grant proposal. The trail system that is currently in place is more than adequate for recreational needs in these critical habitat areas. Our wildlife and preservation of our natural corridors is much more important to me.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
300	5	tenderfoot	I urge you to reject any use of motorized vehicles on our bike and hiking trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
74	1	tenderfoot	I would like existing motorized vehicle use on Tenderfoot Mt. Eliminated and do not support future motorized trail development.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
30	1	tenderfoot	I would like to add our voices in protest to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. Until the fire danger caused by the pine beetle kill is solved, anything that will increase fire danger – as motorcycles surely would – is foolhardy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
437	1	tenderfoot	<p>I would like to express my opposition to any expansion of the defacto, but actually not permitted, motorized use of the Tenderfoot/Oro Grande trail near Dillon, Colorado.</p> <p>The [Tenderfoot/Oro Grande] trail is not an appropriate one for shared use, having several narrow places on steep slopes, where it would be difficult for a bicycle or skier to share it with a motorized user.</p> <p>I've seen occasional off-road users here, and they've generally been courteous. But opening up the trail to larger use, and legitimizing it by putting it on specially published state maps, would dilute the quality of the motorized users.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle on the [Tenderfoot/Oro Grande] trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
24	6	tenderfoot	I would respectfully request that the proposal by SCORR for a Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System be rejected.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
98	2	tenderfoot	<p>I would welcome the proposed additional trails, as well as improvements to existing trails. One of the reasons I bought my home in Corinthian Hills was because of its proximity to these very trails. My family and guests use these trails on a regular basis, and would love to see them expanded and improved. I know of several other owners that feel the same way. Of course, we would only welcome these improvements and expansions if they are carried out in a matter which minimizes impact on the environment.</p>	Alternative GM does include very few trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
218	5	tenderfoot	<p>If approved for increased motorcycle usage as part of a new motorized trail system, what is the local district's specific annual budget amount for educational programs on and off the trail, frequent patrols and enforcement of Forest Service usage rules (including sobriety checks?), and maintenance (including trash pickup) along the trail? If these are not approved, budgeted and funded amounts each year, simply stating that they will occur in an attempt to placate those against increased motorized use of the trails is unethical and reason enough to not approve it.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, The Dillon Ranger District has a very good relationship with SCORR. This 300+ member non-profit organization has demonstrated a willingness to volunteer and a dedication to maintaining trails for their sport. In partnership with the Friends of the Dillon Ranger District, four of their members have been trained as trail crew leaders and volunteer their time leading other volunteers on trail maintenance projects. Should there be a trail system, they have committed to have several members participate in FDRDs ranger patrol program. They will patrol the trail system to contact other motorcycle riders to educate them about trail use ethics, such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users by slowing down when they are encountered. This type of volunteer patrol program has been very successful in many parts of the country. It is true that the Dillon Ranger District has only one law enforcement officer, but it is important to recognize that the District LEO is not the only resource for performing law enforcement. The District has one dedicated patrol person, a FPO, who works during the summer months specifically to	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
87	10	tenderfoot	If there is a real need in Summit County to create a "motor cross," which seems like an attractive activity for a few with high potential for adversely impacting the interests of the many, large areas in relatively vacant tracts of land must and can be identified. "Motor cross" advocates must, in our view, identify areas not adjacent to cemeteries or residential properties, areas that would be, or could be made, safe and suitable for this type of activity; vacant and unused ranch land in the northern part of the county comes to mind.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Designation of Lands
74	8	tenderfoot	If you must have a motorized trail, I suggest a new location be found where it's less populated. Is there land along the interstate where it's already noise or by an abandoned mine with no population, or an airport? Your forest is a big place, please put this trail where such a large number humans are not impacted. Have you considered horse trails on Tenderfoot?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
101	3	tenderfoot	I'm told motorcycle off-road trails are already located south and east of Keystone where there aren't large communities. If you must use state grant money to construct motorcycle only trails, please put them in an appropriate place, not along the corridor where many people try to enjoy "the great outdoors."	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
241	1	tenderfoot	<p>I'm writing to protest allowing motorized vehicles to use the walking trail on Tenderfoot Mountain directly behind Corinthian Hill Subdivision. I have been 4 wheeling on Summit County trails for 29 years which I believe qualifies me to speak with some degree of experience on this subject. I've been told for years that we have 1,800 miles of trails in Summit County that are open to the public with motorized vehicles. I have traveled most of them and can't recall ever being close to a housing addition. The idea that we need more trails which happen to be close to housing is ridiculous. I believe this is just a conjured up way of getting a grant for something that we don't need. Isn't this called "pork" in Washington?</p> <p>Secondly, there is a beautiful trail on the other side of Tenderfoot Mountain which is entered just past the Dillon water plant. I've traveled this trail many times and have yet to see another vehicle or a single home.</p> <p>Let there be no more "pork" in this country and let begin with us!</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
195	1	tenderfoot	I'm writing to you as a dirt bike enthusiast that is a part of the Summit County community. I have volunteered time in the past towards the efforts of SCORR. I believe that this dedicated group has done beneficial work for the county as well as for motorized and non motorized trail users across the county. I have recently heard that plans might be cut back from those that were originally projected for the Tenderfoot Mountain area. I believe that this is an injustice for all that have dedicated their free time and have paid their motorcycle registration fees over the years. I think the efforts to form sustainable trail systems help both those who are for and against motorized trail use. By establishing a fixed and legal trail system, I think that you actually decrease the illegal use of National forest that is an annoyance to those users that often condemn the use of dirt bikes. I hope that you can realize the benefits to the community that would come with a substantial sized sustainable trail system.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
180	6	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Designation of Lands
201	8	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Designation of Lands
399	7	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
71	6	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. The damage to the environment in this area caused by motorcycles can be seen on the western part of the County landfill where motorcycles have carried many species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free just a few years ago, caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
252	6	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
293	7	tenderfoot	In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. That will cause damage to the environment in this area as was done in the western part of the County landfill where motorcycle use caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
192	3	tenderfoot	In close proximity to the proposed trail and only 100 yards above the western edge of the Enclave is a large beaver pond surrounded by wetlands. I can only imagine what would happen to this pristine area with the advent of dirt bikes introduced to the marshes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
399	9	tenderfoot	In order to avoid the fire risk, the safety issues, the many environmental concerns and noise pollution, we strongly object to the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR and urge you to reject same. Please save the environment, peacefulness and beauty of the area for our grandchildren and their children to enjoy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
293	9	tenderfoot	In order to avoid the fire risk, the safety issues, the many environmental concerns and noise pollution, we strongly object to the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR and urge you to reject same. Please save the environment, peacefulness and beauty of the area for our grandchildren and their children to enjoy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
192	2	tenderfoot	In the Denver area I have seen the impact on real estate values on properties that are located in the approach and departure ends of Centennial Airport. These properties suffer almost a 20% to 30% valuation drop, if they can be sold at all, from comparable properties due to the noise factor. The passing of an aircraft overhead is rather brief compared to the high RPM ping of a dirt bike scrambling its way up a hillside that is located directly behind residences. The Enclave has constructed an earthen beam to shield the units from the noise of Highway 6, but the proposed dirt bike trails would be located in close proximity above the 43 units of our complex. The bowl effect of the Keystone valley would only resonate the noise level through out the eastern end of our valley. We currently enjoy the serenity of our backyard and enjoy hiking with our dog and spotting the assortment of wildlife in the area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
524	3	tenderfoot	In the past I have observed damage caused by unsanctioned dirt bikes and based on that observation know that if such traffic were sanctioned traffic would increase and there would be major damage to both the environment and quality of life for those of us who live near and enjoy the peace of Tenderfoot.	Alternative GM does not includes any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible including the development of an education and enforcement program	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
308	3	tenderfoot	In winter the trails allow me to enjoy going on snowshoeing hikes to see Mountain Lions, Elk, Deer and other wildlife. In summer, most likely due to existing dirt bikes using the one trail, the wildlife is driven away from our area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
237	3	tenderfoot	<p>Instead of expansion, we prefer to see the elimination of motorized vehicle use in these areas [Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch] for the following reason:</p> <p>Erosion – We are both mountain bike riders who use the Oro Grande trail in this area. We have seen the erosion that has occurred, especially in the vicinity of the cemetery and the landfill, due to motorized users going off-trail. We suspect that it is the result of a small percentage of users, but nonetheless, it happens, and expanding motorized use will serve to enhance this problem.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The Cemetery and landfill area are not on the National Forest and are not considered in this analysis.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
237	4	tenderfoot	<p>Instead of expansion, we prefer to see the elimination of motorized vehicle use in these areas [Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch] for the following reason:</p> <p>Noise Pollution – We are residents in the Snake River Basin just west of the Keystone Ski Area. In the summer months, we already hear noise from motorized trail users coming from the land fill area, even though it is several miles away from our residence. Expanding motorized trail use east of the landfill on Tenderfoot Mountain will generate an unacceptable increase in noise pollution. The current area and proposed expansion area will also generate increased noise pollution for other residential neighborhoods including Summit Cove, Corinthian Hills, and Summerwood.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
237	5	tenderfoot	<p>Instead of expansion, we prefer to see the elimination of motorized vehicle use in these areas [Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch] for the following reason:</p> <p>Wildfire Danger – The Tenderfoot Mountain area has been severely hit by the Pine Bark Beetle creating large areas of standing dead wood. Current and proposed expansion of motorized vehicle traffic creates an increased risk of human-started wildfires. Considering how close this area is to the urban interface, we should be looking at reducing the possibilities of human-started wildfires, not increasing it.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
102	2	tenderfoot	It [Motorized Traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain] will shatter the peace and quiet of the residents in Summerwood, Corinthian Hills, and visitors to the cemetery.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
524	2	tenderfoot	It is a certainty that exposure of the area to motorcycles is not supportive of the wildlife and plant life on Tenderfoot Mountain. The area is particularly fragile at this point with the pine kill that denies cover for the wildlife and is a serious fire hazard.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
34	2	tenderfoot	It is also our belief that the existing trails in this corridor should be closed to motorcycles/dirt bikes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
36	1	tenderfoot	It is difficult to comprehend why (SCORR) would consider submitting such a proposal concerning "The White River Nations Forest Proposed Travel Management Plan." We feel sure they must be aware that where they want to put these trails, etc. from Dillon to Keystone is a highly populated urban area. Because of this and many other factors it would be our suggestion that the project be moved to an area with little or no development.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
65	2	tenderfoot	It is difficult to understand why a facility being proposed, such as this needs to be constructed in such close proximity to the property we are part of.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
181	1	tenderfoot	It is our understanding that the proposal would open motorized trails from approximately the water tank in Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Doing so will destroy the historic use of this area, cause severe disruption to animal life and increase fire danger considerably.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
12	5	tenderfoot	It is the hope of Corinthian Hill homeowners that the U.S. Forest Service will not permit increased motorized vehicle usage between the water plant and the cemetery. This would mitigate the negative impact on the more heavily populated areas of Dillon and restrict usage to those areas under less strain. There are many other areas in the County that would be better suited for this type of trail system which are not near populated areas.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Private Property
65	1	tenderfoot	It is understood by ourselves, owners of unit #10 at the Enclave on highway #6, that an extension of a motorcycle/dirt bike path is being proposed within 200 vertical feet of the Enclave complex.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest and further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
210	5	tenderfoot	We w[ish] to express our opposition to the above based on our concern for noise, fire, and other environmental issues that have been outlined by the representative of the Enclave complex. It is well-known fact bikers and other off-roaders create many additional trails and ruin the fragile environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
362	1	tenderfoot	It is with great consternation and disappointment that I learned about Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system which is under consideration as part of the WRNF Travel Management Plan and DEIS. There are several reasons why the proposed trail represents an inappropriate and unnecessary intrusion on an already fragile and threatened environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
370	1	tenderfoot	It is with great consternation and disappointment that I learned about Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System which is under consideration as part of the WRNF Travel Management Plan and DEIS. There are several reasons why the proposed trail represents an inappropriate and unnecessary intrusion on an already fragile and threatened environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
218	2	tenderfoot	It makes no common sense to designate this trail for anything other than foot traffic, horse riding and mountain biking ONLY. The trail passes less than 200' from two homes in our subdivision, not the quarter-mile or hundreds of yards that some people at the Forest Service claim. Doesn't the Forest Service have a rule as to a minimum distance from residential homes for designation of motorized trails? If so, what is it?	Regarding the Tenderfoot Road Trail (aka the Oro Grande Trail, Alternative GM includes no motorized use. There is no rule regarding proximity to residences and motorized trails.	Private Property
50	1	tenderfoot	It was a real shocker when we learned that there is "serious" consideration being given to permitting off-road motorcycle activity across the highway from our residence. This is the most invasive, the goofiest, and the most destructive proposal brought forth by public officials in our memory. Please...don't let such a foolish thing happen.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
8	6	tenderfoot	Knowing that this area [Tenderfoot Trail] is important for the elk and deer herds to winter and calve in the summer, we cannot see spending ore money to pursue the Tenderfoot Trail motor cross. We as casual users have seen a change in the herd patterns. This summer we have seen a significant increase in motorized vehicles, and one company rents ATV's and use the trail for commercial purposes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
371	6	tenderfoot	Law Enforcement: In a word-none! Sheriff John Miner told the Snake River Planning Commission that he would be unable to provide any law enforcement for the Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System. The only USFS Law enforcement Officer assigned to the Dillon Ranger District, Ms Jill Wick, shares her time with Eagle County. She cannot devote the amount of time to enforce the law in this area. The proliferation of illegal, social motorcycle trails commenced several years ago and nothing has been done about it.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use. The District has a dozen Forest Protection Officers with travel law enforcement authority and a large volunteer patrol program. The County Sherriff was never asked to assist with additional law enforcement.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
289	4	tenderfoot	Leave our beautiful resort area to bicyclists, hikers, fishermen and boaters—these do not make noise and pollution.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The National Forests are managed to provide opportunities for all types of recreation, not just the 4 you mention.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
308	7	tenderfoot	Let's not make it worst and cause increased life hazards.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
193	1	tenderfoot	Living in Corinthian Hill for the past 15 years, and having to endure motorized vehicles, at this point, a low level, and reading about this proposed motor-cross, really infuriates me. I cannot believe that the Forest Service would sacrifice the wildlife, but also those of us who have been living in this area. It seems no real consideration has been given to the fact that such an increase in the numbers of motorized vehicles, and the impact of those numbers will have. For all of us who would be impacted, there are only negatives.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat. A motorcycle trail system was proposed. Motocross is a very small area with intense, concentrated use. There has been a "motocross" area on Summit County property adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery. This area is not on the National Forest and management of that area is not included in this plan.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
102	3	tenderfoot	Major problems also exist with safety of the mountain bicyclists, hikers and wildlife as well as unacceptable fire risk. Tenderfoot Mountain is not the place for this type of outdoor activity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
20	2	tenderfoot	Most importantly, an increase in the motorized vehicle use of the trail system represents a significant danger to the non-motorized trail users engaging in year round activities such as hiking, biking, cross-country skiing, horse-back riding, sledding and other wonderful outdoor pursuits. These activities are gentle to the environment and do not endanger other trail users or wildlife. In contrast, it only takes on "out of control" motorized vehicle to cause a life-threatening accident.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
362	3	tenderfoot	Most users of the high country value the peace, tranquility and seclusion that it affords. What end is served by adding noise pollution, air pollution as well as an element of danger to existing users, and homeowners? How is this possibly justified, given the risk to wildlife?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
370	3	tenderfoot	Most users of the high country value the peace, tranquility and seclusion that it affords. What end is served by adding noise pollution, air pollution as well as an element of danger to existing users, and homeowners? How is this possibly justified, given the risk to wildlife?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is not summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine the possible effects a motorcycle trail system would have on lynx habitat	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
318	2	tenderfoot	Motorcycles may need a space to ride but it should not be in a heavily populated area. The north side of Tenderfoot might be acceptable as there is already noise pollution from I-70 there and no housing. The wildlife problem wouldn't be solved though.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
25	3	tenderfoot	Motorcycles spook horses which means head injuries.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
214	2	tenderfoot	Motorized vehicles travel the road systems year round as it is. I question the need to have them ruining alpine tundra. Outdoor motorist enthusiasts do not drive their snowmobiles and dirt bikes through other neighborhoods yards and parks. I'm not sure why this is different. Please respect our wildlife and our neighborhoods and keep the motorized vehicles on the roads. We are not saying "not here" we are saying please stay on the roads.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
24	2	tenderfoot	My concern as a homeowner is that of safety, from the perspective of the prevention of forest fires. The concern about fire is one that is very real and exists throughout Colorado because of the pine beetle devastation of the lodgepole pine population. As a motorcycle rider, I know that most motorcycles have appropriate equipment to prevent sparks from migrating outside the engine and electrical system. However, there are certainly dirt bikes and off-road motorcycles that don't have that protection, and their use on single-track trails immediately adjacent to the forest presents an increased risk of fire. The Forest Service has recognized the problem and danger in its handout Spark Arrester Guide, Off-Highway Vehicles, Volume 3. (4/2007). There would be no way to regulate the use of the proposed trails to properly equipped motorcycles, except perhaps the self-enforcement would not be able to patrol those areas sufficiently to assure safe equipment was used, any more than they are able to prevent forest fires by patrolling the existing trail system that doesn't have motorcycle use.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use and fire safety. ALL motorcycles are required to have spark arresters when used on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
18	2	tenderfoot	My family and I adamantly object to the existing trails, not to mention increasing the availability of trails for motorcycles along this corridor. This past summer, the noise generated by the motorcycle activity was constant, oppressive, and down-right depressing. Honestly, I just don't understand why this is being allowed so close to residential areas. The area, once a quiet place to reflect, hike, visit the cemetery, and enjoy nature, now looks and sounds like a speedway... the exact opposite of what so many of us in Summerwood, and the Colorado mountains, are looking for.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest and further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
18	5	tenderfoot	My family and I are offended by what is going on, and strongly request that you understand and respect the degradation to the quality of life of the many homeowners and wildlife along this corridor.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
196	3	tenderfoot	My guess is that less than 1 % of the population engages in this form of motorized recreation. Why should the other 99% of the population be expected to submit to all the negative consequences? There are plenty of other areas away from populated areas that are better suited for motorized recreation than the Tenderfoot Mountain location. Please do what you can.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. The National Forests are managed for ALL people, including motorcycle riders.	Designation of Lands
208	1	tenderfoot	My husband and I are strongly against the proposed ATV Motorized Trails proposed on Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
130	1	tenderfoot	<p>My husband Bill and I have had a home in the Summerwood neighborhood across from Tenderfoot Mountain in Summit County Colorado for 20 years.</p> <p>We are extremely opposed to the proposed motorcycle trail idea for Tenderfoot Mountain. We spend time in Summit County for the peace, tranquility and the pristine beauty. The motorcycle trail plan would devastate the mountain and devastate the tranquility of our neighborhood.</p> <p>Please stop this madness....Motorcycle noise; ruination of the ecosystem of the mountain...is unthinkable.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
199	4	tenderfoot	<p>My main concern about the WRNF proposal and the SCORR Grant request is:</p> <p>Fire – That whole side of Tenderfoot is already brown from the Pine Beetles. Red Hot exhaust pipes parking in dried grass for a lunch break sounds kind of risky. Actually, I was surprised to read that you are supporting this plan. I think approving this plan would be totally irresponsible.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
199	3	tenderfoot	<p>My main concern about the WRNF proposal and the SCORR Grant request is:</p> <p>Live-ability – I bought my property there for a peaceful, beautiful, and tranquil getaway. Not a viewing platform for Motocross practice.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. A motorcycle trail system was proposed. Motocross is a very small area with intense, concentrated use. There has been a "motocross" area on Summit County property adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery. This area is not on the National Forest and management of that area is not included in this plan.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
199	2	tenderfoot	<p>My main concern about the WRNF proposal and the SCORR Grant request is:</p> <p>Property Values- I already lost one Summerwood buyer when he heard the dirt bikes across the valley when he was looking to purchase one of my Summerwood properties. "I really like everything about the location but it's just too noisy for me..." If SCORR gets their way, the problem will only get worse and this could have a huge financial impact on me.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest and further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Private Property
96	1	tenderfoot	<p>My opposition to this proposal by the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) is based on major concerns about safety, noise levels, fire danger, and the impact on the environment. This type of activity is entirely too close to the Keystone Resort and the neighborhoods between Dillon, CO and Montezuma Rd. on the east end of Keystone. With over 2.3 million acres in the White River National Forest, there must be a more suitable place for this type of activity.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
519	6	tenderfoot	<p>No one is enforcing the existing trail system. Why should we expect any better enforcement of an expanded system?</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Forest Service has multiple resources for education and enforcement to deter illegal off-trail use. Enforcement of OHV use in the area has been deferred until after the travel plan decision.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
525	6	tenderfoot	<p>No one seemed to care, about the impact it will have on the citizens of Corinthian Hills by opening up this trail to a very bothersome nuisance.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Private Property
201	6	tenderfoot	<p>Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
399	5	tenderfoot	<p>Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
180	4	tenderfoot	Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
252	4	tenderfoot	Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
293	5	tenderfoot	Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for daytime and 50 dba for night. We believe motorcycles and dirt bikes easily exceed those noise output levels. Clearly the noise level from motorcycles and dirt bikes is unacceptable, and will destroy the peacefulness of the Enclave community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
146	6	tenderfoot	<p>Noise Level</p> <p>□</p> <p>My family has been resident in Keystone since 1979, when we purchased our first condominium in Snowdance. One of the primary reasons for acquiring our current property in The Enclave was its proximity to the undeveloped National Forest land to the north.</p> <p>The existence of a motorized vehicle trail near to The Enclave would be most disruptive of the tranquility for which we obtained our property. The noise level of motorized vehicles of the sort that would use the Tenderfoot trail would surely exceed the limits imposed by Summit County for residential areas. This concern is not just for residents of The Enclave, but indeed for all residents of Keystone near the River Run area.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
274	1	tenderfoot	<p>Noise pollution to those of us living in and around the Snake River Basin is a problem that we do not wish to see increased by a motorized trail system between Dillon and Keystone.</p> <p>One of the reasons we live here is because of the peace and quiet of this area. The sound of motorized vehicles carries across the valley now; we can't imagine how noisy it would be if motorized traffic was permitted on the trails between Dillon and Keystone. Why not permit motorized vehicles on trails which are far removed from residential areas?</p> <p>It is wonderful to open our windows in the summer and hears only the sounds of nature; please don't change that.</p> <p>Our beautiful Summit County trails have been developed for hikers, mountain bikers, horses, and should not be available to motorized traffic.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
563	1	tenderfoot	<p>Noise pollution to those of us living in and around the Snake River Basin is a problem that we do not wish to see increased by a motorized trail system between Dillon and Keystone.</p> <p>One of the reasons we live here is because of the peace and quiet of this rural area.</p> <p>Although the community / sub-division of Whispering Pines Ranch is approx 1 1/2 miles from the nearest point of any such trail, we can already hear clearly the sounds of a motorized vehicle as far away as the trail(s) around the Dillon cemetery.</p>		Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
525	3	tenderfoot	Noise, the noise level at present is very bothersome to us when they are on the trail. This is all new this year to the residents of Corinthian Hills. We never had motor bikes or ATV's in our backyards as we have had this year.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
371	5	tenderfoot	Noise: The Snake River basin is extremely narrow in the vicinity of the Keystone community and noise from all motorized traffic reverberates off both walls of the valley. In 2000, the county enacted an ordinance which restricts noise levels to 55 dba during the day and 50 dba at night. It is my understanding that there is or may be legislation in the future to restrict noise levels on the Federal Forest Service Lands to 97 dba. Since the decibel scale is logarithmic, this means that 97 dba is several times louder than 50 dba, not just twice as much. Some of the proposed motorcycle trails are barely 200 vertical feet above homeowners association on the north side of US 6 in Keystone. The noise from the motorcycles will be heard by everyone in the valley.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
18	6	tenderfoot	Not only am I requesting that you cancel any plans to expand the trail system, but that you close the existing trail system to all motorcycle riding.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
210	3	tenderfoot	Not only is it not fitting to have this activity nearby homes, but creating a disturbance for those folks trying to honor their dead in the Dillon Cemetery is extremely inconsiderate.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Private Property
28	6	tenderfoot	Nowhere can the degradation of the environment in this area by motorcycles be better evidenced than on the western part of the county landfill property where the motorcycles have cut new trails through the wetlands, caused substantial erosion and introduced abundant species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free only a few years ago.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The area referenced is on Summit County property. The Forest Service has several resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
32	6	tenderfoot	Nowhere can the degradation of the environment in this area by motorcycles be better evidenced than on the western part of the county landfill property where the motorcycles have cut new trails through the wetlands, caused substantial erosion and introduced abundant species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free only a few years ago.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The area referenced is on Summit County property. The Forest Service has several resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
56	6	tenderfoot	Nowhere can the degradation of the environment in this area by motorcycles be better evidenced than on the western part of the county landfill property where the motorcycles have cut new trails through the wetlands, caused substantial erosion and introduced abundant species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free only a few years ago.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The area referenced is on Summit County property. The Forest Service has several resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
62	6	tenderfoot	Nowhere can the degradation of the environment in this area by motorcycles be better evidenced than on the western part of the county landfill property where the motorcycles have cut new trails through the wetlands, caused substantial erosion and introduced abundant species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free only a few years ago.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The area referenced is on Summit County property. The Forest Service has several resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
71	2	tenderfoot	Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues. Another safety concern is the closeness of the trails to Highway 6 in the Keystone area. The motorcycle riders will have easy access to the highway to get to restaurants and bars creating a serious risk to area residents.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. Most motorcycles used on Forest trails are not-street legal and therefore would not be threatening the safety of area residents.	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
399	3	tenderfoot	Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in the area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues. Our communities of residents utilize the present system of trails as they should in harmony with the natural mostly undisturbed terrain. The beauty and peacefulness of the area would be replaced by noise, dirt and the danger of accidents.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. Most motorcycles used on Forest trails are not-street legal and therefore would not be threatening the safety of area residents.	Traffic Control and Safety
180	2	tenderfoot	Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in the area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. I don't have to explain horses and motor bikes don't mix very well.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
70	2	tenderfoot	Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every sing trail in the area, which historically have been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues. Our three year old granddaughter plays behind our unit when she visits from Denver and our children's dogs walk there. The beauty and peacefulness of the area would be replaced by noise, dirt and the danger of accidents.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
293	3	tenderfoot	Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in the area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues. Our communities of residents utilize the present system of trails as they should in harmony with the natural mostly undisturbed terrain. The beauty and peacefulness of the area would be replaced by noise, dirt and the danger of accidents.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
8	2	tenderfoot	<p>On a daily basis, we hike and snow shoe on the Tenderfoot Trail, depending on the season, and never miss a day. Because we go on the trail on a daily basis, in all weather, we have seen a lot of wildlife, and we have noticed an increase in motorized vehicles, and a decrease in seeing elk and deer. The motorized vehicles continue to squeeze their respective habitat.</p> <p>Two years ago in the autumn while we were hiking up the Forest Service Road off the Tenderfoot Trail, between the Town of Dillon Cemetery and the Corinthian Hill sub division, we heard a motor bike approaching from the east, and from the sound we realized that it was coming closer to us. Suddenly we saw a deer in a full out run coming towards us, maybe just 12 feet from us, a look of terror on her face, she then saw us and turned her body toward the creek, and it was then that we saw 5 deer behind her and not far from the motorbike. It was a very concerning event for us since the deer was scared and spooked and came very close to us causing a dangerous situation for us and for the deer.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The incident you refer to does not sound like the rider was purposely chasing the deer.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
12	1	tenderfoot	On behalf of the entire Corinthian Hill Property Owners Association, this letter is to express our concerns in regard to the proposed increase of motorized off-road usage on Tenderfoot Mountain. When discussing this issue we hope that the U.S. Forest Service will consider the negative impacts that this addition of 32 miles of motorized usage would have on the residents of Corinthian Hill, our trail systems, and our wildlife.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
146	4	tenderfoot	One of the great blessings of the National Forest area through which the Tenderfoot trail is proposed to run is the abundance of wildlife, including elk, deer, coyote and lynx that inhabit the area. A noisy thoroughfare would disrupt their habitat and drive them away.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
437	3	tenderfoot	Opening this area [Tenderfoot Trail] up to off road motorcycles and ATVs could lead to a wildfire, and that's a pretty scary thought here in the center of a tinder-dry beetle devastated forest. One spark or a carelessly tossed cigarette butt could be extremely costly in terms of human life, wildlife, property, and firefighting resources and personnel.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
26	7	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>□</p> <p>Wildfire danger near populated areas caused by hot mufflers and engine components.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
26	6	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Impact on elk calving areas and other wildlife impacts.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
26	3	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Likelihood of unacceptable engine noise and dust levels.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
26	4	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Potential abuse, such as discarded trash and creation of "unofficial" new trails.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.</p>	<p>Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)</p>
26	2	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Proposed and existing motorcycle trails are too close to urban locations (less than 200 feet of some Keystone condos and homes).</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."</p>	<p>Private Property</p>
26	5	tenderfoot	<p>Oppose any new proposed trails for motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trails as contained in the White River National Forest (WRNF) Travel Management Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Social trails cut through sensitive environmental areas and wetlands.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).</p>	<p>Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)</p>
32	5	tenderfoot	<p>Our [Keystone Citizens League] concern is for the environment. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern half of this area is also excellent lynx habitat according to the Department of Wildlife. Also, according to a 1995 U.S. Forestry Service report (Biological Evaluation for the Proposed Oro Grande Trail – Tenderfoot Mountain Area) wildlife biologist Kathleen Phelps identified potential habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species of plants and animals. In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that ranges in elevation from 9,070 to 9,600 feet and extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the limits of this fen site.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited. Further study is needed to determine any potential effect to lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
279	2	tenderfoot	Our [Keystone Neighbourhood Company] concerns range from issues with excessive noise caused by motorized vehicles and lack of ability for local law enforcement to enforce rules associated with use of these trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
56	5	tenderfoot	Our concern is for the environment. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern half of this area is also excellent lynx habitat according to the Department of Wildlife. Also, according to a 1955 U.S. Forestry Service report (Biological Evaluation for the Proposed Oro Grande Trail – Tenderfoot Mountain Area) wildlife biologist Kathleen Phelps identified potential habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species of plants and animals. In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that ranged in elevation from 9,070 to 9,600 feet and extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the limits of this fen site.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
62	5	tenderfoot	Our concern is for the environment. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern half of this area is also excellent lynx habitat according to the Department of Wildlife. Also, according to a 1955 U.S. Forestry Service report (Biological Evaluation for the Proposed Oro Grande Trail – Tenderfoot Mountain Area) wildlife biologist Kathleen Phelps identified potential habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species of plants and animals. In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that ranged in elevation from 9,070 to 9,600 feet and extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the limits of this fen site.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
28	5	tenderfoot	Our concern is for the environment. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern half of this area is also excellent lynx habitat according to the Department of Wildlife. Also, according to a 1995 U.S. Forestry Service report (Biological Evaluation for the Proposed Oro Grande Trail – Tenderfoot Mountain Area) wildlife biologist Kathleen Phelps identified potential habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species of plants and animals. In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that ranges in elevation from 9,070 to 9,600 feet and extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the limits of this fen site. Details from this report and the site map are attached.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
21	6	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: "Social" trails cut through sensitive "fen" flora and encroachment on wetlands.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
21	7	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: Impact on the elk calving area and other wildlife.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
21	4	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: Likelihood of unacceptable engine noise and dust levels.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
21	3	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: Potential abuse, such as discarded trash and the creation of unofficial new trails (essentially, there is now a "terrain park" adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery).	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails). The terrain park near the Dillon Cemetery is on Summit County property and not included in this analysis.	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
21	5	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: Proposed motorcycle trails are too close to urban interface (within 200 vertical feet of less of some Keystone condos and home).	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
21	2	tenderfoot	Our concern of expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor is: Wildfire danger near populated areas (grass and timber fires caused by hot mufflers or engines).	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
152	1	tenderfoot	Our family strongly opposes the Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system. We believe motorbike traffic in the national forest should be kept to an absolute minimum if allowed at all.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
279	6	tenderfoot	Our main concern is the strong likelihood of a wild fire. The possibility of sparks from the hot mufflers on motors flying into dry grass' and into dead lodge pole pine areas presents an unacceptable risk to the (already at risk) area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
68	6	tenderfoot	<p>Our other major concerns [include]:</p> <p>Environment – The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat. In 1997, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program identified the 500 acre Dillon Bay fen site that extends from Highway 6 to near the top of Tenderfoot Mountain. The Oro Grande bicycle trail bisects this site. A large number of SCORR's proposed motorcycle trails are within the area of the fen site. The damage to the environment in this area caused by motorcycles can be seen on the western part of the County landfill where motorcycles have carried many species of noxious weeds to an area that was weed free just a few years ago, caused substantial erosion and cut new trails through the wetlands. Dust and erosion problems will also occur.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. The area north of Tenderfoot is managed for wildlife where motorized uses are limited. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas. The area referenced is on Summit County property. The Forest Service has several resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
68	3	tenderfoot	<p>Our other major concerns [include]:</p> <p>Noise Level – The Snake River basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In Summit County the noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dba for the daytime and 50dba for night. We understand there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dba at some unknown time in the future. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the residents, visitors and guests in the valley.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p>	Activities on Public Lands (General)
68	7	tenderfoot	<p>Our other major concerns [include]:</p> <p>Private Property Valuation degradation - The noise, dirt, erosion and unsightliness of these trails will all reduce the value of adjacent private property.</p> <p>In conclusion, to mitigate the fire risk, the safety issues, the many environmental concerns, and noise pollution, we strongly object to the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR. While motorcycle riders do need space to ride, it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. Existing areas would seem to be adequate or with the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Why not use the State grant money to design and construct motorcycle only trails in an appropriate location.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect</p>	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
68	4	tenderfoot	<p>Our other major concerns [include]:</p> <p>Safety Issues - Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles consist of all the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues between motorized vehicles and human and horse users.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible</p>	<p>Traffic Control and Safety</p>
56	2	tenderfoot	<p>Our principal concern is the strong likelihood of starting a wildfire. Use by dirt bikes that have no spark arresters on single trail trails immediately adjacent to the forest vegetation presents an unacceptable risk. As you are well aware, essentially every mature lodgepole pine is dead in this area or soon will be. Even without the motorcycle/dirt bikes the potential for a wildfire is substantial.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
62	2	tenderfoot	<p>Our principal concern is the strong likelihood of starting a wildfire. Use by dirt bikes that have no spark arresters on single trail trails immediately adjacent to the forest vegetation presents an unacceptable risk. As you are well aware, essentially every mature lodgepole pine is dead in this area or soon will be. Even without the motorcycles/dirt bikes the potential for a wildfire is substantial.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
28	2	tenderfoot	<p>Our principal concern is the strong likelihood of starting a wildfire. Use by dirt bikes that have no spark arresters on single track trails immediately adjacent to the forest vegetation presents an unacceptable risk. As you are well aware, essentially every mature lodgepole pine is dead in this area or soon will be. Even without the motorcycles/dirt bikes the potential for a wildfire is substantial.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
32	2	tenderfoot	<p>Our principal concern is the strong likelihood of starting a wildfire. Use by dirt bikes that have no spark arresters on single tract trails immediately adjacent to the forest vegetation presents an unacceptable risk. As you are well aware, essentially every mature lodgepole pine is dead in this area or soon will be. Even without the motorcycles/dirt bikes the potential for a wildfire is substantial.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
516	2	tenderfoot	<p>Over the past several years, we have listened to the dirt bike noise across the valley and have watched the riders gradually increase their area of operation, beyond what I understand to be authorized. However the current proposal goes far beyond the existing usage and will detract considerably from the mountain experience for homeowners from Corinthian Hill to Keystone and other visitors who frequent the Tenderfoot area, to say nothing about the tranquility around the cemetery.</p> <p>We respect the multiple use concept of our public lands. However something as noisy and intrusive as an enlarged motorcycle or ATV park would be much better suited for an area such as the Elliott Ridge, outside of Montezuma or in the Swan River drainage where there already is considerable off-road vehicle traffic and very few if any residences.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
289	2	tenderfoot	People come to Keystone for the peaceful, natural beauty of the area. There is no reason to allow off-road biking in such a pretty recreation area. The noise will disturb the wildlife and the peace and tranquility we all enjoy today.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
186	1	tenderfoot	<p>Please add my name to the growing list of Keystone property owners opposed to opening trails near residential areas, such as the Enclave, to motorcycles and dirt bike riders. I share the same concerns for fire, noise, environment, home values and safety as other owners.</p> <p>Please deny the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR. It's a wonderful area. Don't mess things up.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible</p>	Private Property
15	15	tenderfoot	Please cancel any plans to expand the trail system, and close this pseudo-existing trail system to all motorcycle riding.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
48	6	tenderfoot	<p>Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.]</p> <p>[The] impact on the elk calving area and other wildlife.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Technical Studies (Resource Reports, etc.)
48	5	tenderfoot	<p>Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.]</p> <p>"Social" trails cut through sensitive "fen" flora and encroachment on wetlands.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
48	3	tenderfoot	<p>Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.]</p> <p>Likelihood of unacceptable engine noise and dust levels.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
48	4	tenderfoot	<p>Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.]</p> <p>Potential abuse, such as discarded trash and the creation of unofficial new trails (essentially, there is now a "terrain park" adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery).</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p> <p>The terrain park near the Dillon Cemetery is on Summit County property and not included in this analysis.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
48	2	tenderfoot	Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.] Proposed motorcycle trails are too close to urban interface.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
48	7	tenderfoot	Please consider the following [issue] before you make your final decision for or against. [New and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.] Wildfire danger near populated areas (grass and timber fires caused by hot mufflers or engines). The trails directly above the Keystone homes impose a particular danger of wildfire starting so close to homes that evacuation may be precluded.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Private Property
97	4	tenderfoot	Please do not allow increased motorized vehicle usage between the water plant and cemetery in Dillon.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
197	3	tenderfoot	Please do not approve this request to have motorized trails on Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
129	4	tenderfoot	Please do not close existing national forest motorized trails! [A] Specific area of my concern and many of the motorized active users in this area is: Tenderfoot Mountain. - N. of Hwy 6 between Dillon and Keystone (Cemetery Riding area) This area is an important site that has been a work in progress with the Summit County Off Road Riders club, along with the USFS and Colorado State Parks. Alternative "G" is the only plan in the works that will let the planning process that we as a group have been applying our efforts to make a sustainable, safe, managed recreational area happen. Please do not negate our efforts; this is a great addition to and for Summit County and its motorized users!	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
132	4	tenderfoot	Please do not destroy the little of the beautiful land that is left along US 6. [By allowing motorized vehicles.]	Alternative GM does not include any single-track motorized trails, however, the presence of trails in the National Forest does not destroy the land.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
299	1	tenderfoot	Please keep dirt biking open in all areas in our country.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Designation of Lands
8	8	tenderfoot	Please keep in mind there is a cemetery in the area [Tenderfoot Trail] and the noise does not provide a serene area for the visitors to the loved one and friends of the deceased.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
308	6	tenderfoot	Please let's reduce noise pollution.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
20	4	tenderfoot	Please protect and preserve our trail system for all users.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
70	8	tenderfoot	Please save the environment, peacefulness and beauty of the area for our grandchildren and their children to enjoy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
192	6	tenderfoot	Please save the environment, peacefulness and beauty of the area for our grandchildren and their children to enjoy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
252	8	tenderfoot	Please save the environment, peacefulness and beauty of the area for our grandchildren and their children to enjoy.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
527	4	tenderfoot	Potential trespassing beyond posted boundary lines by those who don't abide [by] rules.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Private Property
363	5	tenderfoot	Realizing that you want alternatives rather than just a resounding "no motorcycles," you should consider sites that are further removed from the more populated areas. Peru Creek and Montezuma seem to be much better alternatives for the motorcycle traffic.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system	Private Property
218	4	tenderfoot	Reason for disallowing all motorized use of this trail is safety. Blind curves, crowding from increased motorized use, irresponsible riders (some possibly under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs) and narrow trails are a time bomb for physical harm or death for hikers, bikers, dogs, and wild animals (this includes the motorcycle riders themselves). By designating the trail for heavy motorcycle usage so close to a residential neighborhood, it would seem that the Forest Service understands the problem and is prepared to accept responsibility and liability for any resulting physical harm to users of the trail.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Traffic Control and Safety
109	9	tenderfoot	Regarding Tenderfoot Mountain, again, I like Alternative G. There is a road and a single track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
203	1	tenderfoot	Regarding the proposed changes to the motorized use of trails on the Tenderfoot Mountain area of the National Forest Land above Dillon Colorado. For the safety and peace of mind of homeowners and wildlife please do not open this area to motorized use.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
8	7	tenderfoot	Safety for the foot traffic should be concern one. Pedestrians seem to have no standing with these off road riders, as we do not want them on the trail they feel the same way and they demonstrate their feelings with their engine noise, speed and the throwing dust and dirt in our faces. The forest ranger we met with yesterday told us the off road riders are going to enforce the riders to do what is right, this is an oxymoron because they cannot be up on the trails at all times. So there will be no enforcement of the area [Tenderfoot Trail].	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Traffic Control and Safety
371	3	tenderfoot	Safety Issues: The traditional users of the trails in this area have been horseback riders, hikers and mountain bikers. Keystone Resort leads horseback riding groups, from their stables on the Wintergreen property in Keystone, on all of the single track trails and jeep roads in the Frey Gulch portion of this area. Sharing every single trail with motorcycles is an unacceptable risk for the traditional users.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
525	2	tenderfoot	Safety, at present we use this trail every day for hiking purposes. At present with the ATV's and motor bikes it has become very dangerous for walkers, hikers as well as their animals. The riders do not slow up for foot traffic. On many occasions the riders have total disregard for foot traffic and come dangerously close on the path.	Alternative GM does include very few trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
60	1	tenderfoot	Should the pending WRNF Travel Management Plan be approved to expand motorcycle use along the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor, many people in this area will suffer the results. Those who will be negatively impacted include residents in Summerwood, Corinthian Hills, Summit Cove, and all who live or work in the north Keystone area along highway 6 (including Sunrise, Quick Silver, Tennis Town homes, Cabins in the Pines, Sts. John Condo, the Keystone Center, The Keystone Convention Center, the Enclave, and others). The residents of the Sts. John Condominium, located in the Keystone area, are extremely concerned about the possibility of increased motorcycle activity near our 55 unit condo building. The SCORR proposal, if approved, will allow an existing hiking trail, located just behind the Sts. John condo, to become a motorcycle trail. Since this trail is within 200 vertical feet or less of our building (as well as several other Keystone condos and homes), we have every reason to be concerned. Motorcycle trails in or near the urban interface should not be allowed.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Private Property
72	1	tenderfoot	Should the pending WRNF Travel Management Plan be approved to expand motorcycle use along the Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor, there would be significant negative impact on the quality of living in this area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
138	2	tenderfoot	Since we bought our home in Summerwood eight years ago, noise pollution from the highway has increased substantially. Given the geography of the area, which is somewhat of a valley, noise from cars, trucks and snowplows tends to travel straight into our community. This would increase dramatically if motorcycles are given access to the Tenderfoot Trails. I bought a home in the mountains for the peace and tranquility, not to hear motorcycles revving their engines.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
197	2	tenderfoot	Summit County gets 2 good months of summer each year. The rest of the time would be dangerous for motorcyclists to travel here. We have heavy rains and it can snow at any time of the year. Making trails to encourage motorcyclists from all over the country to travel here would make them assume this area is ideal for motorcyclists. I disagree.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
415	11	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting singletrack northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
415	10	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a road and a singletrack that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down .	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
398	8	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain - north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. The local SCORR club has been working to expand this network of trails in a partnership plan with the USFS. OHV Grants have been submitted and awarded for trail design, construction and NEPA. Alternative G has designated all but a couple trails as motorized single track, and as you would expect, it is being contested. Be sure to comment that we like the all trails in alternative G (and why) and are committed to the SCORR expansion project in this area. Here are a couple bullet points: - There is a road and a single track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down. - There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
510	2	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain - north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
125	10	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting singletrack northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
510	1	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain - north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a road and a single track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
125	9	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone. There is a road and a singletrack that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	17	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone: There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of “journey” to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
175	16	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain – north of Hwy 6 from Dillon to Keystone: There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 & 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
19	4	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain has a significant local Cemetery that needs to be respected in honor of those who have gone before us. We ask you to eliminate this very growing problem.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
446	3	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system: The SFTS [Summit Fat Tire Society] applauds many of the accomplishments of the Summit County Off Road riders (SCORR) and its efforts to educate motorized users in proper conduct in the backcountry.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Outreach/Education
301	39	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain -There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
301	38	tenderfoot	Tenderfoot Mountain -There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
122	1	tenderfoot	Thank you for allowing us to ride and enjoy this area [ATV/Motorcycle friendly] and please allow us to continue doing so.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
520	1	tenderfoot	The additional Motorcycle Trail being proposed would be a disaster to our quiet mountain life. As an alternative, we suggest that the motorcyclists be allowed to roar up and down their own neighborhoods to their own neighbor's discontent rather than ours. Please, please do everything you can to kill this proposal.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
362	2	tenderfoot	The area [Tenderfoot Mountain] already represents a significant fire hazard with the dead and damaged lodge pole pines. The idea of adding motorized vehicles with hot mufflers is unconscionable.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
370	2	tenderfoot	The area already represents a significant fire hazard with the dead and damaged lodge pole pines. The idea of adding motorized vehicles with hot mufflers is unconscionable.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
193	5	tenderfoot	The attitude of the riders is very poor, and when you request that they slow down, a lot of times they go faster or shout out obscenities. Those who partake in this form of recreation are only interested in the Speed and the Noise.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
146	2	tenderfoot	The creation of trails in the proposed area would present considerable hazard to the many young children and adults who use the area behind The Enclave properties for recreational purposes. My children and I own a unit in The Enclave, and my eight grandchildren, all of whom live in the Denver area and use our unit frequently, often hike and play in that area. The existence of relatively high-speed motorized vehicles in the area would be dangerous, not only to my direct family members, but also to the many other families who own property in The Enclave and nearby.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
12	2	tenderfoot	The current [Tenderfoot Mountain] trail system exposes the residents of Corinthian Hill to excessive noise pollution, as well as to noxious exhaust, dust and airborne debris being carried into the homes in the development, particularly during the summer months when windows and doors are open. If the proposed expansion of motorized vehicle usage on this trail system were to become a reality, residents of Corinthian Hill would be subjected to a substantial increase in these problem areas.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
317	2	tenderfoot	The current trail use has shown (1) an increasing year around disregard by motorized users of the existing trails, (2)making new trails, (3) removing barriers to keep them off shoulders, (4) showing disregard for pedestrians, dogs, and horses. Increasing trash is a daily occurrence.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
317	4	tenderfoot	The current trail use has shown an; the whole mountain is already stressed by motorized overuse, leading to decreased grazing area in the lower levels. Pine beetle infestation is leading to increased fire danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
519	8	tenderfoot	The devastation on the forest on Tenderfoot Mountain by the Mountain Pine Bark Beetle has greatly increased the risk of wildfire. Allowing motorcycles with hot with hot engines and mufflers, even with spark arrestors (if the requirement were to be enforced) increases the risk of wildfire. Are the riders who have abused the existing system going to respect the danger of wildfire by maintaining a fire-safe condition of their bikes or properly controlling the embers or butts from their cigarettes?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
526	8	tenderfoot	The devastation on the forest on Tenderfoot Mountain by the Mountain Pine Bark Beetle has greatly increased the risk of wildfire. Allowing motorcycles with hot with hot engines and mufflers, even with spark arrestors (if the requirement were to be enforced) increases the risk of wildfire. Are the riders who have abused the existing system going to respect the danger of wildfire by maintaining a fire-safe condition of their bikes or properly controlling the embers or butts from their cigarettes?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
544	6	tenderfoot	The Dillon Cemetery is one of the most valued and heavily utilized public assets in Summit County. Friends, families and loved ones have the expectation of enjoying this asset without the intrusion of noise and dust created by motorized recreation users. Under Alternative G, the SCORR proposal for a motorcycle practice area immediately adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery would be permitted, pending NEPA approval. We respectfully submit that this situation would be completely unacceptable to the Town of Dillon, and the Town would consider all options for opposing and halting such a project.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
515	3	tenderfoot	The Dillon Cemetery should be a place for quiet remembrance and reflection.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
519	3	tenderfoot	The Dillon Cemetery: A place for quiet remembrance and reflection that was for at least one of our homeowners visiting a friend's graveside shattered by motorcycle noise, an experience that engendered intense emotion when recounted.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
526	3	tenderfoot	The Dillon Cemetery: A place for quiet remembrance and reflection that was for at least one of our homeowners visiting a friend's graveside shattered by motorcycle noise, an experience that engendered intense emotion when recounted.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
526	7	tenderfoot	The elk herd regularly viewed from our homes over the years seems to visit less frequently. Are they being impacted by the motorcycles and noise?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
515	7	tenderfoot	The elk herd regularly viewed from the community over the years, seems to visit less frequently. Are they being impacted by the motorcycles and noise?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
181	2	tenderfoot	The Enclave property line abuts the WRNF and the plat we reviewed places motorized trail very close to our property line. Residents unquestionably will hear the motorized vehicles and possibly see them from their back patios. And, it would almost be a certainty that motorized users would stray from designated trails and possibly trespass on Enclave property. How would you prevent this?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences and (the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
399	6	tenderfoot	It is inconceivable to us, and all Enclave owners, that the United States Forest Service and/or the Colorado Parks System would even give consideration to such a proposal, much less allow motorized trails so close to well, long established residential areas. You have already heard strong opposition from our Enclave Board of Directors in this regard and also from the Board of the 400 member Keystone Citizens League, as well as several individual KCL members, including us. The entire area earmarked for the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System is within winter and summer elk habitat, an elk migration corridor and an elk calving area on Tenderfoot Mountain. The eastern part of this area is also excellent lynx habitat. We have always enjoyed seeing wildlife behind our units.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
146	5	tenderfoot	The existence of the trail would adversely affect, to a significant degree, the natural vegetation of the area. It is one thing for hikers and mountain bikers to use the area – it is quite another for motorcycles, dirt bikes and ATVs to be there. Not only would flora be damaged near the trail, erosion caused by digging of the trail by motorized tires would threaten other vegetation below the trail.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
19	3	tenderfoot	The existing motorcycle noise during the summer months is most annoying to those of us in our subdivision that enjoys the use of our decks in a quite atmosphere. If these trails continue, property values could be greatly affected.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
523	4	tenderfoot	The Forest Service should move the trails to south and east of Keystone areas that do not impact local homeowners. The current plan will impact Summerwood, Corinthian Hills, Summit Cove and Keystone homeowners, and it will reduce our quality of life and property value. Do the right thing and oppose use of county land for motorized vehicles near homes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Private Property
146	3	tenderfoot	The increased danger of fire in the area [The Enclave], caused by the use of motorized vehicles, would pose a significant threat to our and other communities in proximity to the proposed trail. We have viewed the danger of fire in the area as a concern for many years, and the trail would surely add to that danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Private Property
363	3	tenderfoot	The increased motorcycle traffic will increase the risk of wildfires that may threaten nearby home such as mine.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
30	2	tenderfoot	The increased noise would be an annoyance but not a danger. However, it would certainly be unpleasant for those who like to enjoy our mountains with the peacefulness of foot and horseback travel.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
363	4	tenderfoot	The increased use of the trailhead near the Dillon Cemetery will only exacerbate the current noise pollution that is wholly inconsistent with what was intended when the cemetery was established.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
411	2	tenderfoot	The Keystone Center strongly opposes the designation of the overall Tenderfoot Mountain as a motorized play area under Alternative G.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
218	7	tenderfoot	The lots and homes at the top of our subdivision have always demanded premiums due to better views, greater distance from Highway 6 noise and the tranquility of backing up to Forest Service land. Putting a new designated "highway" right behind the most valuable homes in our subdivision would be a financial disaster on top of the already difficult real estate market.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
528	4	tenderfoot	The lower portion of Tenderfoot Mountain provides habitat for elk and deer, and these trails would impact their migration patterns and nesting areas.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
74	4	tenderfoot	The motor cycles have generated dust, litter, perhaps sparks, a few near hits to runner and hikers and the promise of lowering property values.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
19	2	tenderfoot	The motorcycles are destroying the landscape and curtailing the movement of wildlife mainly the elk herds that populate the area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
74	3	tenderfoot	The motorized traffic is using Tenderfoot Mt. 24/7 with no monitoring or sensitivity to the environment. Who approved the current use and why weren't the 100's of humans, who are impacted ever polled on this? There is no consideration for the residents living nearby that have to listen to nature being drowned out by the loud engines, while trying to relax on ones deck or sleep at night.	This process now is the "poling" referred to. The existing use developed over time, just as numerous hiking and mountain bike use off of designated trails developed. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
531	3	tenderfoot	The negative effect on wildlife in the area and the additional fire danger is also reason to ban any motorized vehicles from these hiking trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
298	3	tenderfoot	The negative impact [from motorbikes] to the animal population and general environment is obvious.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to lynx.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
196	2	tenderfoot	The noise from these motorized vehicles will have a significant impact on our quality of life. Over time, I can see deterioration in property values. Who would choose to live in an area where the summer days are filled with the high decibel sounds coming from these vehicles?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
193	2	tenderfoot	The noise is the main negative. During the summer, with windows and doors open, and wanting to enjoy being outside, with the numbers involved it will be impossible to carry on a conversation. Then, there is the dust, during the summer we don't get much rain, and the trail is very dusty, and again with the large numbers, we will be living under a cloud of dust.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
94	3	tenderfoot	The noise of motorcycles is very offensive when sitting on our deck trying to enjoy a peaceful beautiful day.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
34	4	tenderfoot	<p>The owners will also have reduced rental income. Often owners have repeat renters because they enjoy our environment and this will no longer be the case. Our property values will also decrease because of the noise.</p> <p>The noise will have an impact on the Conference Center, and in particular, when attendees wish to meet or have lunch outside.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
11	2	tenderfoot	The people in this county have worked long and hard to be able to live here and enjoy a certain "quality of life" including peace and quite. Then to, when walking on the Tenderfoot Trail, those same people do not want to be run over by someone going full throttle on one of those ATV's. The noise from the machine would be so loud that the driver would not hear the screams of the person trying to get out of the way.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Traffic Control and Safety
298	2	tenderfoot	The problem is noise generated by motorized vehicles in a very beautiful and peaceful area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
35	1	tenderfoot	The proposal to extend the referenced System further East through the Snake River Valley and Keystone is unbelievably callous. Even though Keystone is a resort, it is still a bedroom community for thousands of residential and condo owners. They would be tragically affected by the noise, visual and environment effects. If they asked for a horse back trail, so be it, but to ask for a motorcycle trail, --300 plus people asking to inconvenience thousands of people?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
181	3	tenderfoot	The proposal, as we understand it, would defeat the very intent of quiet and enjoyable residential properties such as the Enclave. We would urge the granting authorities reject any trail location that is within hearing/sight distance of residential properties, such as ours. Certainly, there are other areas in the WRNF that could accommodate the proposed motorized trail system, while avoiding the negatives and fire danger indicated above!	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Designation of Lands
34	1	tenderfoot	The proposed plan to expand motorcycle trails in the Tenderfoot Mountain corridor is not acceptable to the residents of Sts. John. If there is to be an expansion of motorcycle trails it should not be in an area that negatively impacts the majority of people who wish to enjoy the environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
147	1	tenderfoot	The proposed Tenderfoot Mountain motorcycle trail system that would extend from city of Dillon to the east end of Keystone, along the north side of US 6, is ill advised, ill conceived and not in the best interest of the Summit citizens. The significant negatives of the proposal are environment, safety and aesthetics.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
23	4	tenderfoot	The proposed trails are also too close to urban interface and will cause disturbing engine noise, dust levels, and trash in this beautiful natural setting.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is also needed to determine how close is "too close."	Private Property
527	8	tenderfoot	The quality and serenity of the natural experience will severely be altered.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
42	2	tenderfoot	The reason for my opposition of the Tenderfoot Trail is the impact of motorized traffic on the wildlife in this area. We frequently see elk, coyote, and deer, on the Tenderfoot Trail and in the surrounding area. When hiking the trail I see abundant elk scat all winter and fall. These vehicles will negatively impact the wildlife area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
42	4	tenderfoot	The reason for my opposition of the Tenderfoot Trail is the safety of hikers on the trail. This trail is used extensively by hikers. I hike that trail at least once a day, and often two or three times a day. The safety of hikers is at risk now but is minimal compared to what we will face if motorcycles and snowmobiles are allowed on any of these trails. This trail is often touted by the Forest Service as an excellent beginner trail for visitors, as well as a great hike for the young or older hiker. (I am a volunteer at the Dillon Ranger District, so I know this info first hand).	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Traffic Control and Safety
42	5	tenderfoot	The reason for my opposition of the Tenderfoot Trail is there is enough land in other parts of the county that would be a better fit for the use described here.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
42	3	tenderfoot	The reason for my opposition of the Tenderfoot Trail is visual, noise, and air pollution will accompany the use of motorized vehicles. As a resident in close proximity to these trails, I already see, smell, and hear pollution from the current motor vehicle users.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
566	6	tenderfoot	<p>The RMEC [Rocky Mountain Enduro Circuit] believes that the following changes are necessary before the WR TMP/SDEIS can comply with either the intent, or the requirements of the NEPA process.</p> <p>Tenderfoot Mountain</p> <p>-There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p> <p>-There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H.</p>	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
193	9	tenderfoot	The safety issues involved with both using the area? There is no doubt that there will be accidents. So many negatives. Shame on the Forest Service.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
12	3	tenderfoot	The safety of those walking and hiking the trail is also a major concern of Corinthian Hill homeowners. It would be our hope that all of those who engage in motorized off-road recreation would be considerate of their non-motorized pedestrian comrades, but this simply is not the case. Currently, the motorized usage on the trail endangers hikers and walkers, and this dangerous situation would only get worse as the motorized usage increases. Many Corinthian Hill residents have personally been put in a dangerous situation while hiking due to the recklessness of those who access the trail via ATV's and dirt bikes. More motorized vehicle usage of this trail system would only increase the chances of personal injury and liability.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Traffic Control and Safety
176	3	tenderfoot	The seasons are within 50 feet of the trail. One reason we like the seasons is because of the peace and quiet. Motorcycles would surely impact that serenity.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
446	4	tenderfoot	The SFTS [Summit Fat Tire Society] is not opposed to a motorcycle trail system on Tenderfoot per se, but we do have concerns about the proposal as it currently stands. One of the stated purposes of the grant applied for by SCORR is to actively market the area for off road motorcycling. While current levels of motorized use can have negative impacts they are of a level that makes them acceptable. Currently, motorized use concentrated in the landfill area is expected and non motorized users act accordingly depending on their tolerance of that use The SFTS is concerned that a significant increase of the presence of motorcycles and ATVs will leave little room for those who in the past have still been able to use the areas on the greater Tenderfoot to find areas that have less impacts (Noise, exhaust fumes, dust, flying dirt, deeply incised trails) from motorized users. The trail system would be much more palatable if its use was aimed primarily at local motorcycle riders.		Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
446	5	tenderfoot	The SFTS [Summit Fat Tire Society] is not opposed to a motorcycle trail system on Tenderfoot per se, but we do have concerns about the proposal as it currently stands. The proposal utilizes tenderfoot Rd (5-65.1 as a main component of the various loops in the single track system. Tenderfoot Road is an easy mountain bike ride and is used by many non motorized users for dog walking, trail running, and hiking and due to its easy nature; many novice mountain bikers use it as well as families with children who are just learning to mountain bike. The trail head at the water tank on the north end of the road, which is heavily used by non motorized users, would likely be a major portal for motorcycles and ATVs. Since it is one of the few novice opportunities for mountain biking in the Dillon/Keystone/Silverthorne areas it is a valuable resource to this type of non motorized use. The SFTS is concerned that an increase of motorized use will displace the current non motorized use and there are no nearby alternatives for those displaced to go to. If the motorized trail system where to be developed, the SFTS recommends that Tenderfoot Rd not be included in that system.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The Dillon RD is adding over 75 miles of mountain bike trails in Alternative GM to the existing 219, therefore, there are numerous other opportunities for mountain bikes. There is only one other trail system in Summit County that offers single track motorized trails - the Golden Horseshoe.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
527	6	tenderfoot	The Sound problem. Many dirt bikes are very loud (in the 90+ dBA range). http://www.dirtrider.com/features/141_0305_exhaust_noise_test/index.html .	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The website referenced states that 96 db and below is considered not "noisy"	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
104	6	tenderfoot	The stripping of the natural environment will lead to erosion and increased fire danger. As you know, fire danger has been increasing due to the preponderance of dead trees. The greater presence of hot mufflers and engines exacerbate this threat. These wildfires will impose a particular danger to residential areas that in some cases are so close to the trails that safe evacuation will be compromised.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
193	3	tenderfoot	The summers of 2007 and 2008, we have seen an increase in motorized vehicles, including large numbers of ATV's, especially 2008. There is a company out of Silverthorne that is renting them, and according to the sign posted at the Dillon water facility, they are not allowed. I have also seen maps that are littering the trail .By the way, litter has also increased.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
247	2	tenderfoot	<p>The Summit County Off Road Riders club (SCORR) has received around \$100,000 from the state coffers for planning a 36-mile motorized trail system to "improve", and greatly expand motorized use in the area on the South Snake River Valley wall. SCORR has also applied for up to \$500,000 in additional funds for the creation of this trail system.</p> <p>The creation of such a trail system is a terrible idea because:</p> <p>A. The area on the Valley wall has extremely limited to no natural buffer to the noise generated by motorcycle use. This noise either 1) reflects off the valley side behind the riders, and then down and across the valley. Or, 2) it goes directly across the valley to a ridge (Summerwood) and is reverberated back across the valley, and down into the valley. These areas have various subdivisions that house many hundreds of residents.</p> <p>B. The valley length at this point is about 5 miles (from the Dillon Water Tower to above Keystone resort- approximately above the Enclave condo complex). A 36 Mile trail system could mean going back and forth across this valley side wall six-6- times and still leave 6 miles for vertical climbing and descent. Or five-5-times across the length and 11 miles for vertical ascent and descent. Either way, that many miles of trails in a 5 mile by (assumed) 1 to 2 mile vertical area creates one thing:</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is also needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
515	4	tenderfoot	<p>The Summit outdoor experience is disturbed especially on those pleasant summer weekends. Sometimes the noise continues in the night.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
502	10	tenderfoot	<p>The TPA, COHVCO, RMEC and others have compiled the following list of trails that need to be included for motorized recreation in the final WR Plan:</p> <p>Tenderfoot Mountain</p> <p>-There is a road and a single-track that connects the intersection of 5-N287.1 and 5-N298.1 with 5-66W.1A. This would offer more loop opportunities as well as offer an alternate way up or down.</p> <p>-There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H.</p>	<p>These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
532	4	tenderfoot	<p>The trail comes within 50 yards of property owners yards and residents. The noise in this area is very loud and quite bothersome. Summit County prides itself on being an attractive place to live and a place to enjoy the environment.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
94	5	tenderfoot	<p>The trails are adjacent to the Cemetery, where our citizens would like to visit and quietly reflect.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
23	2	tenderfoot	The trails will cut through sensitive wetlands which will destroy flora[.]	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
104	2	tenderfoot	The trails, many of which are illegal, do significant current environmental damage and pose significant future risks. These trails will cut through sensitive flora and will encroach on the wetlands of the area.	Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
318	3	tenderfoot	The value of property in the Keystone, Dillon, Summit Cove, and Summerwood is high. Decreases in value due to the proposal would not be welcome by residents or local and county governments.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
371	1	tenderfoot	The White River National Forest did a commendable job in addressing a very large number of comments during the previous drafts of the Travel Management Plan but the proposal to include the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trails System to the latest iteration has essentially come out of the blue. To the best of my knowledge it has never been offered for public comment in the past.	In the Draft Travel Management Plan EIS, 9 of the routes in the area were proposed for motorized use in Alternative D. Four were proposed to be open to non-motorized uses and 4 were proposed for closure. The dominant use proposed for the area was motorized.	Public Involvement Process
247	8	tenderfoot	<p>There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with free ranging riding that would not disturb local communities. I also understand the USFS has identified a more remote area in the Lower Blue Basin of Summit county while appears to be much more suitable for the type of trail system proposed by SCORR.</p> <p>As a Snake River Planning commissioner, six of my fellow commissioners(2 opposed), decided to update the Snake River Master Plan at our January 15 meeting. That proposed update will close off all county land to motorized use in this area.</p> <p>I understand the Board of County Commissioners has endorsed the closing of this area to motorized use as well.</p> <p>I request that you give serious consideration to my individual concerns, and the concerns of at least two public bodies and numerous other individuals and work with responsible motorcycle riders such as SCORR to seek other alternatives to meet their needs.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
526	12	tenderfoot	There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with lots of exciting riding that would not disturb large communities. Closing the trailhead and the county property to motorcycle riding adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery would make a huge improvement in the quality of life of the adjacent communities.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
519	12	tenderfoot	There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with lots of exciting riding that would not disturb large communities. Closing the trailhead and the county property to motorcycle riding adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery would make a huge improvement in the quality of life of the homeowners of Summerwood and of others nearby. In the even the trails are not closed to motor vehicle access, there will be a terrible degradation to our quality of life, the investment in our house, and the quality of life and investments of the many homeowners in Corinthian hills, summerwood, Summit Cover and Keystone. Please do not allow this to happen. Please do what you can to prevent any expansion of the trail system, and close this pseudo-existing trail system to all motorcycle riding.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
515	8	tenderfoot	There are many already motorized trails south and east of Keystone with lots of exciting riding that would not disturb the communities adjacent to Tenderfoot Mountain and the Cemetery.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Designation of Lands
528	3	tenderfoot	There are many areas in the county that are not adjacent to private homes and subdivisions where trails of this kind could be developed without adversely affecting property owners.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Designation of Lands
532	1	tenderfoot	There are multiple concerns for such a trail system being so close to a residential area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
11	3	tenderfoot	There are our neighbors who have been here forever, the animals. How many of these creatures will be killed or run off. There are plenty of places for these vehicles to go and have lots of fun, in Kansas and Missouri.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
109	10	tenderfoot	There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of "journey" to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	12	tenderfoot	There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of "journey" to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
468	11	tenderfoot	There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of "journey" to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
191	10	tenderfoot	There is a beautiful network of several miles of very fun and exciting single-track northeast of the top of Tenderfoot Mountain and trail 5-55.2b that connects the top of Tenderfoot with 5-66W.2H. These trails are very twisty and turny and provide a unique experience of "journey" to the area where existing trails are more destination oriented. This is a trail I frequently take visitors on.	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
104	4	tenderfoot	There is a greater likelihood of unacceptable engine noise and dust levels.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
97	2	tenderfoot	There is already a decrease in the number of elk on Tenderfoot Mountain from motorized vehicles, and the peace will be further disturbed by this proposed increase in motorized vehicle trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
289	3	tenderfoot	There is enough land in Colorado located further from such resort areas that is better suited to the noise and vehicle intrusion that comes with such trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Designation of Lands
132	2	tenderfoot	There is the chance for potential abuse of the area [Tenderfoot Mountain]. As motorcycle riders become aware of this area more and more will come. Where do they park the trailers, cars etc. that are necessary for motorcycle transportation?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, there are options for trailheads on the Frey Gulch and Straight Creek Roads.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
201	4	tenderfoot	There must be alternate options to consider that would not interfere with the quality of life and owner home values in a community (the Enclave) that has taken great care to maintain the integrity of their investment and standing within the county.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
104	5	tenderfoot	There will be abuse through discarded trash and the inevitable creation of unofficial, illegal new trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
531	2	tenderfoot	These trails that extend behind Keystone are very close to housing areas. The use by motorcycles will cause noise and excess dust that would impact the peaceful resort lifestyle we now enjoy at our Keystone Sts John condo.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
104	3	tenderfoot	They [Motorcycle Trails] have impact on the elk calving area and the lynx corridor.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
94	2	tenderfoot	They [Motorized Trails] are destroying the landscape and beautiful vistas of Dillon Valley.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would not destroy the landscape and are not more visually intrusive than hiking trails.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
530	1	tenderfoot	This is to express my strong objection to the White River National Forest (WRNF) Proposed Travel Management Plan and in particular the proposed increase in the number of trail miles to be used by motorcycles. This appears to be the first step in a series of moves intended to facilitate the plans of the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) group to create new motorcycle trails and significantly expanded motorcycle traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, you are correct in your assumption that the Travel Plan Alternative G was the first step in developing a single-track motorized trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
363	1	tenderfoot	This is to express my strong objection to the White River National Forest (WRNF) Proposed Travel Management Plan and in particular the proposed increase in the number of trail miles to be used by motorcycles. This appears to be the first step in a series of moves intended to facilitate the plans of the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) group to create new motorcycle trails and significantly expanded motorcycle traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, you are correct in your assumption that the Travel Plan Alternative G was the first step in developing a single-track motorized trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
515	1	tenderfoot	This letter is to make you and the department aware that I strongly object to the use of the subject parcel of Summit County property by off-road motorcycles and request that you close the area to any motorized use. I understand that the Forest Service intends to increase the number of available trail miles for use by off-road motorcycles between Dillon and Keystone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, this process does not include land administered by Summit County.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
20	3	tenderfoot	This proposal will destroy this incredible trail system. It would become unsafe for any use besides motorized vehicles. We recognize that motorized vehicles do need space to recreate but there are far more suitable, safer location that would not threaten existing user nor cause such significant damage to the surrounding eco-system.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
87	2	tenderfoot	This proposed development is close to existing homes, immediately adjacent to a historic community cemetery and essentially seizes a trail already used heavily by runners, walkers and hikers May through November and snowshoe ers and cross-country skiers December through April. We do not know of any resident in our subdivision who believes that increased off-road vehicle activity and a more extensive trail system will enhance the natural environment or quality of community life in this part of Summit County.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
532	2	tenderfoot	This trail [Tenderfoot Trail] is heavily used by foot traffic, bicyclists, joggers, horseback riders, hikers, deer and elk. There is conflict already with the recently permitted ATV's and motor bikers, who have demonstrated total disregard for foot traffic.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Traffic Control and Safety
210	4	tenderfoot	To further expand what already exists there would have a detrimental impact on the elk herd and deer in the area as well as other animals.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
71	7	tenderfoot	To mitigate the fire risk, the safety issues, the many environmental concerns, and noise pollution, the Enclave homeowners strongly object to the Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System proposed by SCORR.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
214	1	tenderfoot	To open this area [Summit County] up beyond the existing roads for motorized vehicles is an environmental travesty as well as a huge disservice to those of us who work hard to live here year round.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, some people who live here year 'round ride motorized vehicles.	Designation of Lands
144	2	tenderfoot	To resolve the issue and satisfy our motor-head colleagues, a lane aside Interstate 70, much like the bicycle trails that traverse along side Highways 6 and 9 and other thoroughfares, could be constructed and restricted for their exclusive use – no bicycles, no hikers, just screaming machines. Surely they would feel comfortable with the incessant traffic of Interstate 70 zooming along side their dedicated lane - and their impacts would not be as great as they would be on Tenderfoot Mountain trail.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area. Your perception of "motorheads" is incorrect. We have heard from them that they desire a forest setting for recreation.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
371	7	tenderfoot	Town of Dillon has received more than 50 letters regarding the proposed Tenderfoot Mountain plan. All were opposed. The 350 plus member Keystone Citizens league is very opposed to the plan and you have received a letter so stating from its board president. The board of the Keystone Neighborhood Company representing about 1200 people in the River Run Village area has written a letter opposing the plan. The Summit County Open Space and Trails Department and the Summit County Planning Department have received 55 letters, as of today, in opposition to the plan and none in favor. At its December 18, 2008 meeting, the Snake River Planning Commission voted seven to two to prohibit ALL motorized vehicles from the area between the Dillon water tank and the eastern end of Keystone on Tenderfoot Mountain. The HOAs of The Enclave, North Fork, Saints John, Summerwood and Corinthian Hills, to mention a few, are unanimously opposed to the plan. Today, the Summit County Board of County Commissioners voted unanimously to oppose the Tenderfoot Mountain Motorcycle Trail System portion of the WRNF Travel Management Plan. The message is clear. The great majority of the residents of the Snake River Basin are strongly opposed to the Tenderfoot plan.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, this process is not a vote. The minority or motorized users also have a right to recreate on the National Forest.	Use of Public Comment (vote, majority opinion, etc.)
147	4	tenderfoot	Trail safety is important to hikers and to share the trail with motorcycles is a really a safety concern. As an avid hiker, I find this disturbing.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Traffic Control and Safety

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
525	5	tenderfoot	Trash, we have noticed that there is an increase in water bottles, soda bottles, candy wrappers, and other plastic picnic items since there is a company renting ATV's and motor bikes. We continuously pick up after these un-welcomed guests.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
184	1	tenderfoot	Vote no to a trail system for motorcycles in the Snake River Basin	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, this process is not a vote.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
317	3	tenderfoot	We [Corinthian Hill Property Owners Association] have noted in correspondence from the Forest Service that they and SCORR will provide patrols and increased presence in the area. This is contrary to the observation that none of our residents has ever reported and enforcement personnel on any of the trails and we doubt that any additional funding is available.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). The reason you have not observed any patrol presence is because the education process has not started. Funding sources are available.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
12	4	tenderfoot	We [Corinthian Hill Property Owners Association Inc] are also concerned that increased usage [of motorized off-road on Tender mountain] will negatively impact wildlife in the area, which are already under stress and will be more severely pressured with additional usage. At the present, wildlife migrates down the mountain into our subdivision foraging for food in the fall and winter months. During their migration, they cross the existing trail in several places.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
411	3	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Center] recommend that the area be maintained for non-motorized use only for safety, natural resource protection, noise and property value reasons.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
32	7	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Citizens League] agree that the off road riders do need an area to recreate but with more that 2.3 million acres in the White River National Forest there must be a more suitable area for their activities.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
32	3	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Citizens League] are very concerned about the potential noise level. The Snake River Basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In January 2000, Summit County adopted an ordinance to control, regulate and abate noise within its unincorporated areas. This has helped our community dramatically. The noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dB(A) for the daytime and 50 dB(A) for night. It is our understanding that there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dB(A) at some vague time in the future. Presently dirt bikes use the westernmost section of the county landfill property for their recreation. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the members of the Summerwood homeowners association and can be heard in many parts of the Summit Cove community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The area near the landfill referenced is not on the National Forest and is not considered in this process.	County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
279	3	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Neighbourhood Company] are concerned with the safety of pedestrians and horseback riders who would share the trail system [Tenderfoot] with the bikes.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Traffic Control and Safety
279	4	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Neighbourhood Company] have concerns with environmental impacts on the area [Tenderfoot] including: Negative impacts on existing wildlife in the area (elk and lynx).	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine any potential effect to Lynx.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
279	5	tenderfoot	We [Keystone Neighbourhood Company] have concerns with environmental impacts on the area [Tenderfoot] including: With erosion of soil and wetlands in the area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, the Forest Service can not designate a trail system that would negatively impact wetlands.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
526	1	tenderfoot	We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] strongly object to the use of the subject parcel of Summit County Property by off-road motorcycles and request that you close the area to any motorized use.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, this process does not include land administered by Summit County.	Designation of Lands
526	2	tenderfoot	We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] understand that the Forest Service intends to increase the number of available trail miles for use by off-road motorcycles between Dillon and Keystone. As residents of Summerwood, we are extremely concerned about current as well as increased motorcycle activity directly across from our community. We have suffered the continuous noise generated by what appears to be constantly increasing levels of activity. Much of this activity is on the county landfill property where riders have created what is in effect an unauthorized motorcycle terrain park. Allowing this situation to continue and grow will only perpetuate the already unacceptable conditions.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. This process does not include land administered by Summit County (where the noise this commenter identifies the noise is coming from).	Private Property
15	12	tenderfoot	We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] are also concerned about: According to the maps we've been shown there will be sanctioned trails even on top of Tenderfoot Mountain in a designated Elk Calving Area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
15	9	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] are also concerned about:</p> <p>The devastation of the forest on Tenderfoot Mountain by the Mountain Pine Bark Beetle has greatly increased the risk of wildfire. Allowing motorcycles, even with spark arrestors (if the requirement were to be enforced) increases the risk of wildfire. Are the riders who have abused the existing system going to respect the danger of wildfire by maintaining a fire-safe condition of their bikes or properly controlling the embers or butts from their cigarettes?</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
15	11	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] are also concerned about:</p> <p>We have observed young people riding their dirt bikes on the shoulder of the road to get the trailheads. Those bikes do not appear street legal and certainly are a hazard to the riders.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>
15	10	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] are also concerned about:</p> <p>We understand there is a recommendation to limit the decibel level of the motorcycles to 96db, but even if that limit were to be enacted it is too loud near our homes and, based on our experience to date, unlikely to be enforced.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations.</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
15	14	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] are appalled, but can only request that you see the terrible degradation to the quality of life of the many homeowners in Corinthian Hills, Summerwood, Summit Cove and Keystone that the current motorcycle activity is causing.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	<p>Private Property</p>
15	16	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] as Board of Directors of the Summerwood Homeowners Association, request that you give serious consideration to our position and work with appropriate organizations representing responsible motorcycle riders such as the Summit County Off-Road Riders (SCORR) to seek other alternatives to meet their needs.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	<p>Meetings/Collaboration (Public)</p>
15	3	tenderfoot	<p>We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] have suffered the continuous noise generated by what appears to be constantly increasing levels of activity without, to our knowledge, a recent opportunity to comment or raise objection to this use.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. In the Draft Travel Management Plan EIS, 9 of the routes in the area were proposed for motorized use in Alternative D. Four were proposed to be open to non-motorized uses and 4 were proposed for closure. The dominant use proposed for the area was motorized.</p>	<p>Public Involvement Process</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
15	1	tenderfoot	We [Summerwood Homeowners Association] wish to comment specifically on the elements of the Plan relating to trail use by motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, you are not the only group of people with a "want" for the area.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
71	8	tenderfoot	We not only strongly object to increasing the availability of trails for motorcycles along this corridor, we want the existing trails closed to motorized use. We agree that motorcycle riders do need space to ride, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Why not use the State grant money to design and construct motorcycle only trails in an appropriate location.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
28	7	tenderfoot	We agree that the off road riders do need an area to recreate but with more that 2.3 million acres in the White River National Forest there must be a more suitable area for their activities.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
56	7	tenderfoot	We agree that the off road riders do need an area to recreate but with more that 2.3 million acres in the White River National Forest there must be a more suitable area for their activities.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
62	7	tenderfoot	We agree that the off road riders do need an area to recreate but with more that 2.3 million acres in the White River National Forest there must be a more suitable area for their activities.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
218	8	tenderfoot	We agree with others' comments that there are other more suitable areas of the Forest Service land for designated motorcycle use further away from residential neighborhoods. We also believe that there is an inherent conflict in designating narrow, dusty dirt trails for combined motorized and non-motorized uses.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible	Designation of Lands
562	1	tenderfoot	We also live in the Whispering Pines Ranch area, but are not opposed to a motorized trail system within the Snake River Basin. We live in the mountains because of the lifestyle and recreation is a big part of it. We've avid hikers and mountain bikers, but we still feel that there needs to be more room for people with dirt bikes and ATVs to play. The only request I have would be to separate the motorized trails from non-motorized trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
399	2	tenderfoot	We also understand that dirt bikers do need an area for recreation. However, we strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and extremely close to our units and the Enclave community. This will create serious noise issues, dust, disturbance to the elk herd, and a serious fire danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
293	2	tenderfoot	We also understand that dirt bikers do need an area for recreation. However, we strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and extremely close to our units and the Enclave community. This will create serious noise issues, dust, disturbance to the elk herd, and a serious fire danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
71	1	tenderfoot	We applaud your efforts to close and rehabilitate the many user created trails. Also, we agree that dirt bikers do need an area for recreation. However, we strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and very close to (within 200 vertical feet or less) the Enclave community. This will create serious noise issues, dust, disturbance to the elk herd, and a serious fire danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters on the National Forest. Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
371	8	tenderfoot	We appreciate that the motorcycle riders need a suitable place to recreate and that one should be found in the 2.3 million acres of WRNF that is away from the heavily populated areas and without the safety and environmental concerns associated with Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G	Private Property
87	6	tenderfoot	We are asking you to do all in your power to prevent this development from happening along the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System [because of:] The noise from motorized vehicles on the trail is already unpleasant. Noise levels are sometimes – depending on the type of mufflers, the speeds and the mindless repetition of hill climbs – bothersome to outright maddening.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The only hill climb in the area is on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
87	8	tenderfoot	<p>We are asking you to do all in your power to prevent this development from happening along the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System [because of:]</p> <p>Environmental Damage - we have experienced increased motor traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System. Over the past two – three years a local company has been renting ATV's and dirt bikes, delivering them and their riders to the west end of the trailhead and retrieving them after two or four hours. The road is presumably closed when it is wet to reduce damage. Unfortunately, the National Forest enforcement capacity is spread too thinly to achieve even modest levels of compliance and routine damage occurs throughout the year. Beyond the normal use of the trails off-road vehicles, especially "dirt bikes," are prone to find and exploit various ad hoc branching opportunities; additionally, they race repeatedly up steep hills that define the edges of the roadbed. The damage caused by the repetition of these 'burst of power' exercises can only degrade the existing trail margins whatever the initial planning conditions envision for the proposed development. Indeed, the very term "off-road" invites ad hoc exploration and exploitation of the areas surrounding the existing and planned trail network and invites damage to the</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
87	7	tenderfoot	<p>We are asking you to do all in your power to prevent this development from happening along the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System [because of:]</p> <p>Litter and trash on the trail has increased in the form of bottles, cans, food wrappers and other garbage. I do not know who leaves the litter; I do know that the foot traffic and regular users often pick up after inconsiderate users and I do know that I have never witnessed an off-road vehicle user stop, dismount and police litter.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).</p>	<p>Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)</p>
87	5	tenderfoot	<p>We are asking you to do all in your power to prevent this development from happening along the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System [because of:]</p> <p>Wildlife - herds of elk and deer use the area above the road; elk, I am told, use the area for calving purposes in the late spring. Current users, human and animal foot traffic, do not seem to disrupt one another, a compatible use of National Forest resources. The proposed development of Tenderfoot Mountain trail system and the increased traffic and noise will affect this habitat adversely, potentially eliminating this wonderful and real asset from our community.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.</p>	<p>Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)</p>

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
87	4	tenderfoot	<p>We are asking you to do all in your power to prevent this development from happening along the Tenderfoot Mountain Trail System [because of:]</p> <p>Safety - ATV and motor bike traffic is already dangerous for runners, walkers, hikers, snowshoe-ers, skiers and their pets. Few riders slow for foot traffic; many try to ride two-abreast. The path is narrow and there are close encounters - with added traffic, accidents and injuries for foot and vehicle users are inevitable. Heavy dust, dirt and mud thrown up by the off-road vehicles are routine hazards suffered by foot users now; they will be more severe if the proposed development continues.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Traffic Control and Safety
36	2	tenderfoot	<p>We are confident the Forestry Service is fully cognizant of the adverse effects such a project would have on the existing community.</p> <p>Just to list a few of the many concerns without going onto elaborate details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise - Fire Hazard - Impact on Wildlife - Dillon Cemetery - Danger of sharing trails with other outdoor activities (hiking, horseback riding, dirt biking, etc.) - Law Enforcement 	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations</p>	Private Property
318	1	tenderfoot	<p>We are distressed by the proposed Tenderfoot motorcycle trail system as put forward by SCORR. The environmental impact of the proposal on the wildlife, noise pollution, dirt and wildflowers in Keystone and down to Lake Dillon would be severe. I find it difficult to believe anyone living in the area would be in favor of the proposal.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations</p>	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
528	1	tenderfoot	<p>We are homeowners in the Corinthian Hill subdivision in Dillon, Colorado, and the current trail from the Dillon water plant to the Dillon cemetery passes in close proximity to our subdivision. The amount of summer traffic on this trail by motorcycles, dirt bikes, and ATV's is already creating noise and air pollution as well as a danger to hikers, walkers and bicyclists using the trail.</p> <p>We are opposed to any expansion of motorized vehicle access on Tenderfoot Mountain, as proposed in the White River National Forest Travel Management Plan, and the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) grant request which would result in additional miles of trails being added primarily for the use of motorcycles. Any increase in motorized traffic on Tenderfoot Mountain would only exacerbate an existing problem.</p>	<p>This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
68	1	tenderfoot	<p>We are homeowners on the north side of Highway 6 (The Enclave at Keystone #43) in the Keystone valley whose property backs up against the White River National Forest where the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) are proposing 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community.</p> <p>Several miles of the new trails would run behind and very close to (within 200 vertical feet or less) the Enclave community. This will create serious fire danger, noise and safety issues, environmental and dust problems, disturbances to the elk herd and lynx populations and degradation of private property values.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better. Further study is needed to determine any potential effect to Lynx. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations</p>	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
193	10	tenderfoot	<p>We are in total agreement with the Snake River Planning Commission, and the city of Dillon that this area be proposed only for hiking, horse and non motorized use.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
73	1	tenderfoot	<p>We are long time residents of Keystone and are very much opposed to the proposed dirt bike extension.</p> <p>The reason for our objection [is]:</p> <p>Potential fire hazard because of all of the beetle kill in the area.</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small.</p>	Timber Harvest/Fuel Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
528	2	tenderfoot	We are opposed to any construction of a motorcross-type terrain park adjacent to the cemetery. In fact, we are opposed to even having a trailhead situated there. The cemetery should be a place of peace and tranquility, and visitors to the cemetery should not be subjected to the excessive noise and air pollution created by various types of motorized vehicles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. A motorcycle trail system was proposed. Motocross is a very small area with intense, concentrated use. There has been a "motocross" area on Summit County property adjacent to the Dillon Cemetery. This area is not on the National Forest and management of that area is not included in this plan.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
237	2	tenderfoot	We are opposed to the expansion of motorized vehicle use, specifically in the Tenderfoot Mountain and Frey Gulch areas of the Snake River Basin near Dillon and Keystone, as recommended in Alternative G of the WRNF proposed travel management plan.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
525	1	tenderfoot	We are residents of Corinthian Hills. We are very concerned and are voicing our displeasure and are asking the Town of Dillon, Town Council to inform the various jurisdictions that this proposal is unsatisfactory to the resident of Corinthian Hills.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
61	1	tenderfoot	We are shocked and very disappointed to hear of the plans to add trails for motorized bikes and snowmobiles at our back yard. We have owned our home for over 10 years at the Corinthian Hills neighborhood, and the existing Tenderfoot trail from the water treatment plant and the cemetery is at the back of our home. Our family and all the neighbors use the trail for hiking and simply walking the dog, but we always encounter young men speeding on their motorbikes causing us to pick up the dog and rush to the side to avoid an accident. Adding more trails will only increase the danger, pollution and noise, and not to mention the impact on the wildlife. Please consider the impact on our neighborhood before you make a final decision.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. A system would also need to maximize distance from residences (and the cemetery).	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
210	1	tenderfoot	We are strongly opposed to creating more of a Mecca for motorcycle users in the Tenderfoot Mountain area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
104	1	tenderfoot	We are strongly opposed to the proliferation of motorcycle trails in Summit County and particularly the Tenderfoot Mountain area and request the closure of all motorcycle trails in the area. We believe there are multiple downsides and even dangers to such an idea.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
28	3	tenderfoot	We are very concerned about the potential noise level. The Snake River Basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In January 2000, Summit County adopted an ordinance to control, regulate and abate noise within its unincorporated areas. This has helped our community dramatically. The noise level limit for residential areas is 55dB (A) for the daytime and 50 dB (A) for night. It is our understanding that there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dB (A) at some vague time in the future. Presently dirt bikes use the westernmost section of the county landfill property for their recreation. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the members of the Summerwood homeowners association and can be heard in many parts of the Summit Cove community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
56	3	tenderfoot	We are very concerned about the potential noise level. The Snake River Basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In January 2000, Summit County adopted and ordinance to control, regulate and abate noise within its unincorporated areas. This has helped our community dramatically. The noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dB (A) for the daytime and 50 dB (A) for night. It is our understanding that there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dB (A) at some vague time in the future. Presently dirt bikes use the westernmost section of the county landfill property for their recreation. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the members of the Summerwood homeowners association and can be heard in many parts of the Summit Cove community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
62	3	tenderfoot	We are very concerned about the potential noise level. The Snake River Basin in the Keystone area is very narrow and loud traffic noise is heard by all residents. In January 2000, Summit County adopted and ordinance to control, regulate and abate noise within its unincorporated areas. This has helped our community dramatically. The noise level limit for residential areas is 55 dB (A) for the daytime and 50 dB (A) for night. It is our understanding that there is pending legislation to limit dirt bike noise output to 96 dB (A) at some vague time in the future. Presently dirt bikes use the westernmost section of the county landfill property for their recreation. The noise level from these bikes is unacceptable to the members of the Summerwood homeowners association and can be heard in many parts of the Summit Cove community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
94	4	tenderfoot	We are very concerned that these trails will devalue our property in one of the nicest subdivisions in Summit County.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
519	1	tenderfoot	We are very much opposed to the use of Tenderfoot Mountain for motorized travel, especially use by motorcycles on Tenderfoot Mountain and along the corridor on the north side of Highway 6 from Dillon to Keystone. We not only strongly object to increasing the availability of trails for motorcycles along this corridor, we would like the existing trails closed to motorized use.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/Mangement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
523	3	tenderfoot	We are very unhappy to learn that the Forest Service is considering opening up more trails, and implore the county to exercise restrictions on the use of county land. With the current use of the trails across from Summerwood, we already hear noise day and night from the use of motorized vehicles and can only imagine the impact resulting from more trails. Who will monitor noise levels, trash fire risk, and the many other problems that will, no doubt, result if the county does not exercise limits on the use of our land.	Summit County property is not on the National Forest and management of that area is not included in this plan.	County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.
319	1	tenderfoot	We are writing to you as motorcyclists and Keystone property owners. While a motorcycle trail and park is a fine idea, Colorado has a lot of land away from residential property. Please allow us space away from the hearing range of residential areas to ride our bikes. Bringing noise pollution to a residential district would be inappropriate.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
252	1	tenderfoot	We are writing to you as owners of a unit in The Enclave at Keystone, a community of 43 residences. We purchased our unit 22 years ago, choosing the Enclave in large part because our units are backed up to an area owned by the U.S. Forest Service and would not be disturbed by development. We expected the area to remain pristine and quiet, with wildlife, trees and hiking trails. We have now been informed that the development of dirt bike and motorcycle trails are proposed to run across the United States Forest Service lands lying within a few feet of the rear of our unit.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
94	7	tenderfoot	We ask that you kindly consider removing all trails from Tenderfoot Mountain and move them to a more remote area, where they will not be offensive.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
237	1	tenderfoot	We believe that Alternative G should be amended to eliminate, not expand, the use of motorized vehicles in the Tenderfoot Mountain area of the Snake River Basin near Dillon and Keystone.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
104	7	tenderfoot	We bought a home in Colorado for its great natural beauty and the States perceived commitment to preserving it. A plan that permits more off- road vehicles is contrary to this ideal.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
87	3	tenderfoot	We do not object to off-road vehicle activity; it is apparently a popular pastime and we believe it should be encouraged in areas where the riding surfaces can be maintained, where there is no or limited impact on natural flora and fauna, where established homes, farms and domestic activities are not negatively impacted. Concentrated off-road vehicle activity appears to be an unnatural encroachment on National Forest properties; commercial arrangements would seem more appropriate. It is apparent to us and all of our neighbors that this development will diminish the peace and tranquility of this and other neighborhoods along the intended route. The result will be felt in property value, and quality of life, metrics.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
27	1	tenderfoot	We do not want, nor need more motorized vehicle activity on Tenderfoot Trail. We oppose any proposed change in regulations increasing off road activity on Tenderfoot Trail.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
19	1	tenderfoot	We have a second home in Summerwood, Dillon Co. We understand there is [a] plan under way to increase the motorcycle trails on Tenderfoot Mountain which we most hardily object to. The existing trails should be eliminated on this very pristine wilderness area.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, this area is not a pristine wilderness. It is managed for multiple uses including motorized use.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
529	2	tenderfoot	We have elk, bear and assorted other wildlife walking paths behind Sts. John now and I could see motorcycles making all this go away.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
201	9	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not destroy our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
399	8	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not destroy our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Private Property
180	7	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not adversely affect a community we've enjoyed for over two decades.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
70	7	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not destroy our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Private Property
252	7	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not destroy our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
293	8	tenderfoot	We have no objection to creating a place for motorcycle riders to enjoy, but it needs to be in an area that is not adjacent to substantial residential property. With the millions of acres in the White River National Forest there must be a better area for motorcycle riders. Please do not destroy our community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the Dillon District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system. For the whole Forest, only 65 miles of motorized single-track total was proposed in Alternative G.	Private Property
532	3	tenderfoot	We have noticed an increase in debris since the motorized people have used this trail. They have a total disregard for the environment.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Waste Management and Disposal (incl. Hazardous Materials)
519	10	tenderfoot	We have observed young people riding their dirt bikes on the shoulder of the road to get to the trailheads. Those bikes do not appear street legal and certainly are a hazard to the riders.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations.	Traffic Control and Safety
526	10	tenderfoot	We have observed young people riding their dirt bikes on the shoulder of the road to get to the trailheads. Those bikes do not appear street legal and certainly are a hazard to the riders.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations.	Traffic Control and Safety
519	2	tenderfoot	We have suffered the continuous activity without, to our knowledge, a recent opportunity to comment or raise objection to this use. Expanding the trail system would only exacerbate the current situation.	In the Draft Travel Management Plan EIS, 9 of the routes in the area were proposed for motorized use in Alternative D. Four were proposed to be open to non-motorized uses and 4 were proposed for closure. The dominant use proposed for the area was motorized.	Public Involvement Process
528	5	tenderfoot	We have to consider the possible fire danger created by unmuffled vehicles, hot engines and exhaust systems transiting very dry forest and scrub areas during the summer months. Should a fire be ignited, it would be very difficult for fire fighters and equipment to reach the majority of these areas before the fires had progressed extensively.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
515	5	tenderfoot	We have watched as the number of the trails visible to us from our home was proliferated. Our sense of the situation is that many of the riders have abused the area and have even encroached on the Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands.	The Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands is on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
519	5	tenderfoot	We have watched as the numbers of trails visible to us from our homes and mostly on the county landfill property, especially on particularly exciting terrain, have proliferated repeatedly and undoubtedly without sanction. Our sense of the situation is that too many of the riders have abused the area and have even encroached on the Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands.	The Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands is on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
526	5	tenderfoot	We have watched as the numbers of trails visible to us from our homes and mostly on the county landfill property, especially on particularly exciting terrain, have proliferated repeatedly and undoubtedly without sanction. Our sense of the situation is that too many of the riders have abused the area and have even encroached on the Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands.	The Tenderfoot Meadows Wetlands is on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
529	1	tenderfoot	We head with highway 6 traffic but the idea of being surrounded by noise is hard to comprehend. Since there is no air conditioning in the building, windows have to be left open and the racket and dust created by motorcycles would really present a problem. Please do not extend this path so close to homes. It just doesn't make any practical sense to do so and I hope you agree.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
218	1	tenderfoot	We live in Corinthian Hill Subdivision in Dillon Colorado and we are opposed to converting the Tenderfoot Trail behind our home to a Forest Service designated motorcycle trail. Our Homeowners' Association has already sent a letter opposing this plan, but we have been told by other members of the community that the Forest Service would also like to hear from individual homeowners directly.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
518	1	tenderfoot	We live in Summerwood and strongly oppose the establishment of developing a motorcycle trail on Tenderfoot Mountain. We just do not feel it would be beneficial to people living in the proposed area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
8	10	tenderfoot	We look forward to the solution that protects our wildlife and the serenity of this community. You have a reputation of doing the right things and doing things right. The right thing to do is truncate any further action.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Action (protect/save/do not destroy)
60	11	tenderfoot	We not only object o increasing the availability of trails for motorcycles along this corridor, we would like to see all existing trails and trailheads closed to motorized use.	These trailheads are on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
192	4	tenderfoot	We previously lived in a mountain community consisting of 4 to 5 acre plots where one family in the community bought their son a dirt bike. Initially noise was the main annoyance, but soon the boy got tired of riding on his own property and took the liberty to explore and establish new trails on the neighbors' property. I can envision this same issue happening with the proposed SCORR trails. How do you police 11 miles of trails?	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). Volunteer patrol programs can be very successful.	Enforcement/Fu nding/Staffing
531	1	tenderfoot	We request that the trailhead adjacent to the Dillon Town Cemetery and the trail head at the entrance to Frey Gulch Road not be opened to motorized traffic.	These trailheads are on Summit County property and is not considered in this process.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
525	7	tenderfoot	We request the Council to take these concerns into consideration and take positive action to eliminate this proposed action for Tenderfoot Trail.	This trail is proposed for closure to motorized uses in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
8	9	tenderfoot	We respectfully request of your agency a rethinking of this proposal for the Tenderfoot Trail area. It was quoted in the Summit Daily News that “we need to put these guys somewhere.” Well somewhere should be in a non habituated area of animal and affected citizens of this community.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal Private Property
201	3	tenderfoot	We strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle / dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and extremely close to the Enclave community. We are very concerned about the noise, pollution, safety, privacy and fire dangers that this proposal will undoubtedly provoke should it be allowed to pass.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small.	
523	1	tenderfoot	We strongly object to the use of the west flank of Tenderfoot Mountain by off-road motorcycles.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
70	1	tenderfoot	We support the efforts to close and rehabilitate the many user created trails. We also understand that dirt bikers do need an area for recreation. However, we strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and extremely close to our unit and the Enclave community. This will create serious noise issues, dust, disturbance to the elk herd, and a serious fire danger.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small.	Private Property
252	2	tenderfoot	<p>We support the efforts to close and rehabilitate the many user created trails. We also understand that dirt bikers do need an area for recreation. However, we strongly object to the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. The Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande Trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of Keystone. Several miles of the new trails would run behind and extremely close to our units and the Enclave community. This will create serious noise issues, dust, disturbance to the elk herd, and a serious fire danger.</p> <p>Of the 36 miles of trails, 25 miles represent the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. This means that every single trail in the area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders, would be shared with dirt bikes and motorcycles. This will present serious conflicts and safety issues. Our communities of residents utilize the present system of trails as they should in harmony with the natural mostly undisturbed terrain. The beauty and peacefulness of the area would be replaced by noise, dirt and the danger of accidents.</p>	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to Lynx.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
514	2	tenderfoot	We think having a motorcycle trail, with the accompanying noise, adjacent to a cemetery is inappropriate.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect.	Private Property
132	3	tenderfoot	We understand that the police, forest service etc. are saying they do not have the staff to patrol the usage of this area [Tenderfoot Mountain]. What about discarded trash? This is an area that leads into the Keystone ski area. I can't imagine that when people have a choice of areas they would choose Keystone especially when we've been so capable of destroying the beautiful land leading into the area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
519	9	tenderfoot	We understand there is a recommendation to limit the decibel level of the motorcycles to 96db, but even if that limit were to be enacted it is too loud near our homes and, based on our experience to date, unlikely to be enforced.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations.	Private Property
526	9	tenderfoot	We understand there is a recommendation to limit the decibel level of the motorcycles to 96db, but even if that limit were to be enacted it is too loud near our homes and, based on our experience to date, unlikely to be enforced.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users) and to enforce those regulations.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
532	5	tenderfoot	We urge the Snake River Planning Commission to stop the develop of this motor cross and fully support the effected parties. The Corinthian Hills and Summerwood HOA's are in total agreement that no further action be taken to develop this motor cross.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a single-track trail system in the area is feasible. A motocross (small, intense motorcycle course) was never proposed.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
87	9	tenderfoot	We use these trails regularly. Many of our neighbors walk these trails virtually every day and have expressed their concerns about the increased motor traffic and the dangers and discomforts that go with it.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
94	6	tenderfoot	We use to observe Elk and other wildlife on the lower slopes of Tenderfoot. The motorcycles have caused them to move to other more secluded areas.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to Lynx.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
8	5	tenderfoot	We used to see more people riding their horses, but now there are less due to the motorized vehicles that create a discomfort for the rider and the horse.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
87	11	tenderfoot	We were surprised to hear that the discussions to add additional motor traffic had been going on without notice to impacted residents. We appreciate the current opportunity to express our concerns and those of other residents of the area. We thank you for your interest in this matter and for taking the time to consider our views.	In the Draft Travel Management Plan EIS, 9 of the routes in the area were proposed for motorized use in Alternative D. Four were proposed to be open to non-motorized uses and 4 were proposed for closure. The dominant use proposed for the area was motorized.	Public Involvement Process
248	1	tenderfoot	We would like to express our concern for the above listed project. We have lived in Summit County since 1971 and 1973 respectively and enjoy a variety of outdoor activities. We feel our county needs to offer to all outdoor groups. We need equal balance. Please consider keeping a balance and let all outdoor groups enjoy this beautiful county.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
21	8	tenderfoot	We would sincerely appreciate your help in stopping these proposals. [Expanding motorcycle use along Tenderfoot Mountain Corridor]	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
48	1	tenderfoot	We write to express our objection to the published new and expanded use of the Forest Service land on Tenderfoot Mountain.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
526	13	tenderfoot	We, as Board of Directors of the Summerwood Homeowners Association, request that you close the trailhead and property to motorcycle use and enforce that closure.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
20	1	tenderfoot	<p>We, as concerned homeowners, strongly oppose the proposed Tenderfoot Motorcycle Trail System. Our understanding is that the Summit County Off Road Riders (SCORR) entity has proposed that 36 miles of trails be opened for motorcycle/dirt bike use between the water tank at the west end of the Oro Grande trail in the town of Dillon to the east end of the Keystone community. Of this total, 25 miles of trail represent all of the existing hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding trails in this area. In addition, SCORR proposes to construct 11 miles of new trails. Essentially, every single trail in this area, which historically has been used by hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders and other non-motorized users would be shared with dirt bikes/motorcycles.</p> <p>This trail system and the surrounding open space are priceless treasures. Failure to preserve the balance between non-motorized and motorized use would be a tragic mistake. The proposal will radically increase noise pollution, cause environmental damage and threaten the wildlife population. Additionally, the fire danger from significant additional motorized vehicle use What about the impact on Real Estate?</p>	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. A summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to Lynx.</p>	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
193	7	tenderfoot		<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	Private Property
193	8	tenderfoot	What about those of us who prefer a quieter form of recreation in this area.	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. There are several hundred miles of trail in Summit County closed to motorized uses.</p>	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
370	4	tenderfoot	What reasonable interest would be served that could not easily be met by less intrusive plans? [referring to Tenderfoot Trail]	<p>This comment is difficult to interpret, however, it is assumed that "intrusive" describes motorcycle use on trails and to meet "plans" (alternative G) without being intrusive would be to mitigate the issues: Noise and use conflicts. Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
527	9	tenderfoot	While I am not for motor biking in the mountains, I especially don't like the idea of it happening in my backyard, or within earshot or eyesight of the community.	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.</p>	Private Property
298	4	tenderfoot	While the negative aspects of allowing motorized use are apparent, not a single positive aspect from such use comes to mind.	<p>Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, there is a large and growing segment of the National population who desire to recreate on the National Forests.</p>	General Opposition (suspend/stop)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
371	2	tenderfoot	Wildfire Potential Both Tenderfoot Mountain and the adjacent Eureka Mountain to the east have turned brown as a result of the recent pine beetle epidemic. Even without motorcycles, the potential for a wildfire is considerable. The general lack of spark arrestors on motorcycle mufflers plus the fire potential of hot engines and mufflers against dry grass provides an additional threat.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
147	3	tenderfoot	Wildfire risk is significant with motorcycles with hot mufflers and no spark arrestors. This would impact the fire departments and homeowners. In this time of significant pine bark beetle damaged tress, the potential for forest fires is extreme.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
371	4	tenderfoot	Wildlife Disturbance: This entire area is prime deer and elk summer and winter habitat as well as migration corridor and calving area. The USFS's 2001 final environmental impact statement divides this area into three habitat zones. The 5.41 area between Dillon Town and the Summerwood HOA is a winter deer and elk habitat but these animals live here year around. The recommended USFS guideline would restrict recreation activities that would disturb deer and elk during the winter and spring. The 5.43 prescriptive area is elk habitat and elk calving area. The 5.5 zone is forested landscape linkage that provides a carnivore (including lynx) transition area. The USFS guidelines are for limited recreation use in this area. Tom Kroening, State Wildlife Manager for Summit County from 1997 to 2008 recently stated (Summit Daily News, October 12, 2008) that existing authorized off-road activity along with a helter skelter network of illegal trails has already squeezed the remaining herd of 100 to 150 elk on Tenderfoot Mountain. When he came here in 1997 they were all over the front (south) side of that mountain but at some point in the early 2000s the county authorized	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
176	2	tenderfoot	With all the dead lodge pole pines, I can imagine a much greater danger of fire from the exhaust of the motorcycles. This could turn into a real forest fire with terrible consequences.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
101	2	tenderfoot	With all the dead trees from the beetle infestation, aren't you concerned about wildfires? Aren't you thinking of the people smoking in the area, or the bikes leaving oil/sparks behind? I won't even get into the issue of all the refuse they leave behind.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
97	3	tenderfoot	With motorized vehicles like ATVs and dirt bikes ridden on these mountain trails, there are also safety issues for both riders and others hiking or enjoying the trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
201	2	tenderfoot	With the dramatic increase in development in the area the protected and peaceful preserve, ensured by the U.S. Forest Service, is more important than ever in maintaining the value of our home.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
210	6	tenderfoot	With the dry conditions that exist in the summertime, dust and air pollution would certainly become a problem.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
8	3	tenderfoot	With the increase of motorbikes and ATV's, we have had an increase, of course, in the increase of the very annoying noise from these vehicles, which we experience from our homes, as well as from the trails while hiking; more trash from these off road users and the rudeness of the riders. They do not slow down, and after they pass us, they speed up and we are eating and breathing their dust.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
74	5	tenderfoot	You can no longer have a serene moment at the Dillon Cemetery, which is just is not right. The peace and quiet for many has been destroyed, so a small number can have fun. What's wrong with this picture!	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
98	1	tenderfoot	You may have recently received a letter from the Corinthian Hill Property Owners Association regarding the proposed increased usage of, as well as the addition of, trails on and near Tenderfoot Mountain in Dillon, CO. The letter claims to represent the entire membership of the Corinthian Hills' homeowners' association. Unfortunately, this is a false representation. As a member of the homeowners association, I can assure you that there has been no attempt by the president, or the board of the association, to poll its members to ask how they feel about this issue. Therefore, I do not believe they have any right to speak for all of the members when it could be as few as 3 of the members that have actually expressed their feelings in the letter they sent you. Hundreds of un-poll members are being misrepresented.	Thanks for the comment and the information.	Public Involvement Process
65	3	tenderfoot	Your consideration in finding an alternative location for this facility or the elimination of the project is requested and would be greatly appreciated.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, other areas in the District were not found to be suitable to introduce a new motorized trail system.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
544	9	tenderfoot, frey gulch	[ATT 1:] 62 letters from dillon citizens that have already been submitted individually	Thanks for the comment and the information. All of these letters have been reviewed.	See Attachment
544	4	tenderfoot, frey gulch	Currently, USFS is not staffed to adequately manage, patrol and enforce lawful use of the existing trail system in the Tenderfoot/Frey Gulch area. The Summit County Sheriff's Department and the Dillon Police Department do not have the personnel or resources to take on this responsibility. The Town of Dillon is concerned that Alternative G will result in an expansion of the trail system in the area without provision for additional management and enforcement.	The commenter is not aware of the Forest Service resources available for education and enforcement. Summit County or Town of Dillon law enforcement are not expected to take on any additional responsibility.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
45	1	tenderfoot, frey gulch	I feel that the proposed trails [Tenderfoot and Frey Gulch Trail Systems] are in too close of a proximity to the urban interface at Keystone. I believe, as proposed, they will come within 200 feet of nearby residential areas. I believe that this will cause a likelihood of engine noise and dust as well as the potential for abuse, i.e. trash and "unauthorized" new trails and potential for negative human interactions.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine how close is "too close." Further study is also needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users).	Private Property
45	5	tenderfoot, frey gulch	I would oppose the proposal to create and expand these motorcycle trails.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
544	2	tenderfoot, frey gulch	The Tenderfoot/Frey Gulch area has seen a proliferation of unauthorized trails being created by motorized recreation users. These unauthorized trails have already impacted critical wildlife habitat identified by the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and sensitive wetlands/fens areas identified by the Colorado Natural Heritage Program. The negative impacts to the visual qualities of the area cannot be understated, and could certainly impact property values and scenic qualities important to our residents and visitors.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to Lynx. Alternative GM does not designate any trails other than the Oro Grande Trail in the Dillon Bay Fen Conservation Area. Further study is needed to determine the limitations of travel routes in these areas. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
544	3	tenderfoot, frey gulch	The Town of Dillon is concerned that mixing motorized and non-motorized uses in this area is creating unacceptable safety issues and frequent conflicts between users. The Town would respectfully recommend that the trails in this area be restricted to non-motorized use, which would accommodate that vast majority of current users and serve to minimize conflicts.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Traffic Control and Safety
544	1	tenderfoot, frey gulch	The Town of Dillon is extremely concerned that Alternative G will open the door to increased motorized recreation in the Tenderfoot Mountain/Frey gulch area and create unacceptable noise impacts to residents in the Corinthian Hills, Oro Grande, Summerwood, Summit Cover and Sts. John subdivisions, as well as to families utilizing and visiting the Town of Dillon Cemetery facility. These residential subdivisions and cemetery are immediately adjacent to the area in question.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
45	3	tenderfoot, frey gulch	The trails [Tenderfoot and Frey Gulch Trail Systems] cut through an elk calving area and would negatively affect these animals as well as have an impact on other wildlife.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk or deer habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where food sources are better.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
544	7	tenderfoot, frey gulch	The vast majority of the property owners in Dillon, Summerwood, Summit Cove and Keystone chose to buy their properties for the quality of life aspects they provide – beautiful mountain vistas, wildlife viewing, hiking and mountain biking opportunities, clean mountain air, etc. The Town of Dillon would ask the SUFS to not approve a Preferred Alternative that will damage these qualities in the Tenderfoot/Frey Gulch area.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible.	Private Property
45	4	tenderfoot, frey gulch	There is the potential for wildfire from the exhaust, muffler or engines of these bikes. Given the close proximity to the residences, the fires could be devastation and preclude speedy evacuations.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, the incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters.	Private Property
45	2	tenderfoot, frey gulch	These trails [Tenderfoot and Frey Gulch Trail Systems] would significantly affect the flora in the immediate area as well as potentially disturb the wetlands there.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails, however, further study would be needed to validate this claim.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
544	8	tenderfoot, frey gulch	With these comments in mind, the Dillon Town Council has reached a consensus position that the Town of Dillon can support the provisions of Alternative G if the USFS will permanently close the trails in the Tenderfoot Mountain/Frey Gulch area to motorized public recreation.	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle trails in the area (and very few non-motorized trails), however, further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
496	1	tenderfoot, golden horseshoe	<p>In recent years there was a parking lot /loading area built for use [in the Tenderfoot Mountain area]. And recently Summit County Off-Road Riders motorcycle club received a Grant for upkeep and upgrades of area for motorized use. SCORR has done a lot for upkeep in this area already! And now that we have Grant, money, to upkeep and upgrade use area, to make better for all concerned, this area may be Shutdown to motorized use?</p> <p>I also worked with SCORR in the Golden Horseshoe area. I love to spend time riding with my wife and friends there also. Please keep these and other areas open to motorized use. I believe we have the right to use our public lands just as much as non-motorized used do.</p>	These trails are proposed for closure in Alternative GM, however, further study is needed to determine the potential for a single-track trail system in the area.	Designation of Lands

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	14	tenderfoot, montezuma	Snake River Basin: Alternative G to designate an approximately 25-mile system of trails designed for motorcycle use in the Tenderfoot Mountain/Frey Gulch Area. We [Summit County] strongly oppose this proposed use of this area, and request that Tenderfoot Mountain/Frey Gulch area from Dillon to Keystone be closed to all motorized public recreation. This represents a change from our past comments de to strong community and Board of County Commissioner concerns regarding the proposed expansion of motorized use. These concerns include by are not limited to the following: -Critical wildlife habitat identified by the Colorado Division of Wildlife; -Proliferation of additional trails, and lack of ongoing funding to monitor and manage the systems; -Noise impacts on local residents and visitors; -Loss of serenity and public enjoyment of Dillon Cemetery -Decreased property values; -Increased wildfire hazards; -Displacing existing users; -Enforcement problems -Increased user conflicts and safety concerns -Inappropriate to include this development as part of the current TMP process. The Board applauds the efforts of SCORR and other users to create sustainable motorized recreational opportunities on lands administered by the SFS. We believe the routes and areas proposed in Alternative G above the Specific facts and supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider: Tenmile Canyon from outside of the Town of Frisco to Climax HWY91 Crossing on the old railroad bed: This area is closed in ALT G, but considered open in other alternatives. Tenmile canyon is a very good place for snowmobile trail riding that, for local political reasons, has been closed to snowmobiling. This area is noisy as a result of its proximity to the highways and does not sustain wildlife. I believe the reason this is closed to snowmobiling is that it is a bike path in the summertime and there is a political, broad-defining May 2004 local rule that says no snowmobiling on a bike path, even in rural settings where the environment makes sense to put snowmobile use. Contrary to popular local reports . . . this area was open to snowmobiles prior to 2004 according to (a) local sheriff's office who was responsible for public lands prior to creation of the local trails department; (b) the 1984 USFS forest plan; (c) the 1991 USFS travel management uses map; (d) current Colorado revised statutes (state law) title 33-11-103 bullets 4, 5, and 6. With this history and factors in mind I request that the Tenmile canyon floor south and east of Tenmile creek which is an old railroad bed turned into a summer bike trail that can be open to	Alternative GM does not include any motorcycle or ATV trails, however, a summer motorcycle trail system would have no effect on winter or elk calving habitat. The area is NOT summer elk habitat as these animals go to higher elevations in the summer where the food sources are better. Further study is need to determine any potential effect to Lynx. The Dillon Ranger District has the resources to educate motorcycle riders about responsible use (such as staying on designated trails and respecting other users). There are numerous funding and volunteer resources available to the Dillon Ranger District that Summit County Commissioners are apperantly unaware of. Further study is needed to determine the effects and intensity of noise and dust from these vehicles. A 96 decibel requirement is now in effect. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that maximizes distance from residences (and the cemetery) is feasible. Further sudy is needed to validate the claim that trail systems reduce property values. The incidence of wildfires caused by motorcycles is extremely small. All motorcycles are required to have spark arresters. Further study is needed to determine if a trail system that offers separation of uses is feasible. A travel management plan is the most appropriate process for a proposal for a trail system. Other areas in the Distrcit (including	Road and Trail Classification/Management
231	1	tenmile			County or Municipal Laws, Policies, etc.

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	15	three forks of swan	<p>THREE FORKS OF SWAN</p> <p>This area is an important destination for local as well as regional snowmobile riders. Its large parking areas provide optimal access to this region's many trails. The trail grooming provided by the local snowmobile tour company enhances this destination. It is a draw for a lot of out of the county and out of the state snowmobilers that generates a significant financial benefit for the local economy.</p> <p>Several of the Front Range snowmobile clubs as well as the local club regularly hold group rides here. We [High Country Snowmobile Club] feel it important to keep all this area open to motorized recreation and snowmobiling in particular.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/Management
342	3	town of montezuma	<p>We [Town of Montezuma] are located in a narrow peaceful valley and the need to be buffered from the constant noise of climbing snow machines is essential to the quality of life of the residents of our town. The town is prepared to use whatever means available to keep from being overwhelmed. If all other areas of Summit County are closed to snow machines we will be inundated with users with nowhere to park, use the restroom or throw trash away.</p>		Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
342	6	town of montezuma	<p>We [Town of Montezuma] feel strongly that motorized users should pay for the infrastructure that is needed to support their sport through parking fees and impact fees at time of purchase.</p>		Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
342	4	town of montezuma	<p>We [Town of Montezuma] recognize the rights of the people to use public lands. Rights come with responsibilities and designating this area for such intense use with no infrastructure to support it, is not only irresponsible but just plain wrong.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
354	6	trailheads	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need a place to park. Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs, the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated need.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy mountain via CR 520, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pull-offs alongside I-70 and more.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
477	6	trailheads	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need a place to park. Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated needs.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy Mountain via CR 20, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pull offs alongside I-70 and more.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
337	2	trailheads	<p>Contrary to popular belief, the Town of Blue River allows unlicensed vehicles like ATV's and snowmobiles to operate on the town roads while on their way to and from a trailhead. This is especially important to recognize because the trailheads for Indiana Gulch, McCullough Gulch, Fredonia Gulch and Pennsylvania Gulch are completely surrounded by the Town of Blue River and see heavy use from its residents.</p> <p>Because many of the local trails see use by the very residents who live in the immediate vicinity of them, we [High Country Snowmobile Club] do not feel any improvements are needed to the trailheads. We do not need additional parking or turnarounds as most of our members riding locally leave right from their home. We believe our group is one of the few ones that believe that less infrastructure is needed by the Forest Service. None of our comments require additional parking, additional closure gates or additional enforcement.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/Management
435	15	Undetermined	<p>5-611.1 TO 611W.3B (UPPER PA. GULCH ROAD THAT LEAVES 611.13A AND HEADS SOUTH ON RIDGE This road eventually comes to a high saddle between Red Peak and x12331 where it becomes 611W.3B.</p> <p>This is a great mountain bike ride, used as a loop with the Dyersville single-track and a loop down into Como and back up the Gold Dust Trail. Incredibly scenic and desirable. It is hard to determine from your map, but it looks like you leave this road open to motorized past a point where we strongly feel this road should be closed. It crosses through a very wet area that every year gets wider and wider from full sized vehicle traffic. This also happens to be where there once were dense wildflowers, and it is truly disturbing to see how much damage has occurred across this short section of road.</p> <p>- This road, from where it starts heading south, should be closed to all motorized with the exception of dirt bikes. The Pike National Forest has closed the other side of this motorized route so at least we are no longer seeing traffic coming from the Como entrance. It would be much simpler to close it at its junction with 611W.3A, especially if this becomes a winter closure point as well. Please, the damage on this road gets so much worse every year, and it is through an incredibly beautiful wildflower meadow.</p>		Road and Trail Classification/Management
178	4	Undetermined	<p>The section between 5-GH-71 and 5-GH-44 needs to become a shared route so we can connect those trails. As it is now they would dead end for OHV use.</p>	Based on the comments recommendations, the northern end of GH-73 will be changed to shared use trail to allow for a shared use trail connection between GH-71 and GH-44.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
337	1	upper blue valley	<p>We [High Country Snowmobile Club] had a few general observations that seem to be unique to this area. First is that many of the areas in the Upper Blue Valley are used heavily by resident snowmobilers rather than destination snowmobilers who trailer and travel to a specific area. We feel that the ability to continually access these areas is vital to the resident's quality of life.</p>	ZZZ - NIMBY - we are not all things to all people in all places.	Private Property

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
320	32	upper blue, indiana, pennsylvania gulch	Upper Blue Indiana/Pennsylvania Gulch Winter Motorized Area: Area includes SCG open space properties and private property. Area should exclude SCG open space properties (Dyersville Historic Townsite, Upper Blue Tax Default claims, Ridge #1, Wakefield Blue River Trail, Easement, Wakefield Monroe Conservation Easement), and Wakefield Ranch private property.	Decision to be made in the TMP apply only to National Forest lands. In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Mapping, GIS
436	133	upper william fork	Upper Williams Fork Road The lower portion of this road falls within another National Forest but the upper portion of this road, along the ridge, is closed to winter motorized travel. Often trailers are parked at the bottom of this road, so we [Summit Chapter of Backcountry Snowsports Alliance] assume it is a known motorized route. Please sign or gate accordingly.		Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
436	86	weber gulch	WEBER GULCH (no roads or trails exist) If Summit Huts builds a hut in Weber Gulch, then it is even more important to make Baldy closed to winter motorized. There will be less of a cause for the non-motorized user to have issues with the impacts of a new hut if the front side of Baldy Mtn. is available for local day skiers and riders. A hut at Weber Gulch will be a loss for the occasional skier and rider who goes there seeking solitude and avalanche safe glade skiing on a north facing pitch. Weber Gulch is really an unknown area for most folks, and we ask that the hut be kept to a small size.		Designation of Lands
436	87	weber gulch	WEBER GULCH (no roads or trails exist) Weber Gulch is not only pristine elk habitat, but a region which rarely sees humans, especially in the summer. Elk tracks and scat have been seen throughout the summer and fall. Bobcats have been sighted there. The hut site is actually somewhat removed from Weber Creek and is in an area that is very difficult to reach. We ask that the Forest Service carefully evaluate the environmental impact from a hut in this remote location which is one of those dwindling 'untouched niches' in the Upper Blue backcountry.		Specially Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
446	18	west indiana cr, upper indiana cr	Trail not shown on map but should be included into system West Indiana Creek Road, Upper Indiana Creek south east of Breckenridge: This road was most likely created for the construction and maintenance of the power line that traverses the upper Blue River Valley. It dead ends in a small alpine cirque below the divide between the Indiana and Pennsylvania Creek drainages. It receives light motorized traffic but is a vital link to the Dyersville trail. (see above) While it does have some drainage issues, they are related more to puddling rather than flowing water and erosion. The SFTS recommends that this road be included to the travel system as a non motorized trail with motorized access granted by permission for power line maintenance.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
175	27	Winter access Nfork swan	General Summit County – outside the Golden Horseshoe and Tenderfoot Mountain areas: Maintain winter access to the top of the North Fork of the Swan River.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
172	4	Winter correction	Our comment pertains to the Winter Travel Map G: It appears that a portion of the map is incorrect, and identifies Town-owned land [Frisco, Co] at the South end of 2nd Avenue as USFS land (in pink), and it appears that a designated motorized trail (in red) is shown across the southern portion of the Town's parcel. If the intent is to offer a trail at this location, the Town requests additional information in order to further reviews that particular component of the draft plan.		Mapping, GIS
88	21	winter non-motorized	A concern is Wise Mountain Road. Although we are thrilled to see that this road is now winter non-motorized, we are concerned that many snow machines will instead access it from above. Snow machines routinely get stuck on this steep road and make skiing down it a significant challenge. Please extend the non-motorized boundary from the top of this route further to the east to protect Wise Mountain from intrusion.		Designation of Lands
90	21	winter non-motorized	A concern is Wise Mountain Road. Although we are thrilled to see that this road is now winter non-motorized, we are concerned that many snow machines will instead access it from above. Snow machines routinely get stuck on this steep road and make skiing down it a significant challenge. Please extend the non-motorized boundary from the top of this route further to the east to protect Wise Mountain from intrusion.		Designation of Lands
88	23	winter non-motorized	All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention. The amount of unrestricted winter motorized use does not mix well being so close to an urban environment. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously trashed by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. We would recommend WRNF meeting with Frisco user groups to come up with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.		Meetings/Collaboration (Public)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	23	winter non-motorized	All the routes to the south of Frisco need special attention. The amount of unrestricted winter motorized use does not mix well being so close to an urban environment. Numerous non-motorized trails are continuously trashed by snowmobile use, especially close to Rainbow Lakes, and the Mt. Royal trail. We would recommend WRNF meeting with Frisco user groups to come up with a solid plan on how to manage this area. Motorized use should be restricted when it is this close to a town.		Meetings/Collaboration (Public)
90	1	winter non-motorized	<p>As a winter non-motorized skier/snowshoer in Summit County I would like to express gratification, but also concern about preferred Alternative G for the White River National Forest Plan.</p> <p>One of our biggest concerns is the dwindling terrain for the backcountry skier and rider, a user group who wants adequate terrain for 'making turns.' Snowmobiles are increasing their ability to go off-trail to access the same areas where skiers and riders go. Ski area expansions are eliminating some of our favorite destinations. Please recognize this new user group and find out what terrain is realistically available to us since this tends to be exaggerated. The Travel Management Plan recognizes the different needs for various summer non-motorized user groups, as well as listing numerous percentage breakdowns showing differences amongst the various summer non-motorized user groups (hiker, biker, horse). In the winter, the needs differ between a Nordic skier/snowshoer and the backcountry skier/rider but are not mentioned in the Travel Management Plan.</p>		Designation of Lands
88	1	winter non-motorized	<p>As a winter non-motorized skier/snowshoer in Summit County I would like to express gratification, but also concern about preferred Alternative G for the White River National Forest Plan.</p> <p>One of our biggest concerns is the dwindling terrain for the backcountry skier and rider, a user group who wants adequate terrain for 'making turns.' Snowmobiles are increasing their ability to go off-trail to access the same areas where skiers and riders go. Ski area expansions are eliminating some of our favorite destinations. Please recognize this new user group and find out what terrain is realistically available to us since this tends to be exaggerated. The Travel Management Plan recognizes the different needs for various summer non-motorized user groups, as well as listing numerous percentage breakdowns showing differences amongst the various summer non-motorized user groups (hiker, biker, horse). In the winter, the needs differ between a Nordic skier/snowshoer and the backcountry skier/rider but are not mentioned in the Travel Management Plan.</p>		Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
88	6	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>A place to park. Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs, the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated need.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy mountain via CR 520, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pulloffs alongside I-70 and more.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
90	6	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>A place to park. Although the Travel Management Plan might not be appropriate for discussing parking needs, the point is more that a backcountry skier's needs sometimes differ from other non-motorized winter users. Previous attempts to suggest to the WRNF future parking locations have been answered with that there is 'no demonstrated need.' We want it to be known that there is a need: A few examples: Fredonia Gulch, Baldy mountain via CR 520, Lower Bemrose Road, Town of Montezuma, Slalom Drive in Peak 7, Tunnel at I-70, various pulloffs alongside I-70 and more.</p>		Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
88	4	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Avalanche safe above treeline skiing, since much of it is too wind effected or too dangerous.</p>	Alternative GM provides a variety of recreation opportunities in areas that address the needs of backcountry skiers and riders.	Designation of Lands
90	4	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Avalanche safe above treeline skiing, since much of it is too wind effected or too dangerous.</p>	Alternative GM provides a variety of recreation opportunities in areas that address the needs of backcountry skiers and riders.	Designation of Lands
90	5	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Certain aspects - for instance - south facing slopes above treeline are sometimes more desirable because they tend to be safer earlier and hold snow, or north facing slopes below treeline which hold better snow.</p>	Alternative GM provides a variety of recreation opportunities in areas that address the needs of backcountry skiers and riders.	Designation of Lands
88	5	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Certain aspects –for instance - south facing slopes above treeline are sometimes more desirable because they tend to be safer earlier and hold snow, or north facing slopes below treeline which hold better snow.</p>	Alternative GM provides a variety of recreation opportunities in areas that address the needs of backcountry skiers and riders.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	8	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Closure gates for snow machines: they will inevitably go further if there is only a sign. (Priority gates for all winter non-motorized users are: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch Roads, Spruce Creek Road, Pennsylvania Gulch Road, 'Middle Indiana'/Dyersville Road, Baldy Mountain Road, Mayflower Gulch Road, Sallie Barber Road, Miners Creek Trail, Wise Mountain Road).</p>	Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
88	8	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Closure gates for snowmachines: they will inevitably go further if there is only a sign. (Priority gates for all winter non-motorized users are: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch Roads, Spruce Creek Road, Pennsylvania Gulch Road, 'Middle Indiana'/Dyersville Road, Baldy Mountain Road, Mayflower Gulch Road, Sallie Barber Road, Miners Creek Trail, Wise Mountain Road).</p>	Gates are one of many tools used to close or restrict use on a given route or area. The Forest Service will use a variety of techniques to implement the selected travel management plan.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
90	12	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Cumulative effects from our recreational growth on our community and the strain on local services. How much does a ski area expansion such as Peak 6 affect the rest of the forest?</p>	ZZZ - Peak 6 ski are expansion	Cumulative/Combined Effects
88	12	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Cumulative effects from our recreational growth on our community and the strain on local services. How much does a ski area expansion such as Peak 6 affect the rest of the forest?</p>	ZZZ - Peak 6 ski are expansion	Cumulative/Combined Effects
88	3	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Glade skiing since often Summit County's winds make skiing above treeline difficult, yet tree skiing is sparse in Summit County.</p>	The entire Dillon Ranger District, outside developed ski areas, is open to glade skiing when such terrain is available.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
90	3	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>Glade skiing since often Summit County's winds make skiing above treeline difficult, yet tree skiing is sparse in Summit County.</p>	The entire Dillon Ranger District, outside developed ski areas, is open to glade skiing when such terrain is available.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
90	7	winter non-motorized	<p>Backcountry skiers and riders need:</p> <p>More backcountry access gates in ski resorts and we need to re-evaluate the current location of existing gates which are often behind rope closures.</p>	The policy and location of backcountry access gates at ski area is addressed in the administration of the permitted ski areas. It is outside the scope of the travel management plan decision.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
88	7	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: More backcountry access gates in ski resorts and we need to re-evaluate the current location of existing gates which are often behind rope closures.	ZZZ- The policy and location of backcountry access gates at ski area is addressed in the administration of the permitted ski areas. It is outside the scope of the travel management plan decision.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
88	11	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: Recognition and addressing the needs of non-motorized winter users who outnumber snowmobiles by 3 to 1.	ZZZ- cite figures for acre open to non-moto and moto.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
90	11	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: Recognition and addressing the needs of non-motorized winter users who outnumber snowmobiles by 3 to 1.	ZZZ- cite figures for acre open to non-moto and moto.	Non-motorized (hiking, hunting, horseback, snowshoeing, skiing, etc.)
90	2	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: Terrain that is fairly avalanche safe because of our weak snowpack.	ZZZ- FS is not in the business of snow stability evaluation and risk assessment for winter recreation users.	Traffic Control and Safety
88	9	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: Trailheads that are reasonably close to our final destination.	ZZZ - winter trailheads	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
90	9	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: Trailheads that are reasonably close to our final destination.	ZZZ - winter trailheads	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
88	10	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: We also want the WRNF to recognize the cumulative effects from ski area expansions and snowmobile play areas and how that affects the rest of the forest – adding more user group pressure to all other locations, crowding wildlife into smaller habitats; recognizing that non-motorized winter users are growing at a faster rate than the growth of ski area numbers in the White River National Forest.	ZZZ - Peak 6 ski are expansion	Cumulative/Combined Effects
90	10	winter non-motorized	Backcountry skiers and riders need: We want the WRNF to recognize the cumulative effects from ski area expansions and snowmobile play areas and how that affects the rest of the forest – adding more user group pressure to all other locations, crowding wildlife into smaller habitats; recognizing that non-motorized winter users are growing at a faster rate than the growth of ski area numbers in the White River National Forest.	ZZZ - Peak 6 ski are expansion	Cumulative/Combined Effects

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	17	winter non-motorized	Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous to ski after it has seen snowmobile tracks. Snowplowing down a snowmobile's deep narrow track is extremely challenging and almost impossible for most Nordic skiers. Uphill travel on whoop-de-doo and snow machine tread often down to the dirt on PA. Gulch makes ski touring miserable. The non-motorized winter user has been displaced from this area, despite the low percentage of snowmobiles that use this area.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Traffic Control and Safety
88	17	winter non-motorized	Both Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch have become too difficult and dangerous to ski after it has seen snowmobile tracks. Snowplowing down a snowmobile's deep narrow track is extremely challenging and almost impossible for most Nordic skiers. Uphill travel on whoop-de-doo and snow machines tread often down to the dirt on PA. Gulch makes ski touring miserable. The non-motorized winter user has been displaced from this area, despite the low percentage of snowmobiles that use this area.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Traffic Control and Safety
88	14	winter non-motorized	For many years, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch was some of the most popular terrain for the Nordic skier as well as backcountry skier. It was the local's favorite due to great snow conditions, loop opportunities, easy glade skiing, beautiful scenery, solitude and close to the town of Breckenridge.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Action not Specified

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	14	winter non-motorized	For many years, Pennsylvania and Indiana Gulch was some of the most popular terrain for the Nordic skier as well as backcountry skier. It was the local's favorite due to great snow conditions, loop opportunities, easy glade skiing, beautiful scenery, solitude and close to the town of Breckenridge.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Action not Specified
89	1	winter non-motorized	I am an avid non-motorized user of the White River National Forest. I would like to thank you for the changes you have made to the Travel Management Plan that have restricted many areas from motorized use. I would like to encourage you to continue to make more areas non-motorized.	ZZZ-- Cite acreage of no-moto and mot uses	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
89	2	winter non-motorized	I live in a neighborhood at the base of Baldy, just two miles to the east of Breckenridge. The vast majority of my neighbors are non-motorized users who complain about the way motorized users ruin the experience for everyone else. The area around Baldy sees a lot of illegal snowmobile use, so I am hopeful that the new restrictions will deter snowmobile usage.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
89	3	winter non-motorized	I understand that non-motorized users outnumber motorized users by 3 to 1. In my neighborhood, I find the ratio to be much higher than that, with far more non-motorized users. The impact of one motorized user is much greater than a skier, leading me to think that motorized use should be more limited and strictly enforced. Thank you for any actions you take to limit snowmobile use throughout the White River National Forest.	ZZZ-- Cite acreage of no-moto and mot uses and	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
88	19	winter non-motorized	In Alternative G, the south side of PA Gulch Road is closed to motorized, yet this is where snow machines often travel off-route. How will this be managed effectively? Please weigh the cost of the large number of signs and enforcement this road will need, versus closing the road entirely to winter motorized since most of the winter motorized use was to illegally access Horseshoe Basin. At the very least, put a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch (611W.3A). This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Structures (Bridges/culvert s/gates/signs, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	19	winter non-motorized	In Alternative G, the south side of PA Gulch Road is closed to motorized, yet this is where snow machines often travel off-route. How will this be managed effectively? Please weigh the cost of the large number of signs and enforcement this road will need, versus closing the road entirely to winter motorized since most of the winter motorized use was to illegally access Horseshoe Basin. At the very least, put a gate across PA Gulch Road where the non-motorized boundary begins. We would also like a gate at the top of the connecting road between PA Gulch and Indiana Gulch (611W.3A). This gate would eliminate any temptation for the snow machines to head south on the ridge and eventually continue down into Horseshoe Basin. We rarely see their tracks on this route, despite the Travel Management Plan having this zone open to unrestricted motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
88	26	winter non-motorized	In particular, we are thrilled about Baldy Mountain, which has always been one of the most popular destinations to make turns or ski a short loop on its numerous surrounding trails but recently has been ruined from an increase in hybrid snow machine use. Thank you.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
90	26	winter non-motorized	In particular, we are thrilled about Baldy Mountain, which has always been one of the most popular destinations to make turns or ski a short loop on its numerous surrounding trails but recently has been ruined from an increase in hybrid snow machine use. Thank you.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
88	15	winter non-motorized	In the last few years, Pennsylvania Gulch road has seen a huge increase in snowmobile traffic, mostly to illegally enter Horseshoe Basin for hybrid use as well as highmarking.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	15	winter non-motorized	In the last few years, Pennsylvania Gulch road has seen a huge increase in snowmobile traffic, mostly to illegally enter Horseshoe Basin for hybrid use as well as highmarking.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
90	27	winter non-motorized	Keeping the motorized winter use off of the west side of Hoosier Pass is a huge bonus for all winter non-motorized groups, but in particular the backcountry skier and rider who only recently has been displaced from this area from snow machines high marking on their favorite pitches. The high alpine tundra is often exposed on Hoosier Pass and snowmobiles would travel across the bare ground.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
88	27	winter non-motorized	Keeping the motorized winter use off of the west side of Hoosier Pass is a huge bonus for all winter non-motorized groups, but in particular the backcountry skier and rider who only recently has been displaced from this area from snow machines highmarking on their favorite pitches. The high alpine tundra is often exposed on Hoosier Pass and snowmobiles would travel across the bare ground.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
88	29	winter non-motorized	Mayflower Gulch Road is another success story especially given how popular it is with not only locals but the Front Range. Again, snowmobiles only could go a couple miles up the road, but this is the perfect distance for the non-motorized user. Recently snow machines were heading off road and onto the valley floor, trashing the willows and ruining the ski experience. We are excited to see that this area is under the restricted motorized designation, and it appears that Mayflower Gulch Road will not allow motorized winter use.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
90	29	winter non-motorized	Mayflower Gulch Road is another success story especially given how popular it is with not only locals but the Front Range. Again, snowmobiles only could go a couple miles up the road, but this is the perfect distance for the non-motorized user. Recently snow machines were heading off road and onto the valley floor, trashing the willows and ruining the ski experience. We are excited to see that this area is under the restricted motorized designation, and it appears that Mayflower Gulch Road will not allow motorized winter use.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
88	18	winter non-motorized	Most of this region in the Travel Management Plan has been given the unrestricted motorized use designation. This unrestricted motorized boundary extends from Pennsylvania Gulch Road's north side, and includes Middle Indiana Creek, Dysersville Road to Boreas Pass and Main Indiana Gulch Road to Boreas Pass. This boundary also extends along the ridge between Pennsylvania and Indiana, and all of Hoosier Ridge from PA Gulch north to Boreas Pass. Much of this terrain has rarely seen motorized winter use and Hoosier Ridge only sees light non-motorized use. Please re-evaluate this boundary. Too much of this terrain never sees motorized use.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands
90	18	winter non-motorized	Most of this region in the Travel Management Plan has been given the unrestricted motorized use designation. This unrestricted motorized boundary extends from Pennsylvania Gulch Road's north side, and includes Middle Indiana Creek, Dysersville Road to Boreas Pass and Main Indiana Gulch Road to Boreas Pass. This boundary also extends along the ridge between Pennsylvania and Indiana, and all of Hoosier Ridge from PA Gulch north to Boreas Pass. Much of this terrain has rarely seen motorized winter use and Hoosier Ridge only sees light non-motorized use. Please re-evaluate this boundary. Too much of this terrain never sees motorized use.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Designation of Lands
88	16	winter non-motorized	Parking at the cul-de-sac of PA. Gulch Road is limited, and trailers aren't feasible. Most of the snow machines travel illegally on County roads to reach this trail.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	16	winter non-motorized	Parking at the cul-de-sac of PA. Gulch Road is limited, and trailers aren't feasible. Most of the snow machines travel illegally on County roads to reach this trail.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Infrastructure (roads, pipelines, utilities, etc.)
88	30	winter non-motorized	Thanks for Peru Creek road and all of its side roads which are proposed to be closed to winter motorized. Since so much of Montezuma is popular with snow machines, we believe that this is the balance necessary for the health and protection of the natural resources in this area. Peru Creek never saw heavy snow machine use, yet this was the most popular destination in Montezuma for the non-motorized skier and rider.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
90	30	winter non-motorized	Thanks for Peru Creek road and all of its side roads which are proposed to be closed to winter motorized. Since so much of Montezuma is popular with snow machines, we believe that this is the balance necessary for the health and protection of the natural resources in this area. Peru Creek never saw heavy snow machine use, yet this was the most popular destination in Montezuma for the non-motorized skier and rider.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
88	13	winter non-motorized	The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	13	winter non-motorized	The Pennsylvania/Indiana roads are a major concern for us. Please consider closing Pennsylvania and Indiana gulch Roads to winter motorized use. Please change this area from "unrestricted motorized to "restricted motorized.'	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
88	22	winter non-motorized	This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	zzz- miners creek	Designation of Lands
90	22	winter non-motorized	This trail is within a 'closed to motorized' designation but it has seen a steady increase of snow machines using it to access and 'play' in the basins of Peaks 1, 2, 3 and 4. This high alpine, remote terrain needs a higher level of protection. Please consider extending the non-motorized winter boundary further down Miners Creek road to give this area a larger buffer zone for protection.	zzz- miners creek	Designation of Lands
88	28	winter non-motorized	We are also excited that Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road are now winter non-motorized. Neither of these routes received much traffic from snow machines, because they couldn't go very far, yet this is one of the busiest areas for snowshoers and skiers.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
90	28	winter non-motorized	We are also excited that Spruce Creek and Crystal Lakes Road are now winter non-motorized. Neither of these routes received much traffic from snow machines, because they couldn't go very far, yet this is one of the busiest areas for snowshoers and skiers.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
88	25	winter non-motorized	We do want to thank you for all the new areas which have become winter non-motorized: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch road, Baldy Mountain, Spruce Creek Road, Crystal Lakes Road, Wheeler Flats, Mayflower Gulch Road, Peru Creek and all its side routes, Burro Trail, Wise Mountain.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands
90	25	winter non-motorized	We do want to thank you for all the new areas which have become winter non-motorized: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch road, Baldy Mountain, Spruce Creek Road, Crystal Lakes Road, Wheeler Flats, Mayflower Gulch Road, Peru Creek and all its side routes, Burro Trail, Wise Mountain.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Designation of Lands

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNumber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
90	20	winter non-motorized	We would like to at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes the Middle Indiana Creek road, also called the Cabin road. It is not on your maps. This road dead ends at a cabin, which is also where the 'Dyersville single tracks' begin. This road is part of a great nordic ski or snowshoe loop and snowmobiles would not lose much by closing the short mile or so they can travel on this road. We would also like the Dyersville Road to be winter non-motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
88	20	winter non-motorized	We would like to at least a part of this region as winter non-motorized and that includes the Middle Indiana Creek road, also called the Cabin road. It is not on your maps. This road dead ends at a cabin, which is also where the 'dyersville singletracks' begin. This road is part of a great nordic ski or snowshoe loop and snowmobiles would not lose much by closing the short mile or so they can travel on this road. We would also like the Dyersville Road to be winter non-motorized.	In the final Travel Management alternative GM, the large open motorized area that runs from the southern flanks of Bald Mountain, through Indiana Gulch, and south into Pennsylvania Gulch will be designated as a non-motorized zone based on safety, access, terrain, and natural resources issues. Specifically, the area has no clear geographic or topographic boundaries, steep wooded hillsides, wetland and riparian areas and also has high natural resource values and challenging, difficult to manage terrain.. In addition, open motorized use in this area may encourage unauthorized access into the restricted areas south of Pennsylvania Gulch.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
88	24	winter non-motorized	Why offer such a small play area off of Miners Creek Road and to the north of Rainbow Lake being so close to town? This should be switched to restricted motorized use. This road is used by all users, and unrestricted motorized is not appropriate for shared use.	zzz- miners creek	Designation of Lands
90	24	winter non-motorized	Why offer such a small play area off of Miners Creek Road and to the north of Rainbow Lake being so close to town? This should be switched to restricted motorized use. This road is used by all users, and unrestricted motorized is not appropriate for shared use.	zzz- miners creek	Designation of Lands
354	23	winter-nonmotor	We do want to thank you for all the new areas which have become winter non-motorized: Hoosier Pass West, McCullough Gulch road, Baldy Mountain, Spruce Creek Road, Crystal Lakes Road, Wheeler Flats, Mayflower Gulch Road, Peru Creek and all its side routes, Burro Trail, Wise Mountain.	This comment supports Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

Response to Site-Specific Comments: Dillon Ranger District

letterNu mber	comment Number	category	comment	Response	action
354	20	wise mountain	<p>WISE MOUNTAIN ROAD</p> <p>Another concern is Wise Mountain Road. Although we are thrilled to see that this road is now winter non-motorized, we are concerned that many snow machines will instead access it from above. Snow machines routinely get stuck on this steep road and make skiing down it a significant challenge. Please extend the non-motorized boundary from the top of this route further to the east to protect Wise Mountain from intrusion.</p>	<p>The boundary line between "closed to motorized" and "unrestricted motorized" is based on WRNFL&MP management areas (5.5 Forested Flora and Fauna and 4.31 Recreation, respectively). The boundary between the two management areas is defined as generally the treeline and above treeline elevation. Due to the topography and open above treeline character of the area along the divide it is not practical to move the boundary to the east.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement
489	7	Wise Mountain Road, Baldy Mountain, Hoosier Pass west side, Mayflower Gulch, Peru Creek Road.	I support the following Winter Travel Plan designations: Wise Mountain Road, Baldy Mountain, Hoosier Pass west side, Mayflower Gulch, and Peru Creek Road.	<p>This comment supports Alternative G.</p>	Designation of Lands
471	17	wise mtn	<p>Wise Mountain Road: Although we are happy to see that this road is now winter non-motorized, we are concerned that many snow machines will instead access it from above. Snow machines routinely get stuck on this steep road and make skiing down it a significant challenge. It would be more effective to extend the non-motorized boundary from the top of this route further to the east to protect Wise Mountain from intrusion.</p>	<p>The boundary line between "closed to motorized" and "unrestricted motorized" is based on WRNFL&MP management areas (5.5 Forested Flora and Fauna and 4.31 Recreation, respectively). The boundary between the two management areas is defined as generally the treeline and above treeline elevation. Due to the topography and open above treeline character of the area along the divide it is not practical to move the boundary to the east.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/M anagement

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
366	1	Jul-31	It has come to my attention that the White River Travel Mgmt. Plan, Alternative G has omitted designating road #7031 (just past the 6 mile marker off the Homestake Valley Road) in the plan. I assume this is simply an oversight, as this small road is the sole access to a private bridge, and 3 private cabins on National forest. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	The route in question provides access to the Homestake Summer Home Group. The cabins in the summer home group are authorized under a special use permit. At the present time, the road is closed to public access at the bridge over Homestake Creek. The preferred alternative is to close the road to the public at Forest Road 703. The road will then become a road authorized under a special use permit the entire length. As a result the road will not show on any of the maps, as the maps only show public routes. Therefore, access will remain to the cabin owners. The final alternative will not be modified to show this route.	Mapping, GIS
438	2	Jul-31	The NFH cabin I mentioned previously [at Homestake Valley] is at mile 6 on Road #7031. This road is not mentioned in Alternative G. We are concerned that access might be denied by the new travel management plan. Please add our access road to the map.	The route in question provides access to the Homestake Summer Home Group. The cabins in the summer home group are authorized under a special use permit. At the present time, the road is closed to public access at the bridge over Homestake Creek. The preferred alternative is to close the road to the public at Forest Road 703. The road will then become a road authorized under a special use permit the entire length. As a result the road will not show on any of the maps, as the maps only show public routes. Therefore, access will remain to the cabin owners. The final alternative will not be modified to show this route.	Mapping, GIS
198	7	2009.2, 2011.1, 2013.1, 2014.1, 1884.1	I find it interesting that the FS who never uses their horses (or any livestock) thinks they know what trails to close. Having ridden up all of these trails to hunt or fish I know them well and travel them almost every year. There is no reason to close the following trails to horse (livestock) use they provide the only horse access and all were historical livestock trails. There are no existing problems on these trails there is room for all. 2009.2 2011.1 2013.1 2014.1 1884.1 - horse trail is the only good access from Muddy Pass down into the Piney River of course the FS would have to have a trail crew clear the trail at some point and actually put in time on it.	The preferred alternative (G) allows foot and horse use on all of the trails listed: 1884 (Pine Creek), 2009 (Mt of the Holy Cross), 2011 (Booth Creek), 2013 (Bighorn Creek), and 2014 (Deluge Lake). Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified as it already addresses the concern raised.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	11	3-400.2, 4-431.1, 3-512.1, 3-519.1, 4-416.1, 4-436.1, 4-418.1, 4-435.1, 4-435.1A, 4-421.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 3-400.2, 4-431.1, 3-512.1, 3-519.1, 4-416.1, 4-436.1, 4-418.1, 4-435.1, 4-435.1A, 4-421.1, traditional 4WD, ATV and motorcycle routes that provide loop routes outside of Sylvan Lake State Park. Mixed use on road. Access to traditional hunting areas.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 400. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on the entire length of this road. That study is also based on the fact that in the State of CO there is no age restriction for ATV or unlicensed motorcycles and therefore engineers base the study on young riders as well. The Forest Service consulted with engineers, CDOW and others to consider if the road would be considered safer and meet a moderate rating if all users were required to have a valid licence. It was determined that the road would render a moderate rating, so the Forest Service is willing to allow mixed use for licence holders in the final. This new concept will be tested to see if it can be done without extensive management and adhered to. Based on the limited miles of road available for a quality ATV experience, the final alternative will include leaving this road open to travel. The final alternative will not be modified to close this road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	61	3-611.2a	FSR 611.2A Deer Creek/Eagle RD Vehicular travel along this route is entirely unnecessary except possibly to service the stock pond near its end. Since no such reason is given, We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] must assume that it doesn't exist and that the public will be best served by limiting use of this route to foot travel.	The Deer Creek road does exist and provides access to the rim above Red Dirt Creek. The preferred alternative includes leaving this road open to travel. The final alternative will not be modified to close this road.	Oil/Gas/Mining Permitting, Leasing, Exploration, Extraction
480	79	401, 429, 442, 444, 402, 437, 784, 445, 447, 7-405.1, 7-700.1, 7-North and East of Piney Ridge including McPhee Gulch) the main, established roads should all remain open to current use. 744.1, 7-433.1, 7-717.1, 7-780.1, 7-Holy Cross Ranger District: 778.1, 7-783.1, 7-774.1, 7-734.1, 7-The following list of roads should be open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. These roads are listed as open to licensed vehicles only in Alt G. Maintaining access to these roads is critical to providing sufficient hunters access to maintain harvest objectives. Opening these roads to unlicensed will not increase the maintenance costs and during periods of inclement weather unlicensed vehicle would have less impact on the roads: 7-719.2C, 7-728.1, 7-708.1, 7-N708.2, 7-702.1, 7-714.1.	Holy Cross Ranger District: In general (Spring Creek Road part of Dillon Ranger District including Elliot Ridge to Mahan Lake, Piney Peak and USFS McPhee Gulch) the main, established roads should all remain open to current use. Holy Cross Ranger District: The following list of roads should be open to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. These roads are listed as open to licensed vehicles only in Alt G. Maintaining access to these roads is critical to providing sufficient hunters access to maintain harvest objectives. Opening these roads to unlicensed will not increase the maintenance costs and during periods of inclement weather unlicensed vehicle would have less impact on the roads: 401, 429, 442, 444, 402, 437, 784, 445, 447, 7-405.1, 7-700.1, 7-744.1, 7-433.1, 7-717.1, 7-780.1, 7-778.1, 7-783.1, 7-774.1, 734.1, 7-786.1, 7-786.1A, 7-719.1, 7-719.2C, 7-728.1, 7-708.1, 7-N708.2, 7-702.1, [and] 7-714.1.	Alternative G allows mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) on the following roads: 401 (Sheephorn), 444 (Cottonwood Basin), 402 (Cottonwood), 784 (Cottonwood Peak), and 445 (High Trail Gulch). Therefore, no change is needed in the final alternative. Alternative G converts road 442 (Walters Lake) to an unlicensed vehicle trail due to the condition of the road and that a full-sized vehicle can no longer drive it. Therefore, no change is needed in the final alternative. Alternative G closes road 429 (Three Licks) because currently three roads exist within one mile of each other and provide access to the same basic area. Therefore, no change will be made in the final alternative. Forest Road 437 does not exist on the ground, therefore no change will be made in the final alternative. Road 447 (Garden Gulch) is in poor condition and will be closed at the Forest Boundary and a parking area created under Alternative G. Therefore, there will be no where for ATV's to be used. Therefore, no change will be made in the final alternative. The final alternative will be modified to allow ATV's on the following roads by hunters during hunting seasons and after log hauling has ended on Road 700 (Red Sandstone-Muddy Pass): 405 (Muddy Pass), 700 (Red Sandstone-Muddy Pass) from Muddy Pass east to the junction with Road 701, 744 (Piney), 433 (Moniger), 717 (June Creek), 780 (Power Road), 778 (Beard Creek), 786 (Tames Creek), 774 (Berry Creek) from Edwards to the junction with 717 as the remainder of the road will be decommissioned due to its poor conditions (steep, sediment flows), 734 (Red & White Mountain), 708 (McAllister Gulch), and 702 (Resolution) from Nova Guides property to Ptarmigan Pass. The final alternative will not be modified to allow unlicensed vehicles on the following roads	Oil/Gas/Mining Permitting, Leasing, Exploration, Extraction Road and Trail Classification/Management
339	3	4-1886.1	4-1886.1 on the F Plan needs to be added on the G Plan. This trail connects mountain bike users, Hikers as well, i.e. 421.1b which connects to 4-421.1, Belly Ache and ultimately into Big Park. This is the only access route into the Belly Ache Big Park Area from the Edwards area. Please put 4-1886.1 on the G Plan.	There appears to be a typing error as the trail in question is believed to be 1866.1. Alternative G has the trail as foot and horse only. The final alternative will be modified to allow mountain bikes on this trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	10	4-400.2	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 4-400.2 from sylvan lake to 3-400.2	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 400. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on the entire length of this road. That study is also based on the fact that in the State of CO there is no age restriction for ATV or unlicensed motorcycles and therefore engineers base the study on young riders as well. The Forest Service consulted with engineers, CDOW and others to consider if the road would be considered safer and meet a moderate rating if all users were required to have a valid licence. It was determined that the road would render a moderate rating, so the Forest Service is willing to allow mixed use for licence holders in the final. This new concept will be tested to see if it can be done without extensive management	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
151	1	4-400.2, 4-414.1, 7-400.1, Coffee Pot, Camp Hale, Wilderidge, June Creek, Red and White	<p>The mixed use safety study suggests closing certain access roads due to safety issues of ATVs vs. licensed vehicles. Closing the access roads such as 4-400.2, 4-414.1 and 7-400.1 (including Coffee Pot Road) and roads south of Eagle and near Camp Hale will force more trucks with ATV trailers farther into the forest in order to unload their ATVs. Presently one can park at areas near the forest boundaries and then, by using the access roads, ride to the designated ATV roads and trails. This reduces truck and trailer traffic in the national forest.</p> <p>Closure of the access road at the north edge of the Wildridge Subdivision in Avon will force more motorized use into June Creek where presently there is a lot of foot and mountain bike use. Out of respect for those users I generally use the current access road to Red and White Mountain although I understand the lack of parking and erosion with that road.</p>	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 400, 414, and 600 (Coffee Pot) below the junction with Road 632. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads. That study is also based on the fact that in the State of CO there is no age restriction for ATV or unlicensed motorcycles and therefore engineers base the study on young riders as well. The Forest Service consulted with engineers, CDOW and others to consider if the 400 and 600 (at the Forest boundary) would be considered safer and meet a moderate rating if all users were required to have a valid licence. It was determined that the road would render a moderate rating, so the Forest Service is willing to allow mixed use for licence holders in the final. This new concept will be tested to see if it can be done without extensive management and adhered to. Others will	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
361	8	4-413.1, 4-414.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 4-413.1, 4-414.1 main access roads to hardscrabble mountain from Eagle and Gypsum. A lot of ATV use from forest boundary. Most people drop ATV at forest boundary or enter forest from BLM roads near Gypsum. Great opportunity for loop routes.	The mixed use study on Road 414 determined that mixed use was not safe. Therefore, the designation of this section of road will not be modified in the final alternative. However, the final alternative will be modified to allow mixed use on Road 413 (Hardscrabble) as the required study determined mixed use as not being unsafe.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	52	4-422.1	FSR 422.1 Squaw Creek/Holy Cross RD There is private property with buildings on it near the end of this route, yet alternative G contemplates closing this section to motor vehicles. It appears to us that it needs to be kept open for private use, with public, non-mechanized access diverted around the west side of the property from the parking area on the north side of the inholding.	The final alternative will be modified to allow access to the private land. The road will be closed at this point and a trail will be built around the private land to give public access to Trails 1866 and 1897.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	4	4-445.1	The following is a road in Alternative F and G identified as open to licensed and unlicensed use that should be open to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide. 4-445.1, this road is one of the poorest roads on the district. Only crazy 4WD enthusiasts have the nerves to drive this one. Road comes off of BLM access, so any travel restriction would have to be coordinated with BLM.	The route in question is very rough and does cross BLM land. However, at the present time this route provides the only public motorized access to the north side of the Piney River in this area. During the hunting seasons, both licensed and unlicensed vehicles utilized this road to access the area. As a result, the final alternative will not be modified to change the designation of this route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	4	4-451.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Abrams Creek 4-451 Roads are proposed to be converted to a bike trails, and decommissioning of user-developed roads is proposed in the upper watershed under Alternative G. These activities may improve habitat for a population of cutthroat trout downstream in Abrams Creek.	The final alternative is not being modified and may improve trout habitat.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	9	4-451.1, 4-451.1A	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 4-451.1, 4-451.1A, traditional hunting access roads as well as roads used for 4WD, ATV and motorcycle loop route from BLM lands near Gypsum.	The final alternative is not being modified to allow unlicensed vehicles in this area. Motorized access is allowed on Road 451.1 for licensed vehicles and road 451.1A is proposed for closure.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	21	4-451.1B, 4-461.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to mechanized use and should be changed to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide or Motorized Licensed/Unlicensed in Alternative G. 4-451.1B, 4-461.1, these roads are traditional loop roads that tie in with a road network from BLM lands near Gypsum. Heavily used by ATV's and motorcycles. 4WD road that accesses traditional hunting areas.	The final alternative is not being modified to allow unlicensed vehicles in this area. The use of unlicensed vehicles is allowed in other parts of the District and the proposed travel system matches with the proposed travel system on BLM lands.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	7	4-600.1, 4-600.3A, 4-600.3L, 4-604.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 4-600.1, 4-600.3A, 4-600.3L, 4-604.1, the coffee pot road is a main access road to the Flat Tops and receives a lot of summer/fall use. Numerous campsites are located along these roads and are starting point for ATV excursions, both summer and during the big game hunting seasons. It is going to be very difficult to enforce licensed vehicles only on these roads, as public users generally off load their ATV's at campsites. Safety shouldn't be a concern as the 600.1 road is wide and site distances are good.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 600. The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 400. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on the entire length of this road. That study is also based on the fact that in the State of CO there is no age restriction for ATV or unlicensed motorcycles and therefore engineers base the study on young riders as well. The Forest Service consulted with engineers, CDOW and others to consider if the road would be considered safer and meet a moderate rating if all users were required to have a valid licence. It was determined that the road would render a moderate rating, so the Forest Service is willing to allow mixed use for Forest Road 611 is being closed to protect a conservation population of cutthroat trout. The road was built in the water influence zone and sediment from the road reaches the stream after each rainfall. The Forest Service has implemented measures to improve the stream and the sediment negates some of the work. The road will be closed from the top of Derby Mesa to the Forest Boundary where a parking lot will be constructed to allow non-motorized public access to the Red Dirt drainage. The final alternative will not be modified to change the type of access to this Forest Road 611 is being closed to protect a conservation population of cutthroat trout. The road was built in the water influence zone and sediment from the road reaches the stream after each rainfall. The Forest Service has implemented measures to improve the stream and the sediment negates some of the work. The road will be closed from the top of Derby Mesa to the Forest Boundary where a parking lot will be constructed to allow non-motorized public access to the Red Dirt drainage. The final alternative will not be modified to change the type of access to this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	1	4-611.1	The following are roads in Alternative G that should remain open to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide. 4-611.1, section in Alt. G that is designated as foot and horse travel. This road is narrow and rocky as it climbs out of Red Dirt Creek on to Derby Mesa. Provides a great ATV trail ride and hunter access.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	8	4-611.1, 4-2073.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Alternative G proposes to convert 4-611.1 road along the East Fork of Red Dirt Creek to a foot/horse trail, and decommission trail 4-2073.1 that currently experiences illegal OHV use. These proposed activities would benefit a conservation population of cutthroat trout. District fisheries staff periodically replace the road closed sign on 4-2073.1, but it is repeatedly removed and illegal OHV use continues. The conversion of 4-611.1 to a trail along East Fork Red Dirt Creek would minimize sedimentation to the stream due to periodic wash-outs, since a trail in this location would require less maintenance and width to remain passable to foot/horse travel when compared to passenger trucks/cars. Nevertheless, complete decommissioning of this road may be appropriate since it was originally constructed in water influence zone (riparian area). Under Alternative F, these roads/trails would continue to degrade cutthroat trout habitat.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	2	4-611.2d, 4-613.1	The following are roads in Alternative F identified as open to licensed and unlicensed use that should remain that way in Alternative G. 4-611.2D, this road provides a loop access into 4-613.1 for recreational vehicles and hunter access. 4-600.3H, 4-603.1,	Alternative G proposes to close roads 600.3H and 603.1. These are short roads and the location of the roads has lead to rutting and are impossible to maintain. Road 611.2D is also proposed for closing in Alternative G as access is provided by other routes. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
361	20	4-622.1, 4-632.1, 4-623.1A, 4-624.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to foot/horse use and should be changed to Motorized vehicles les: Alternative G has been modified to allow licensed vehicles on the following roads : 622 (Deadhorse), 623 (Wagon Gulch) and 642 (Blue Gulch). Road 623.1A (Lower Lake) will be decommissioned as proposed in the preferred alternative as the other two roads provide improved access into the area. Therefore, the final alternative will be modified to allow this use. 4-622.1, 4-632.1, 4-623.1A, 4-624.1, these roads are traditional 4WD roads that get a lot of use during the big game hunting seasons. They provide access to traditional hunting areas and fall camping areas. Eliminating motorized use on these roads will concentrate more camping along 4-600.1.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	17	4.421.1, 4.421.1A, 4.421.1B	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: 4.421.1, 4.421.1A and 4.421.1B: Preserve these routes as open to bike, horse and foot. These routes also provide access to Salt Creek, Big Park and loop to Stag Gulch via.	421.1B will remain as a mountain bike trail to provide for a loop opportunity. 421.1A is scheduled to not be added and rehabilitated as it was determined both routes are not needed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	18	4-N6068.1, 4-1869.1	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: McKenzie Gulch – N6068.1 or 1869.1: Maintain as excellent mountain bike loop from Eagle via Hardscrabble area or loop from Sylvan Lake. Also good snowshoe route.	1869.1 McKenzie Gulch will remain as a mountain bike trail, not sure what N6068 is referring to.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	67	4-1864.1, 4-1872.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDT 1864.1 Yates Gulch and 1872.1 Sneve Gulch, open for mechanized travel should be closed to that use.	Due to demand and popularity of these routes these will remain open to mechanized use in the final. Other non-system routes in the area are removed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	68	4-1869.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDT 1869.1 McKenzie Gulch commend the USFS for closing this route to mechanized use. All the routes the CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] is requesting to be opened that were not included in Alt. G or that the CDOW is requesting to be opened to mixed motor vehicle use are for the purpose of user dispersal to help meet wildlife management objectives.	1869.1 McKenzie Gulch will remain as a mountain bike trail due to popularity, current use, and sustainability. Other routes open or closed to mixed motorized use are each evaluated for need, impact and managability.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	20	4-1873.1	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: Iron Edge – 1873.1: Allow Mountain Bike (typically descent only) in addition to Foot and Horse. Needs improvements, local trail groups could assist. Makes good loop from Yeoman Park.	Due to the steep nature of the trail, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	79	4-1873.1	FST 1873.1 Iron Edge/Eagle RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] strongly support restricting the use of this steep and winding trail to non-mechanized travel.	Due to the steep nature of the trail, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mountain bikes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	88	4-1884.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-1884.1 horse trail is shown as not needed in Alt G. This trail needs to be maintained to provide horse access into the Piney River drainage from the Marma Lake side.	The maps for Alternative G shows this trail to be open to foot and horse traffic. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	87	7-2009.2, 7-2011.1, 7-2013.1, 7-2014.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. The following trails are shown closed to horses. These trails provide the only horse access into their respective drainages. Closing these trails to horses would limit the ability for hunters to utilize these areas for hunting sheep, goats, deer and elk. Closing these trails would go against the stated intent of the USFS to direct more hunters to use horses. Due to the steep topography and rocky terrain it is not possible to safety access these drainages without using these trails. 7-2009.2 Mount of the Holy Cross 7-2011.1 Booth Lake 7-2013.1 Bighorn Creek 7-2014.1 Deluge Lake.	The maps for Alternative G shows these trails to be open to foot and horse traffic. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
249	5	7-2106.1	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town supports the continued mixed non-motorized use for the Buck Creek (#7-2106.1) trail.	The final alternative will not be modified and mixed use (mountain bikes, foot, and horse travel) will continue to be allowed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
249	10	7-2107.1	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town values the historic significance of the Nottingham Ridge (#7-2107.1) Trail and the loop options that this trail offers, and recommend keeping mixed use where possible-including mountain bikes.	The final alternative will not be modified and mixed use (mountain bikes, foot, and horse travel) will continue to be allowed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	85	7-2135.1, 7-n236.1, 7-n237.1	FST 2135.1 Middle Creek, FST N236.1 and FST N237.1/Holy Cross RD In order to keep some small part of the area north of Vail free of intensive recreation, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] strongly support the decommissioning of these three routes.	The preferred and final alternative includes the decommissioning of N236.1 and N237.1. Forest Service Trail 2136 (Middle Creek) is a popular mountain bike trail that provides an alternate access off of the bottom part of the Red Sandstone Road that is heavily used by motor vehicles. As a result, the final alternative will not be modified to closed Trail 2136.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
535	19	4-2230.1	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: Sneve Gulch – 4-2230.1: Identified in 2006 as a route, and not on the decommission list but not currently shown on Alternative A, or Alternative G. Does exist, restore to maps. Manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse; same as in 2006. Good route from Sylvan to/from Yeoman. Needs improvement, local groups could assist. Located approximately at third curve road 4-416.1 from Crooked Creek Pass. The trail would go in a straight line (following an old logging road) to connect to road 4-436.1 and then to the top of Sneve Gulch.	Sneve Gulch FDT 1876 will remain open as a mountain bike route	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	100	7-2230.1	FST 2230.1 (decommissioned) from FSR 416.1 Hat Creek to FSR 436.1 West Hat Creek/Holy Cross RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] believe that decommissioning this old trail will greatly improve the mountain biking experience in this popular near-urban recreation area and help to compensate the local biking community for a number of other routes in the area that cannot be maintained to a proper standard and need to be closed to bikes or decommissioned entirely.	Sneeve Gulch FDT 1876 will remain open as a mountain bike route	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	90	7-2348.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-2348.1 - mountain bike trail goes thru the Whiskey Creek State Land Board lease held by the CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife]. This lease is not open to mountain bike use and the trail needs to be deleted from the trail system.	As a result of this comment, the final alternative will remove the Whiskey Creek Trail (2348.1) from the system. The closure will be from the junction with Forest Road 748 (Line Shack) to the private lands in Eagle-Vail. The Forest Service has no legal authority to maintain or promote use across this property.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	56	7-400.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 400 Eagle –Thomasville remain closed to mixed motorized vehicle use, open only to licensed motor vehicles from the forest boundary to Sylvan Lake Park Service campground. On all the routes that have been designated as licensed motorized travel in Alternative G from Sylvan Lake to the Crooked Creek Pass Divide, non-licensed and ATV use should be allowed. This would allow for safe travel on the most heavily travel portion of the road and the highest speed areas but allow access for non-licensed and ATV users to some of the rougher, 4-wheel drive routes, the Power line and Spine Creek.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 400. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road and thus the final alternative will not be modified to change the licensed vehicle only designation.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	51	7-404.1	FSR 404.1 Box Canyon/Holy Cross RD Overall, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] strongly support the decision to close so many miles of superfluous roads along Piney Ridge. However, we do question the decision to keep this short, eroding-to-the-point-of-collapse route open when there are several other spurs in better shape on the same side of the ridge. Either close them all (our recommendation) or maintain one that is in better shape.	While this route is short, it does provide some access to the Lost Lake area and some dispersed campsites. The final alternative will not be modified to close this road.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
361	19	7-405.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-405.1, narrow road with very few turnouts. Public safety increased if ATV use is allowed on road. Dead ends at private. Provides traditional hunting area access.	The final alternative has not been modified as licensed motorized access is provided during hunting seasons. There are other areas on the District that allow unlicensed access during hunting seasons and the Forest does not believe unlicensed access needs to be allowed in all areas.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	22	7-409.1	The following are roads in Alternative F identified as open to mechanized use, but not identified in Alternative G for any use. These roads should be changed to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide or Motorized Licensed/Unlicensed in Alternative G. 7-409.1, road template is in place and provides access during big game hunting seasons to traditional hunting areas. Also provides additional route to explore on ATV's and motorcycles. Dead ends with view to Colorado River.	Forest Road 409 is currently open to foot and horse travel at the present time. Alternative F does not change this designation. Because foot and horse travel is allowed area-wide in the travel management plan, Alternative G proposes to remove the route from the system and reduce maintenance costs. As a result, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	57	7-412.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 412 Gypsum Creek remain closed to mixed motor vehicle use from the forest boundary on the north end until the intersection with Power line 433.1 and Hardscrabble Road, 413. From that point to the south and east the remaining designated licensed motorized routes would become open to non-licensed and ATV use, this would include Hardscrabble Road, Gypsum Power line, etc.	The preferred alternative does not allow mixed use on the Gypsum Creek Road (412) from the Forest Boundary to the Hardscrabble Road. No change is required in the final alternative.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	58	7-413.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 413 Hardscrabble Road remain closed to mix use from Brush Creek road to the Forest Boundary or Wolverton Spring. From Wolverton Spring allow routes designated in Alternative G as licensed motorized to be open to mixed vehicular access, non-motorized and ATVs. Other routes recommended for mixed motor vehicle use will be described later in this document.	The final alternative has not been modified to allow mixed use from the Forest Boundary to Gypsum Creek on Forest Road 413 due to the small amount of road system involved and thus a low quality recreation experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	64	7-413.1, 7-431.1, 7-441.1, 7-451.1, 412.1, 425.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: The following routes accessed from FDR413 Hardscrabble are recommended for mixed use; FDR 431.1 Power line – Crooked Creek, FDR 441.1 Beecher Gulch, FDR 451 Sawmill as the connection from BLM property on to the forest. FDR 451 Sawmill should be managed in concert with BLM travel management. If the BLM determines that their portion of the route is closed to motorized travel or will be closed then the USFS decision to decommission that route for motorized use is sound. The route accessed from FDR 412 are recommended to be open as a mixed motorized route; 425.1 Red Creek.	Forest Road 441 (Beecher Gulch) and 425 (Red Creek) are currently closed to motorized travel. The final alternative will not be modified to open these currently closed roads. The final alternative will be modified to allow mixed use on Road 451.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	59	7-413.2b	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 413.2B Third Gulch on BLM property is open to mixed motorized use. This is also the one established motorized access point from the Eagle Ranch subdivision, designated by the Town of Eagle onto BLM and in turn onto the Hardscrabble road. Alternative G would allow only licensed motorized vehicle to access Hardscrabble Road from Third Gulch effectively neutralizing the non-licensed motorized access from the subdivision onto Hardscrabble Mountain. Recommend that mixed motor vehicle use be allowed on Hardscrabble Road from its intersection with Third Gulch if that is consistent with the BLM's travel management decision. If the BLM decides to close the route then access onto the forest should also be closed.	The final alternative will not be modified to designate the Hardscrabble Road as motorized mixed use from the junction of the BLM Road coming up Second Gulch to the Forest Boundary and beyond. This coincides with future BLM management in the area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	60	7-415.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 415 East Brush Creek remain closed to mix use from the intersection with FDR 400 until reaching the Parks Service yurts. At this point travel routes designated as licensed motorized travel only in Alternative G should be open to non-license and ATV use. This should include access points into the Yeoman Campground, to Hat Creek, Triangle Park, Methany Park, Big Park, Granite Springs, and Lettuce Patch. In addition to these routes, the DOW will recommend later in this document that additional routes designated as closed in Alt. G be opened for mixed use. Some of these recommendations will include routes comment. Unlicensed use will remain prohibited due to the small amount of miles and therefore the lack of a quality that would be accessible from this point on East Brush Creek and include New York Mountain.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 400. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road and thus the final alternative will not be modified to change the licensed vehicle only designation. Licensed motorized access is allowed on the other roads stated in the recreation experience.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	61	7-416.1, 7-416.1a, 7-416.1b, 7-436.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 416.1 Hat Creek, 416.1A Yeoman Campground, 416.1B Yeoman Campground B and 436.1 West Hat Creek should be designated as routes available to mixed motorized use. Incorporating these routes as mixed use would serve a variety of purposes. Yeoman Park and the parking area at the intersection of East Brush Creek road and the Yeoman Park campground route would allow for a staging area for users to off load non-licensed and ATV vehicles and provides a parking area for trailers.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 416.1A and 416.1B. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads and thus the final alternative will not be modified to change the licensed vehicle only designation. As a result, the parking lot is not available as a staging area so the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on the Hat Creek and West Hat Creek roads. Upon consideration based on comments the decision has been made to allow ATVs on these routes to provide access for State Park users, hunters, Fulford residences, and others.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	62	7-418.1, 7-421.1, 7-435.1, 7-435.1a, 7-435.1c	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 418.1 Nolan Creek, 421.1 Bellyache (Big Park), 435.1 Porphyry, 435.1A Granite Springs, 435.1C Methany Park should all be open to mixed motorized travel. These routes could also be considered as ATV routes only.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	101	7-419.1	FSR 419.1 Old Fulford Road/Holy Cross RD In line with the comment on FST 2230.1 above, keeping the former full-size vehicle route open to mountain bikes will help maintain the recreational qualities of this intensively used area without significantly increasing ecological impacts.	This route is going to be retained to allow for non-full-size vehicle access. This is to allow for State Park needs as well as public access needs for these use types as the main road to Fulford was not recommended for mixed use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	13	7-421.1, 4-421.1b, 4-1866.1	4-421.1 to 4-421.1B to 4-1866.1 Cordillera Summit to Squaw Creek: 4-1866.1 manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse Bike/Foot/Horse. Provides loop opportunity. Work to obtain in public access through the Summit at Cordillera.	The final alternative will be modified to leave road 421.1B open to maintain the loop opportunity.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	63	7-423.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FDR 423.1 West Lake Creek designated as licensed motorized use in Alternative G open to mixed motorized use.	The majority of this road is county jurisdiction where unlicensed vehicles are not allowed. The last two miles of the road are Forest Service jurisdiction, but due to the short length it would not provide a quality ATV experience. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on the last two miles of the road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	53	7-445.1	FSR 445.1 High Trail Gulch/Holy Cross RD Our fieldwork on and around Piney Ridge during the height of hunting season in 2003 determined that the western part of High Trail Gulch Road is the least-used and most-deteriorated road in the whole Piney Ridge area. While we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] applaud the decision to decommission so many of the old roads in this area, we wonder why this one wasn't at the top of that list. It is badly eroded and highly erosive, and dead-ends at the boundary of the Piney River Ranch, which doesn't approve of trespassers or look kindly on people getting stuck in its back yard. Further, dead ending off forest where the use would be incompatible conflicts with the WRNF's intent to eliminate these sorts of management headaches by design. The only apparently plausible reason for keeping it open is to provide ATV access to the 1892.1 Big Park Trail, which itself would be only partially open to motorized use – a questionable piece of planning as well. The whole idea of maintaining any dead-end 4WD routes in such a remote and little-used area strikes us as being an inappropriate allocation of resources.	The route in question is very rough. However, at the present time this route provides the only public motorized access to the north side of the Piney River in this area. During the hunting seasons, both licensed and unlicensed vehicles utilized this road to access the area. This route also provides a link to the road system north of Piney Ridge. The Forest Road that links Road 445 to the Olsen Ranch was closed in the fall of 2008 to reduce the potential for trespass. As a result, the final alternative will not be modified to change the designation of this route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	54	7-445.1a	FSR 445.1A High Trail Gulch Road/Holy Cross RD With or without 445.1 closed to vehicular travel, 445.1A is a superfluous route and should be decommissioned.	Forest Road 445.1A provides motorized access to several popular camp sites used by hunters in the fall. This helps to distribute hunting camps and improve hunting. As a result, the final alternative will not be modified to close this route.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
47	5	7-449.1	Already, several changes to accessing the backcountry are being observed. More and more, access to prime locations is not allowed by four-wheel drive vehicles. With the closure of access roads, staging areas are formed by necessity at these closure sites and pack animals are becoming the alternative mode of travel. The land that once served as a campsite, must now function not only for the camper, but some of this same space must also serve as a corral or holding area for the pack animals. Colorado has multiple hunting seasons beginning in August of each year. Because of these arbitrary road closures, and alternative campsites not being available, these campers/hunters are prevented from distributing along the existing roads and trails. Rather they must contend for, and "bunch" up in, available space. They must share grazing sources, attempt to control and dispose of human and animal waste, create parking areas for vehicles and trailers, erect a campsite, set aside an animal containment area, have a water source for both humans and animals, it is highly likely that damage to those	This is a general comment that is addressed in the Travel Management Plan response to comments for programmatic comments.	Traffic Control and Safety
47	14	7-449.1	As an alternative to the permanent closure of 449, I offer the following option: Any other ideas that would help to balance resource issues for hunting and camping. Seasonal closing of the road into Big Park. With this option the Forest Service could put a gate at the top of McCord Pass and only allow vehicular traffic during the hunting seasons. We discussed having the road open from September 1 till December 1. The placement off additional signage along the road into Big Park, particularly at the big switch-back just above Big Park and in the area where the road intersects the Grape Creek Trail. Limiting vehicular travel to licensed full sized vehicles only -prohibiting ATV's beyond the top of McCord Pass. An offer from us to help the Forest Service in implementing any restrictive activity, i.e. helping to post and place signs, reporting violators, etc.	Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience	Activities on Public Lands (General)
47	4	7-449.1	Changes such as those proposed in Alternative F and G are large and must certainly come with expenses and a sizeable time line for their completion. From that assumption, one would wonder where the business case is to support these changes. If the Forest Service has experienced financial constraints in recent years managing a somewhat static travel program, where will the additional funds come from to institute and complete the various activities such as road barriers, new mapping, added signage, creation of alternative campsites, etc? It should be recognized that even now, maps sold to the public are less than accurate. What length of time is allocated for the implementation and completion of these proposals?	Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
47	8	7-449.1	<p>Elsewhere in the TMP documentation it is noted that Road 449 is "no longer needed". There is no clarification of who would "need" this or any other road. This is being used to effectively de-commission 449, yet "need" is not established for any of the other remaining roads in this area. Those who have used this road for decades would be the first to tell you of the "need" to leave this road open to the public.</p> <p>From the above statements, it is surmised that there is documented need for all roads that are being allowed to remain open in the White River National Forest. If there is such documentation, a copy of that document would be appreciated. If the information is only available through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), please advise. If there is no such document, why not? What is the definition of "need" used to satisfy this criterion?</p> <p>It seems as if there is no way that 449 can remain open with the above verbiage, unless I have missed something in the documentation. I have sincerely tried to show good faith in the "system", but at this point no longer know how to continue.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p> <p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Document Composition (clarity/grammar/s spelling/punct.)
555	1	7-449.1	<p>Forest Road 449 has been a popular access point into the Big Park area of the Piney River drainage for many of our friends and family for more than 40 contiguous years. Throughout these years we have hunted, camped, and enjoyed that special place.</p> <p>Closing the road at McCord Pass has now created a situation where the public has been squeezed into just a few places to camp near Walter's and Slough Grass Lakes. The impact from so many people and horses using a small area has created possible health related issues, compacted the soils, and resulted in the destruction of vegetation in these remaining camping areas.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p> <p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
551	1	7-449.1	<p>Forest Road 449 has been a popular access point into the Big Park area of the Piney River drainage for many of our friends and family for more than 40 contiguous years. Throughout these years we have hunted, camped, and enjoyed that special place.</p> <p>Closing the road at McCord Pass has now created a situation where the public has been squeezed into just a few places to camp near Walter's and Slough Grass Lakes. The impact from so many people and horses using a small area has created possible health related issues, compacted the soils, and resulted in the destruction of vegetation in these remaining camping areas.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p> <p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
99	1	7-449.1	<p>Opening the road to Big Park and the meadows immediately beyond, even seasonally during the hunting seasons, will allow better access to hunting areas otherwise unavailable unless horses are used. It would also open up several preferred level Forest Road 449 has been a popular access point into the Big Park area of the Piney River drainage for many of our friends and family for more than 40 contiguous years. Throughout these years we have hunted, camped, and enjoyed that special place.</p> <p>Closing the road at McCord Pass has now created a situation where the public has been squeezed into just a few places to camp near Walter's and Slough Grass Lakes. The impact from so many people and horses using a small area has created possible health related issues, compacted the soils, and resulted in the destruction of vegetation in these remaining camping areas.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p> <p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
550	1	7-449.1	<p>Forest Road 449 has been a popular access point into the Big Park area of the Piney River drainage for many of our friends and family for more than 40 contiguous years. Throughout these years we have hunted, camped, and enjoyed that special place.</p> <p>Closing the road at McCord Pass has now created a situation where the public has been squeezed into just a few places to camp near Walter's and Slough Grass Lakes. The impact from so many people and horses using a small area has created possible health related issues, compacted the soils, and resulted in the destruction of vegetation in these remaining camping areas.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p> <p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
47	15	7-449.1	<p>Opening the road to Big Park and the meadows immediately beyond, even seasonally during the hunting seasons, will allow better access to hunting areas otherwise unavailable unless horses are used. It would also open up several preferred level Given no other choice, please register my comment in support of alternative A. Given a choice, leave the road and trail system alone.</p>	<p>Thank-you for your comment. There is no site specific issues to address.</p>	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)
47	9	7-449.1	<p>I believe that each of the alternatives puts a preferential high priority on the economic aspect of the decisions to be made and puts precious little, if any, consideration on the general public's use of the forests as we have known them to be. While economic ventures such as ski resorts and energy development are addressed and protected throughout these alternatives, minimal efforts have been placed to protect the recreational user of the forest unless a payment is received by one of the protected groups. Ski resorts, guides and outfitters, energy companies, mining, utility companies, and municipalities seem to have nothing but gains from any of these alternatives. Verification of this statement can easily be done by reviewing the recently completed and scheduled projects within the forest. Leasing of lands to energy companies and expansion of ski</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments on alternatives in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	Multiple Use Emphasis
567	1	7-449.1	<p>I was surprised it took so long to close road F.R. 449 in the White River National Forest. I can't tell you how much garbage we have packed out of that area. Being such a remote area, people feel they don't have to abide by the rules. The woods used to be a steady rumble of ATV's and chain saws cutting new trails through the forest. When you spend four hours horse back to get to your camp, and the next day an ATV drives by your tent and there is no road by your tent, something needs to be done. One particular camp site in Big Park is so bad it will almost make you sick, old campers, sheds, bed springs, latrines etc. Every year you could count on several new items to be left behind. It will take years for the scars to heal, some may never heal. Since the road closure I have seen many hunters in the area that have had great success. Hunters are willing to put more effort into a hunt if the outcome is rewarding. Big Park is at peace, the sound of ATVs in the woods is only a memory. The hunting is better than ever for the person or persons willing to go the extra mile.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience has been increase by the closure. Slough Grass Lake has been a heavily used campsite during hunting seasons.</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
47	7	7-449.1	<p>In my view, the TMP is structured in such a way as to allow for no changes other than those desired by the authors of the document who have apparently already decided the apparent outcome of this effort. They all point to the TMP Summary, page 2, where the overviews of the three alternatives are outlined and requirements and reasons for change are given.</p> <p>What was formerly Alternative B, and is now Alternative F, states that it is the "minimal action required to be compliant with laws, regulations and the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan..."</p> <p>Alternative G is stated to be "a reflection of a blend of the previously presented alternatives, public comment, and management implication due to the travel rule".</p> <p>Alternative A states that "this alternative would not meet the purpose and need or forest plan direction." and that Alternative A is shown only to "provide a basis for comparison of the effects of the action alternatives". Further, Alternative A, which is the only plan showing USFS Road 449 to remain open, would in effect be a violation of law, rule, or direction. I know of no one who would want to become involved in such an act. When we are told that Alternative A is only there for a reference, which interprets to mean that it is not offered for consideration. Said another way, "We can't just leave it alone. We have to change something."</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments on alternatives in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)
47	2	7-449.1	<p>I've had the opportunity to review the Travel Management Plan (TMP), The Roadless Initiative DREIS, and major portions of the Master Plan for the White River National Forest along with many other documents. I must immediately confess my concern that virtually every one on the documents seems intent on protecting and maximizing revenue sources while closing off forest access to virtually every means excepting foot travel. This is especially true where forest service roads that have existed with minimal maintenance costs for decades are being closed based on the unexplainable decisions of a few. Vehicular travel on existing roads is being eliminated while exceptions abound for the ski industry, oil exploration, natural gas exploration, coal mining, grazing allotments, etc. An excellent example of this is the Piney River Drainage, which the DREIS (Draft Environmental Impact Study) notes have a high probability of becoming "developed". From that, the Travel Management Plan (TMP) has been used to propose permanently closing USFS Road 449 in an apparent attempt to ensure that the public will not have an access into this area when it becomes developed. The TMP now states that USFS Road 449 No mention is made in the DEIS or the TMP as to how those who are unable to make a pack laden hike will now be able to continue enjoying the national forests as done before by 4WD vehicle. The TMP fails to address, in any fashion, any consideration being given to the disabled, aged, small children, or the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). My wife, who is an amputee, and my Mother who has had both knees replaced, have both accompanied me into Big Park on multiple</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience The Travel Management Plan continues to provide many miles of open road that provide access to many areas for the disabled, aged, small children, or the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA)</p>	Multiple Use Emphasis
47	6	7-449.1	<p>Not one of the White River National Forest documents, including the TMP, addresses shared usage of our forests nor do they address distributing the load of users at peak times. The current philosophy seems to be one of all or nothing.</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
47	3	7-449.1	<p>Future usage of the National Forests will most certainly increase in the near term. Some estimates are that the usage will increase by as much as 50% over the next 25 years. I do not understand how it is intended to place more people into 58.5 million acres (approximately 4 million acres in Colorado) less space being accessible by vehicle, and to still make the national forest experience a positive one.</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	Multiple Use Emphasis
99	2	7-449.1	<p>Opening the road to Big Park and the meadows immediately beyond, even seasonally during the hunting seasons, will allow better access to hunting areas otherwise unavailable unless horses are used. It would also open up several preferred level camping sites with access to water, which would help to distribute the load on the soils of the area.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
555	2	7-449.1	<p>Opening the road to Big Park and the meadows immediately beyond, even seasonally during the hunting seasons, will allow better access to hunting areas otherwise unavailable unless horses are used. It would also open up several preferred level camping sites with access to water, which would help to distribute the load on the soils of the area.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience</p>	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
47	16	7-449.1	<p>Spend the time and money needed to make the changes required by the adoption of an alternative to make our national forest enjoyable, open to the general public and not just a select few and for the enforcement of the rules and regulations that are</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments on alternatives in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
226	2	7-449.1	<p>The United States Forest Service continues to promulgate vast amounts of data, rules, regulations, proposals, and information relative to the management and public utilization of our forests. Much of this information has been released over such a period of time, that it has become virtually impossible for the layperson to understand and follow the logic of this avalanche of information. To have missed one step in the string of procedures and/or requirements may be deemed by the Forest Service to be just cause for dismissing any or all issues raised by interested parties.</p> <p>The Travel Management Plan (TMP) for the White River National Forest is just one more example of complexity and impenetrably complex procedures. Taken literally, there is no clear means of proposing changes to the plan, nor is there a true opportunity to provide input. Rather, it would seem that opinions have already been formed and decisions made relative to the future of the White River National Forest. Page 2 of the TMP Summary section where the overviews of the three alternatives are outlined re-enforces that belief.</p> <p>What was formerly Alternative B, and is now Alternative F, states that it is the "minimal action required to be compliant with laws, regulations and the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan..."</p> <p>Alternative G is stated to be "a reflection of a blend of the previously presented alternatives, public comment, and management implication due to the travel rule".</p> <p>Alternative A states that "this alternative would not meet the purpose and need, or forest plan direction." No mention is made as to whether or not this Alternative would be compliant with laws and/or regulations. The implication is that Alternative A We are willing to help the Forest Service monitor the area [McCord Pass] for illegal ATV use during hunting seasons.</p>	<p>This is a general comment see comments on alternatives in the response to comments for programmatic comments.</p>	<p>Planning Document (Rule, EIS, etc.)</p>
99	3	7-449.1	<p>We are willing to help the Forest Service monitor the area for illegal ATV use during hunting seasons, and may even be willing to help build barriers or erect signage at the meadows in the Big Park area to prevent illegal OHV and licensed vehicles from driving past the meadow areas which is of primary concern to the Forest Service.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
551	2	7-449.1	<p>We may even be willing to help build barriers or erect signage at the meadows in the Big Park area to prevent illegal OHV and licensed vehicles from driving past the meadow areas which is of primary concern to the Forest Service.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter. We stand ready to help, but because some of us have quite a distance to travel, an organized date and time schedule would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Several years ago the Forest Service closed Forest Road 449 from McCord Pass to Big Park. The road was closed because of the continued intrusion of illegal motorized routes into the Lower Piney Roadless Area. The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 2002 Revision determined that the roadless area was capable and available for wilderness. Beginning in the late 1990's, the Forest Service made numerous attempts to stop this intrusion including felling trees and construction of a fence. However, users of the area continued to remove the trees and drive around the fence. In fact, after the road was closed at McCord Pass ATV users created a new trail around the closure at the Pass. The Forest Road officially ends at the upper end of Big Park and a full-sized vehicle trail has been established well past this point. Therefore, allowing full-sized vehicles on the road will not solve the problem. Signage has been ignored in the past and is not a solution with a high degree of success. Many users are now reporting that the quality of the hunting experience</p>	<p>Enforcement/Funding/Staffing</p>
99	4	7-449.1	<p>FSR 455.1 Ragged Creek & FSR 456.1 Too Much/Eagle RD</p> <p>Our [Wilderness Workshop, et.al] fieldwork found 455.1 to be a rather little-used route for most of its length, and little difference between it and 456.1, which spurs off from it and is slated for decommissioning. Maintaining such little-used spurs into a recommended wilderness area strikes us as inappropriate, unnecessary and bad planning that only encourages wilderness transgression, creating management challenges that an overstretched Forest Service can ill afford. We recommend decommissioning both of these routes in their entirety.</p> <p>South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44:</p> <p>FDR 464W2N should be closed to all motorized travel along.</p>	<p>Based on the comment and the low amount of use, the final alternative will be modified to convert the road into a trail (extension of Trail 2224) that will provides access to the Lost Lake area.</p>	<p>Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)</p>
509	55	7-455.1, 7-456.1	<p>South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44:</p> <p>FDR 529.1 Fitzpatrick should also include 529.2A the route to Smith Ridge should be designated for mixed motor vehicle use.</p>	<p>The final alternative has not been modified to leave open road 529.2A and to allow mixed use. This is based on the small amount of miles available and the fact motorized access is allowed for licensed vehicles.</p>	<p>Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal</p>
480	66	7-464w.2n	<p>South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44:</p> <p>FDR 529.1 Fitzpatrick should also include 529.2A the route to Smith Ridge should be designated for mixed motor vehicle use.</p>	<p>Based on this comment, the final alternative will be modified to close and rehabilitate Forest Road 464W.2n.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>
480	65	7-529.1, 7-529.2a	<p>South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44:</p> <p>FDR 529.1 Fitzpatrick should also include 529.2A the route to Smith Ridge should be designated for mixed motor vehicle use.</p>	<p>The final alternative has not been modified to leave open road 529.2A and to allow mixed use. This is based on the small amount of miles available and the fact motorized access is allowed for licensed vehicles.</p>	<p>Road and Trail Classification/Management</p>

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	73	7-600.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FSR 600 The Coffee Pot Road should have a seasonal closure allowing for mixed use motorized travel from Sept. 15 through Nov. 30 to allow hunters access on this major access traffic artery. This exception would help CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] reach management goals as well as provide quality hunting opportunity for the public.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 600. The study determined that mixed use was not safe from the Colorado River Road to the junction with Forest Road 632 (Grizzly Cow Camp). That study is also based on the fact that in the State of CO there is no age restriction for ATV or unlicensed motorcycles and therefore engineers base the study on young riders as well. The Forest Service consulted with engineers, CDOW and others to consider if the road would be considered safer and meet a moderate rating if all users were required to have a valid licence. It was determined that the road would render a moderate rating, so the Forest Service is willing to allow mixed use for licence holders in the final. This new concept will be tested to see if it can be done without extensive management and adhered to. This is from the The preferred alternative allows for mixed use on these roads. The final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	71	7-610.1, 7-612.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: USFS RD 9610.1 and 4612.1, Stump Park: Alt G to continue to allow licensed and unlicensed vehicle travel. These two roads provide an essential access point for hunters into the Flattops Wilderness Area and the camping/trailheads at the middle fork of Derby Creek. Additionally, these roads are very well established routes and would create an enforcement problem if closed.		Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	69	7-611.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: USFS Rd 4611.1, Red Dirt: Alt G to allow licensed and unlicensed vehicle travel.	Forest Road 611 is being closed to protect a conservation population of cutthroat trout. The road was built in the water influence zone and sediment from the road reaches the stream after each rainfall. The Forest Service has implemented measures to improve the stream and the sediment negates some of the work. The road will be closed from the top of Derby Mesa to the Forest Boundary where a parking lot will be constructed to allow non-motorized public access to the Red Dirt drainage. The final alternative will not be modified to change the type of access to this Forest Road 611.1A is being closed under the preferred alternative as it is a short spur with no demonstrated need to be left open. The final alternative will not be modified to change the type of access to this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	60	7-611.1a	FSR 611.1A Eagle RD Vehicular travel along this route is entirely unnecessary except possibly to service the stock pond near the end of 611.2A. Since no such reason is given, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] must assume that it doesn't exist and that the public will be best served by limiting use of this route to foot travel.		Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	62	7-611.2d	FSR 611.2D Deer Creek/Rifle RD This spur serves no real purpose and receives so little use that it should be decommissioned.	Forest Road 611.2D is being closed under the preferred alternative as it is a short spur with no demonstrated need to be left open. The final alternative will not be modified to change the type of access to this area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	70	7-613.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: USFS RD 4613.1, Crescent Lake/MacKinaw Lake: Recommend change to Alt G from "License/Unlicensed travel" to "Motorized Vehicles less than 50 inch width (ATV)" due to heavy road damage, inaccessibility issues and current use trends.	Based on the validity of this comment, Forest Road 613 will be changed to a route for vehicles less than 50" from the cow camp east of the South Derby Creek crossing to the terminus.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	72	7-615.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: USFS RD 9615.1, Sunnyside: Recommend change to Alt G from "Licensed Motorized Only" to "License/Unlicensed travel" due to heavy road damage from licensed vehicles and currently it appears that ATV is the preferred method of travel during hunting seasons.	Because unlicensed vehicles are prohibited on County Roads and the short section of open road on National Forest lands, there is not a quality ATV experience on road 615. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	75	7-621.1, 7-621.1a	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FSR 621.1 and 621.1A Rencos Road and Coyote Park Road should have a seasonal opening for FSV's and ATV's. With the closure of the Deep Creek Rim Road, access to the west side of Deep Creek will be limited and dispersal camping during hunting seasons will be extremely limited in this area. A seasonal opening of these two roads will help to alleviate this pressure and allow some access for hunting.	This is a very short loop and a spur, that provides limited access to the area. Camping is allowed within 300 feet of the Coffee Pot Road provided resource damage is not done. Also ATV use is not allowed on this section of the Coffee Pot Road for safety reasons. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	74	7-622.1, 7-623.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: FSR 622 and 623 Deadhorse Road and Wagon Gulch Road should have a seasonal closure allowing for mixed motorized use from Sept. 15 through Nov. 30 to allow hunter access. While these are not major thru ways, these two roads provide access to several drainages that may otherwise be inaccessible to hunters. Impact on the foot and horse trails that stem from these roads was illegally accessed by users on ATV's this fall, but with increased enforcement and the new CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] ATV regulations this behavior can be curtailed.	Alternative G has been modified to allow licensed vehicles on the following roads : 622 (Deadhorse), 623 (Wagon Gulch) and 642 (Blue Gulch). Road 623.1A (Lower Lake) will be decommissioned as proposed in the preferred alternative as the other two roads provide improved access into the area. Therefore, the final alternative will be modified to allow this use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	76	7-642.1, 7-1853.1	South Eagle Ranger District, GMU 44: 642.1 Triangle Mountain Road should retain at least foot and horse travel openings so that connectivity to the Coffee Pot Road can remain from the Sweetwater Trail (1854). 1853 Tie Gulch trail should remain open to provide foot and horse access from the dead horse trail to the East End Trailhead / Rest Area. This trail provides access for hunters south of the Coffee Pot Road into Tie Gulch and French Creek. All trails that are currently open for livestock movement or use should remain open to that use.	Foot and horse travel is permitted on and off of designated routes. Access to the Coffee Pot Road is provided by following Trail 1854 to the trailhead at Indian Camp Pass. The final alternative will not be modified to not decommission this road. The final alternative will be modified to allow foot and horse traffic on trail 1853.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	13	7-700.1 from 7-786.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-700.1 from 7-786.1 west to Hwy 131. Main access road from Vail. High use, both summer and fall. Lots of ATV use during big game seasons and summer since road system offers loops and access to traditional hunting areas.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 700. The study determined that mixed use was not safe from the town of Vail to the junction with Forest Road 701 (Piney). Therefore, the designation of this section of road will not be modified in the final alternative. Unlicensed use of Road 700 from the junction with Road 701 to Muddy Pass is prohibited until after the road is no longer needed for timber hauling. This could be for the next decade and thus outside the time period for this plan. Therefore, the final	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
361	16	7-701.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-701.1, provides access to Piney Lake Lodge and numerous dispersed camping opportunities where unlicensed vehicles can leave camp and enjoy a ride on other system roads in the area.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 701. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to The route in question provides access to the Homestake Summer Home Group. The cabins in the summer home group are authorized under a special use permit. At the present time, the road is closed to public access at the bridge over Homestake Creek. The preferred alternative is to close the road to the public at Forest Road 703. The road will then become a road authorized under a special use permit the entire length. As a result the road will not show on any of the maps, as the maps only show public routes. Therefore, access will remain to the cabin owners. The final alternative will not be modified to show this route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
448	1	7-7031.1	I am sending this e-mail to notify you that our road #7031 into our cabin is not on the Alternative G road map. This road goes off of County Road 703, which is the road to the Homestake reservoir. #7031 is the road that leads to the Homestake Summer Home Group. Thank you for looking into this for us and getting it on the map. Please confirm the road number, in case I am mistaken.	The route in question provides access to the Homestake Summer Home Group. The cabins in the summer home group are authorized under a special use permit. At the present time, the road is closed to public access at the bridge over Homestake Creek. The preferred alternative is to close the road to the public at Forest Road 703. The road will then become a road authorized under a special use permit the entire length. As a result the road will not show on any of the maps, as the maps only show public routes. Therefore, access will remain to the cabin owners. The final alternative will not be modified to show this route.	Mapping, GIS
537	2	7-705.1, Yoder	Winter - close as winter play area. Wurts Ditch/no Name Road 7-705.1 Pass by northwest entrance to Yoder. However, no snow machines should be allowed down into Yoder Gulch. Yoder should not be an open winter motorized area. Close and designate restricted motorized routes only. Extend existing pink area on map north to top of ridge that separates Yoder and 7-705.1P Yoder Gulch. Summer-should be closed to all travel. Route exits across private land on North Eastern end at Highway 24. Route travels through extensive wet lands that have been severely damaged by vehicles, portions of the route follow a creek and human/horse passage is difficult without extensive bush whacking.	Based on this comment, the lack of suitable terrain in Yoder Gulch and with no outlet, and past snowmobile intrusions into the Holy Cross Wilderness above the road, the current open area (green) will be changed to a restricted area (pink) in the final alternative and the No Name-Wurts Ditch Road will be the designated route. The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 700 (from Vail to junction with road 701), 701, and 709. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on these roads.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
537	1	7-705.1p		The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 700 (from Vail to junction with road 701), 701, and 709. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on these roads.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	80	7-709.1, 7-700.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are open to licensed vehicles only in Alt G due to safety concerns. These roads provide important connector routes to other roads that are open to unlicensed vehicles. These roads should be open to unlicensed vehicles as listed below: Shrine Pass Road 7-709.1 from the intersection of 7-747.1 to the intersection of 7-728.1. Red Sandstone Road 7- 700.1 from the intersection of 7-719.1 to the Piney Lake.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 700 (from Vail to junction with road 701), 701, and 709. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on these roads.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	12	7-709.1, 7-728.1, 7-708.1, 7-N708.2, 7-715.1, 7-714.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-709.1, 7-728.1, 7-708.1, 7-N708.2, 7-715.1, 7-714.1, Easy recreational access loops from Vail Pass and Redcliff. Mixed use on roads. Access to traditional hunting areas.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads 709 and 714. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on these roads. The designation for Forest Road 728 (Lime Creek) will not be changed in the final alternative due to the short length of available road based on the closure of Road 745 and no mixed use of Road 709. The final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on Roads 708, N708.2, and 715 due to the The Gore Creek Watershed is a municipal watershed and Gold Medal trout waters. Mill Creek has elevated sediment levels and bank instability related to ski runs and roads, as well as old timber sale roads and landslides. the cumulative effects of sediment and other urbanization-related impacts to Gore Creek have been observed in aquatic insect communities in Gore Creek. Conversion of these roads to trails, as proposed under Alternative G, would reduce sedimentation to Mill Creek and Gore Creek downstream, as well as improve watershed hydrology. Complete decommissioning of these roads/trails would lead to more significant improvements to stream health in this severely degraded watershed. The final alternative will not be modified and the roads will be converted to trails from the end of the pavement in Vail to the current road terminus.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	83	7-710.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-710.1 – Mill Creek road provides the only motorized access to the Black Gore and Gore Creek drainages, the north side of the Two Elk drainage and Vail ski area. Maintaining this motorized access for hunting is critical to prevent these areas from becoming a sanctuary for elk.	The Gore Creek Watershed is a municipal watershed and Gold Medal trout waters. Mill Creek has elevated sediment levels and bank instability related to ski runs and roads, as well as old timber sale roads and landslides. the cumulative effects of sediment and other urbanization-related impacts to Gore Creek have been observed in aquatic insect communities in Gore Creek. Conversion of these roads to trails, as proposed under Alternative G, would reduce sedimentation to Mill Creek and Gore Creek downstream, as well as improve watershed hydrology. Complete decommissioning of these roads/trails would lead to more significant improvements to stream health in this severely degraded watershed. The final alternative will not be modified and the roads will be converted to trails from the end of the pavement in Vail to the current road terminus.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	7	7-710.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Mill Creek road system 7-710.1: Conversion of these roads to trails, as proposed under Alternative G, would likely reduce sedimentation to Mill Creek and Gore Creek downstream, as well as improve watershed hydrology. Complete decommissioning of these roads would lead to more significant improvements to stream health in this severely degraded watershed, as proposed under Alternative F.	The Gore Creek Watershed is a municipal watershed and Gold Medal trout waters. Mill Creek has elevated sediment levels and bank instability related to ski runs and roads, as well as old timber sale roads and landslides. the cumulative effects of sediment and other urbanization-related impacts to Gore Creek have been observed in aquatic insect communities in Gore Creek. Conversion of these roads to trails, as proposed under Alternative G, would reduce sedimentation to Mill Creek and Gore Creek downstream, as well as improve watershed hydrology. Complete decommissioning of these roads/trails would lead to more significant improvements to stream health in this severely degraded watershed. The final alternative will not be modified and the roads will be converted to trails from the end of the pavement in Vail to the current road terminus.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
249	11	7-717	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town of Avon values the use of June Creek Road (#7-717.1) for recreation and for emergency egress in the event of wildfire, landslide, or similar catastrophe. The road is currently obstructed with boulders near the Singletree Subdivision.	The route that connects the Singletree Subdivision road system with the June Creek Road (NFSR 717) was closed by the Forest Service several years ago to motorized vehicles because the Singletree Subdivision closed their section of the connection to motorized vehicles. The Forest Service has validated that it does not have an easement across Singletree property and therefore has no legal authority to designate a road across the land. As a result, the preferred alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
537	4	7-726.1, Colorado trail	7-726.1 Old Highway. Your Alternative G map confuses "Old Highway" with the Colorado Trail which crosses highway 24. 100 Feet South of Old highway both should be shown because Colorado Trail is mountain bike, hike, animal, and old highway permits all uses. The Colorado Trail shows up under several numbers to note a few: 7-N718W.1, 7-756W.1, [and] 7-2108.1	Alternative G proposes to close Forest Road 726 (Old Highway) to motorized travel and allow mountain bike, foot, and horse travel. The mapping error is no showing the Colorado Trail from the valley floor up to Road 726 through the old rifle range. This error will be corrected on the final maps. The Colorado Trail is trail number 2108.1. The final maps will be corrected with the correct number as well.	Mapping, GIS
358	2	7-727w.1	Would not assigning one number for the Colorado trail be easier? Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Closure of 7-727W.1 roads in the vicinity of the Holy Cross City boreal toad breeding site would lessen potential impacts to boreal toad individuals (direct mortality) due to jeep/OHV use.	Forest Road 727W.1 will be decommissioned under Alternative G. The map for Alternative G does not show this road. Therefore, the final alternative does not need to be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	81	7-730.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-730.1 - Flagstone Park provides access to the Eagles Nest Wilderness, off road use has not been a problem in this area.	Alternative G proposes to decommission Forest Road 730.1 (Flagstone Park) and extend Trail 1884 to Forest Road 700. A new trailhead would be built on Forest Road 700. The final alternative will not be modified to not decommission this road, therefore no change in allowed use is needed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	17	7-734.1, 7-433.1, 7-717.1, 7-778.1, 7-780.1, 7-774.1, 7-734.1, 7-433.1, 7-717.1, 7-778.1, 7-780.1, 7-774.1, 7-783.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-780.1, narrow winding roads in numerous places with limited turnouts. Safety concern with licensed vehicle traffic when meeting oncoming traffic and no turn around. Public safety improved if ATV use is allowed on these roads. Very good access to traditional hunting areas, very high use during big game hunting seasons. Major access roads from Edwards/Single Tree	The final alternative will not be modified to allow unlicensed motor vehicles on these roads. Access is allowed for licensed vehicles and other areas of the District and Forest allow unlicensed use.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	82	7-737.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-737.1 - Spraddle Creek open to end of existing road. Spraddle Creek road provides hunting access to the upper reaches of Bald Mtn. there is no other motorized access. The road has a current special use permit for livestock and will not be restored.	The Spraddle Creek Road (737) is proposed to be closed from the stables to the end of the road under Alternative G. The Spraddle Creek road is a cherry-stem into the Spraddle Creek Roadless Area that was determined to be capable and available for wilderness in the Final Environs Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The livestock permit holder can access the area via horse and thus the road can be decommissioned. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified and the road will be decommissioned.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	85	7-737.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-737.1- Wildridge Road is shown closed in Alt G. The road should be opened for seasonal for hunting access to unlicensed vehicles only. The road is a major access point for residents from Avon and will continue to receive heavy use. Further the road has a current special use permit for livestock that will require the road to remain open and not be restored.	This is a typing error and it is impossible to determined the correct road number to respond to.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	3	7-737.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): 737 road (Spraddle Creek): Much of the 737 would be decommissioned under Alternative G, which would result in improvements to stream health in Spraddle Creek and Gore Creek downstream. Under Alternative F, the Spraddle Creek road system (7-737.1) would not be decommissioned, and the existence of this road along a riparian area would continue to degrade aquatic habitat in Spraddle Creek as well as Gore Creek downstream, which contains a Gold Medal trout fishery.	Thank-you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	15	7-737.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-737.1, road is access to trail and traditional hunting areas.	The Spraddle Creek Road (737) is proposed to be closed from the stables to the end of the road under Alternative G. The Spraddle Creek road is a cherry-stem into the Spraddle Creek Roadless Area that was determined to be capable and available for wilderness in the Final Environs Impact Statement for the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The livestock permit holder can access the area via horse and thus the road can be decommissioned. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified and the road will be decommissioned.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	18	7-744.1	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-744.1, road is rocky, bumpy, rutted and single lane. Mainly used by C&H permittee and private access to Marmot Lake, as well as public access to Piney Guard Station. Very heavy use during big game hunting seasons, accesses traditional hunting areas. There is more ATV user access on this road than anything else since it is so rough.	The final alternative has not been modified to allow ATV use on Road 744 by hunters during the fall hunting season due to the short length of the road and that access is allowed for licensed vehicles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	89	7-748.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. The following mountain bike trails should be closed seasonal for elk production May 1 to June 30. 7-2107.1, 7-2106.1, 7-734.1B, 7-1881.1, 7-2350.1, 7-748.1.	Several of the trails listed currently have elk calving closures. The final alternative will be modified to include an elk calving closure during the dates listed on all of the trails suggested.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	86	7-751.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-751.1 - Wearyman Road is shown in Alt G to be closed instead of connecting thru to the Shrine Pass road. This connection should be maintained to provide a connection to Shrine Pass road. The Wearyman Road has a base of rock and does not contribute significant runoff to the creek. Additional Wearyman Road provides dispersed camping areas and excellent access into the Sloane Mtn. area for hunting.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the final alternative will not be modified to leave this road open.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	84	7-755.1	Holy Cross Ranger District: The following roads are listed as closed in Alt G and should be opened to licensed and unlicensed vehicles. 7-755.1 – Ranch Creek road the road will not be restored as it provides a special use access permit to the Jackal Hut. The road should be open to licensed and unlicensed vehicle up to the hut location and then the road should be decommissioned after the hut.	The Ranch Creek Road (755) is proposed to be closed to public motorized and mechanized use under Alternative G. The road will then be placed under a special use permit to the 10th Mountain Hut Association. The Association will be responsible for maintenance of the road. Limiting use to the few trips needed to maintain the hut will reduce long-term maintenance costs and reduce sediment into the creek. The road is extremely steep and it is difficult to keep effective water bars on the road. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to change Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	12	7-765.1	7-765.1 – Work to acquire public access to trail through Cordillera Valley Club. Provides loop opportunity from Edwards and Berry Creek.	Thank-you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
358	5	7-774.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Berry Creek/7-774.1 and associated spur roads— Alternative G proposes to decommission several roads along Berry Creek. This watershed is particularly sensitive to ground disturbance related to OHV use due to the soils capacity to produce fine sediment. Decommissioning several of the roads will benefit Colorado River cutthroat trout by eliminating sediment sources to Berry Creek. Decommissioning should emphasize restoring natural hydrology of the watershed. Under Alternative F, no change from the existing condition of the road system in the Berry Creek watershed is apparent. Many short-dead end spur roads would remain, and impacts to cutthroat trout habitat due to sedimentation would continue.	Thank-you for your comment. The final alternative will not be modified to leave any additional roads open.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	6	7-774.1	Site-specific comments on Alternatives F and G (Eagle/Holy Cross District): Under Alternative G, a net decrease in road density in the Spring/Thames Creek road system (7-765 roads) would benefit cutthroat trout habitat in a manner similar to that described for the 7-774 road.	Thank-you for your comment. The final alternative will not be modified to leave any additional roads open and thus a net decrease in road density.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
249	6	7-779.1	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town values the continued mixed use for Metcalf Creek Road (#7-779.1), and opposes the decommissioning of said trail proposed in plan Alternative E.	Alternative G proposes to close and decommission this road. At the current time there are three roads (Berry Creek, June Creek, Metcalf Creek) less than two miles apart that access the same road system on Red & White Mountain. Both the Berry Creek and Metcalf Creek roads are proposed for decommissioning as they are unsustainable. The Metcalf Creek Road is very steep and when wet is nearly impassible. As a result, the road is several lanes wide in several spots from the public driving in the grass when the road surface is wet. Near the top, the road is so narrow that is almost impossible to navigate in a full-size vehicle. In the past, the Forest Service has received complaints from Wildridge homeowners over mud-flows coming down the road after heavy rains and the sediment being deposited in their yards. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to no decommission this road. The White River National Forest will analyze and determine winter travel management in the Vail Pass area in a separate analysis based on impacts on Lynx from snow compaction and current/projected levels of recreation use. Until this separate analysis is complete, current winter travel routes will not change. Road 780 currently has a closure from two days after the last hunting season (includes late season) until May 1. The High Trail Road does not have such a closure and thus is open in snow-free periods. As a result, no change is needed in the final alternative.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	91	7-780.1, 7-445.1a, camp hale	Winter travel alternatives: The winter travel plan shows the Camp Hale area being open motorized within prescription 5.41 deer and elk winter range. This should be changed to restricted motorized routes only. The northern part of the Holy Cross District is in BGU 36. BGU 36 has a late season cow elk hunt that runs roughly from Dec 1 to Jan 15 each year. To provide adequate access to achieve the harvest objective additional routes for winter travel are needed during this season. By opening 7-780.1 (Power Road) and 7-445.1A (High Trail) as designated routes during the late season should provide sufficient access. If snow depths are not sufficient for over the snow vehicles then the CDOW [Colorado Division of Wildlife] would request the USFS allowed wheeled vehicles on these roads. The Elliot Ridge area is very easy to access from above Spring Creek and there has been snowmobile use going into the wilderness area. Additional measures may be needed to prevent this situation in the future.	This road appears on the Alternative G map as Other Public Roads/Trails. Since a portion of this road is gated and the entire road does not access National Forest lands, the road will be removed from the Alternative G map.	Designation of Lands
249	9	7-782.1	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town recommends that buck Creek (#7-782.1) road be decommissioned and removed from Forest Service maps for the following reasons: 1) The Forest Service does not have jurisdiction, 2) No legal public access is available, and #) alternative access is available on a nearby road and trail.	This road appears on the Alternative G map as Other Public Roads/Trails. Since a portion of this road is gated and the entire road does not access National Forest lands, the road will be removed from the Alternative G map.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
249	7	7-782.2a	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town recommends that Buck Creek (#7-782.2A) road be decommissioned and removed from Forest Service Maps, supporting Alternatives C, D, and E for the following reasons: 1) The forest Service does not have jurisdiction, 2) No legal public access is available, and 3) Alternative access is available on a nearby road and trail.	This road will be removed from the maps.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	69	7-784.1	FSR 784.1 Cottonwood Peak/Holy Cross RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] strongly recommending closing and decommissioning this route and all of its spurs on the west side of Piney Ridge/Cottonwood Peak (as recommended in Alternative D) for safety as well as habitat protection reasons. The start of this road on the east side of the ridge involves a long, narrow, side-sloping switchback across a talus slope that is a deadly rollover waiting to happen. During field inventory in this area our surveyor saw children riding ATVs and small motorcycles along the ridgetop section of this road: it would be all too easy for an inexperienced driver or rider such as one of these children to take a fatal roll off the dangerously substandard section of this road. A much more likely scenario is for hunters camping along the ridge to be snowed in and unable to get out, or to try to get out and go over the edge. Without major reconstruction and regular maintenance, such accidents are all but inevitable.	This road provides the only access to the south side of Piney Ridge in this area. It is used by hunters during the fall and other recreationists during the summer months. There is no known history of accidents on this road. Therefore, Alternative G will not be modified to decommission this needed road.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
361	14	7-786.1, 7-786.1A, 7-719.1, 7-719.2C	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to Licensed Vehicles Only that should remain open to Licensed and Unlicensed Vehicles as identified in Alternative F. 7-786.1, 7-786.1A, 7-719.1, 7-719.2C, narrow winding road with limited turnouts. Safety concern with licensed vehicle traffic when meeting oncoming traffic and no turn around. Public safety improved if ATV use is allowed on these roads.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 700. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road from Vail to the junction with Road 701. Roads 786 and 719 are fairly short and do not provide a quality ATV riding experience since the use is prohibited on Road 700 in this area. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow mixed use on these roads.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	16	7-n1866.1	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: Stag Gulch – 4-N1866.1: Between Squaw Creek and 421.1, access to Big Park should be improved and mountain bike traffic should be included. N1866.1 Stag Gulch is only access trail from Edwards west for Mountain Bikes and was built when Cordillera closed off other access trails. This trail used frequently by horses and needs to be improved before mountain bike traffic travel and maintained as a mixed use, with bikes yielding to horses. Trailhead not obvious and trail is narrow, steep and switch-backed, work with local groups to improve trail to be wider. Improve Squaw Creek Road signage to increase use. Should include re-route of Squaw Creek trail 1897 – FS422 around Wilderness. In addition or as alternative to switchback improvement on Stag Gulch, work with USFS, ECO Trails, Trail Action Group and Cordillera to formalize and preserve historic livestock access to Big Park through the Cordillera development. Connects to western slopes of New York Mountain via trails and roads that drop down to Fulford, Yeoman Park and Eagle. Opportunity also exists to create connection from Salt Creek in Brush Creek drainage up and over Bellyache to Squaw Creek in	We appreciate the ideas. The TMP is not addressing re-routes and trailheads, but would encourage the groups to work with the Ranger District post TMP to initiate these new ideas.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	11	7-n2106.1a	7. N2106.1A – do not close as suggested in Alternative G. Manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse. Resource damage has occurred due to motorized uses, but Committee would like to review with USFS if these routes can remain open to non-motorized users. Ties into Buck Creek longer loop from Vail up Red and White Mountain across and down into Avon.	Trail N2106.1A is an illegal trail built by unknown persons. The trail has not been found on the ground and the origin of the data is unknown. As a result of the trail being illegal and within deer and elk winter range, the final alternative will not be modified to adopt it.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
249	8	7-n2106.1a	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: The Town supports the mixed non-motorized use for the Swift (#7N-2106.1A) trail.	Trail N2106.1A is an illegal trail built by unknown persons. The trail has not been found on the ground and the origin of the data is unknown. As a result of the trail being illegal and within deer and elk winter range, the final alternative will not be modified to adopt it.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
339	4	7-n227.1	7-N227.1 From alternative A needs to be on Alternative G. 7-N227.1 gets you across Forest Service land, through ski area, ultimately connecting with 7-2109.1. Thank you for adding to Alternative G.	The Forest Service does not have any legal authority or easement to adopt and open this road across private land on the north end. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to add this road to the transportation system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	15	7-n227.1	Homestead Water Tank Trail or "A-10" Trail – N227.1: Shown on Alternative A, but not Alternative G. Restore to inventory and manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse. Popular trail and loop from Arrowhead. Access easements needed We [Eco Eagle Valley Trails Committee] recommend keeping this trail on system so that access can be secured over time as development and open space funding opportunities arise. Work with local trail groups to secure.	This trail is not currently on the system. Should easement be obtained the trail can be added to the system.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	23	7-n236.1, 7-237.1	Vail/Camp Hale Area: N236.1 and N237.1 are important connectors and portions of loop trails to and from Vail from Red Sandstone and Lost Lake Cross Gulch-Nottingham Ridge. Manage as open to Mountain Bike, Horse and Foot.	Trail N236.1 is a winter trail used to access the Eiseman Hut. The trail disappears at the junction point with N237.1. Therefore, it does not connect to the road system near the hut. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to adopt these routes.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
339	5	7-n238.1	7-N238.1 is a needed connector to get around private land to 7-2107.1. It is shown as closed to public on Alternative A. It should be added to G.	In order to get around private lands, N238.1 will be adopted and added to the trail system under Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	9	7-n238.1, 7-n231.1	7. N238.1 and 7.N231.1: Shown in Alternative A, removed in Alternative G. Retain as connector from Red and White to Nottingham Gulch (Cross Gulch) should be left in to provide access around private property. Manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse. Only remaining connection to Cross Gulch/Nottingham Gulch Trail 7.N231.1. Fast downhill, makes the connection with Davos to Avon, loop opportunity between Vail and Avon.	In order to get around private lands, N238.1 will be adopted and added to the trail system under Alternative G. N231.1 is an illegal trail created by motorcycle riders. It is an unsustainable route in its current location due to steep slopes and wetlands. In order to curb this illegal use, Alternative G will not be modified to adopt this illegal trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	10	7-n248.1	7 – N248.1 where it turns into 7 – N239.1: Recommended for decommission but needs to remain open so connection can be made with #7 – 734, 1 Red and White Mountain Road. 7 – N248.1 is too steep to climb for mountain bikes. Keeping this open is necessary because trails in this area cross Village of Avon private property and access is currently tenuous, until	The final alternative will be modified to adopt trail N248.1 to provide access around private land and the final alternative will not be modified to adopt trail N239.1.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	105	adam mtn	Adam Mountain Area/Eagle RD Designating the greater part of Adam and Eve Mountains as an Open Motorized Area makes no sense – the terrain is far too steep and/or the forest too dense to allow for off-trail snowmobile use. The area south of FSR 436.1 West Hat Creek and FST 1872.1 Sneve Gulch does make sense for open travel – it's not so steep, much more open, and there is a network of old ski roads and thinned-out forest areas to make for an enjoyable riding experience. Likewise on the east side of FSR 416.1 Hat Creek – the terrain is too steep and the forest too dense to allow for off-road travel. FSR 646.1 Craig Peak should also be closed to snowmobiles in order to help direct traffic to the more appropriate riding terrain north of Fulford.	Thank-you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
358	1	aquatic	According to our local Holy Cross Ranger District, East Zone Fisheries Biologist, Brian Healy, an assumption in the Forest Plan EIS was that watersheds would improve as standards and guidelines and direction contained within the USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Region Watershed Conservation Practices (Forest Service Handbook 2509.25) are implemented. In the process of conducting site-specific analyses of watershed health for various projects in the Holy Cross District, Brian Healy identified stream health impacts within the Eagle River Watershed related to the road system. His concerns are herein reiterated to insure that they continued to be recognized as issues that need to be addressed by the Travel Management Plan and that this focus not be lost by the admittedly broader aspects of the plan in its totality. Road-related impacts are listed in parentheses next to each stream: -Gore Creek Watershed-municipal watershed-Gold Medal trout waters Black Gore Creek (303(d)-listed due to sediment related to Interstate-70) Spraddle Creek (sediment related to 4-wheel drive roads) Mill Creek (elevated sediment levels and bank instability related to ski runs and roads, as well as old timber sale roads and landslides) Red Sandstone Creek (elevated sediment levels related to road system, sensitive soils) Cumulative effects of sediment and other urbanization-related impacts to Gore Creek have been observed in aquatic insect communities in Gore Creek. -Upper Eagle River Watershed Game Creek (high levels of sediment due to ski area road system) Turkey Creek/Wearyman Creek (loss of riparian habitat due to roads constructed in riparian area) -Eagle River above Lake Creek - Cutthroat trout Conservation Population June Creek (road-related sediment loading) Berry Creek (user-developed roads in sensitive soils, unauthorized OHV use, existing sediment sources identified on system roads/trails).	Thank-you for your comment.	Technical Studies (Resource Reports, etc.)
535	8	avon, edwards	Avon and Edwards Area: Connections from Vail to Avon – several popular road or trail connections exist that are shown on Alternative A, and not on Alternative G. We [Eco Eagle Valley Trails Committee] request discussion with USFS staff to discuss use patterns, trail condition, viability for retention. All are considered appropriate as open to Mountain Bike, Foot and Horse. Includes Davos Trail, Nottingham, Cross Gulch, Red and White Mountain, Buck Creek, and others. For example popular single track from Davos Trail out of Vail, provide a loop opportunity between Vail and Avon. Some user conflicts exist between motorized and non-motorized and an access easement is needed but we recommended keeping this trail on the system so that access can be secured over time as development approvals are negotiated (e.g. Village at Avon) and open space acquisitions occur.	This comment does not contain any specific route numbers, but the issues are believed to have been addressed elsewhere.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
455	24	avon, red and white	Area 2 – Avon access point: This area provides important access from Avon to the Red and White riding area and must remain designated as Open for motorized use. Members of the Holy Cross Powder Hounds in the Avon area use this area for their access and are interested in signing and grooming a route through this popular access point. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The Forest Service has no authority to allow access to Area 2, as shown on the comment letter. Area 2 is deer and elk winter range and motorized access must be via a designated route. The Forest Service is unaware of any use in this Area. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified to allow use in this area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	5	avon, red and white	Avon access point: This area provides important access from Avon to the Red and White riding area and must remain designated as Open for motorized use. Members of the Holy Cross Powder Hounds in the Avon area use this area for their access and are interested in signing and grooming a route through this popular access point.	No specific area to analyze and respond. We appreciate the willingness of the Powder Horns to help.	Designation of Lands
509	104	bellyache mtn	Bellyache Mountain Area/Eagle RD The Open Motorized Area needs to be restricted to the west side of FSR 421.1 and 421.1B in order to keep motorized traffic out of the Holy Cross Wilderness and a proposed addition to it.	The Forest Service will consider this issue in the future should the area become wilderness or motorized use into the wilderness occur.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
46	1	camp hale	It has come to my attention that you are planning on closing down several four wheel drive roads around the camphale area. Some of these roads include nsfr 755, nsfr 747, nsfr 758, nsfr 743, nsfr 731, nsfr 705.1p, nsfr 998w.1, and nsfr 713. I grew up enjoying these mountains, and many times it was difficult to enjoy them by hiking all of the way up the mountain to get to the top. These roads make it much easier for people with disabilities, age impaired, and with small children such as myself to share the outdoors with their loved ones. I am pleading with you to please keep these roads open to us to enjoy and not take away another pleasure from my family and myself.	The final alternative proposes to decommission roads 755, 747, and 705.1P for reasons stated in other responses to comments. The final alternative has been modified to leave road 758 open to licensed vehicles. Road 998W.1 is a non-system road Forested Landscape Linkages Management Area. The Forest Plan standard is that open motorized travelway density will not increase. As a result, this road will not be added to the system and open to the public. Road 713 was built to harvest timber. The road provides limited public access and its closure will improve wildlife habitat by reducing road density. Road 731 enters into a Forested Landscape Linkages Management Area. Its closure at the Forest Boundary will improve the ability of forest carnivores to move through the area while still This comment refers to the issue of dispersed camping at Camp Hale and not travel management. Therefore, it is outside the scope of this analysis.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
366	2	camp hale	We wanted to comment that the Camp Hale closures have negatively affected Homestake Valley, which is not able to accommodate the dispersed camping as well as Camp Hale did.	This comment is outside the scope of this analysis as it expresses a concern over management of camping at Camp Hale and not the travel system.	Designation of Lands
232	5	camp hale	With the increase of population and the increase of people in the forests we need to keep roads open or with over use the cry for more closures will be heard. We found the closure of the first mile of McCalister to be unconscionable. At the very end of camping season forest service came in with bull dozers and split rail fences to effectively close some really wonderful dispersed camping. We had enjoyed that area so much and it was such great camping. Why was it closed like that? There are not very many places in that area of the White River that could accommodate the large groups and the large RV's. And we've heard from forest service personnel that the plan is to completely close off Camp Hale. Those closures have since pushed a lot of the people over into the Homestake Valley which cannot support the heavy usage and will now have more closures posted. I had always expected Camp Hale to be developed into a large camping area, I never in my worst nightmare expected it to be closed. Where is the visionary who can see the potential for this area as a recreation area for multi- purpose to honor the history that the 10th Mountain Division had in the area? For years I marveled at how it was really quite ugly with the concrete foundations and blacktopped roads and then I started to see the signs bringing back some of the history (similar to Teller City in Routt Forest) and the large RV's enjoying the area and families, church groups etc... I could finally see beauty and purpose Vail/Camp Hale Area: The ski trails that double as Mountain Bike, Foot and Horse trail on the ski areas are within the operator's permit and USFS does not intend to show the ski area summer or winter trails on the final maps, but is recommended that the connectors be shown on the maps, into and through the special use permit areas to other forest areas or main trails. For example 711.5D Grand Traverse to Two Elk is the only connections from trails constructed by Vail Mountain to the USFS Two Elk trail. 711.5D was built by USFS, not Vail Mountain, and should be shown for public interested in connections between the two. 7-14W.4 Cougar Ridge is another example of a ski area trail connector trail and is shown.	The maps in the TMP are based on and focus on the decisions made for this effort. Recreation maps will be made subsequent the decision to show users where to go for various uses.	Designation of Lands
535	22	camp hale, two elk			Road and Trail Classification/Management
507	1	Chicago basin	I would like to express how deeply disappointed I and my family are about the over restrictive motorized access to our forest. We have used and respected the forest, however now our access to our forest is being severely reduced. The Chicago Basin area just west of the Climax mine. This area has been used extensively by snowmobilers for decades and now it is shut off. You have "offered" up a couple of routes that give little to no access to the area. There are many other examples, but I will just address just this one now. However, I see that to not make it look so obvious on the charts of different access opportunities, this entire area and many others just like it are considered "motorized" even if only 5% is available to motorized use. I don't understand how an organization once great and fair has turned into the bias anti-motorized organization of today. The forest is a vast area which can support many uses. The main recreational impact to the forest is skiing. From downhill ski areas, and the communities that have been built around them, they have cut down tens of thousands of acres, to the cross country ski areas and hut system with their wide cut trails thru the forest and "hotels" in the backcountry. Their impact dwarfs anything from the snowmobile community, however it is the snowmobile which is being restricted from the forest.	The Land and Resource Management Plan - 2002 Revision for the White River National Forest designated the Chicago Basin area as Management Area 1.32 Backcountry Recreation - Non-motorized with Limited Winter Motorized. The Forest Plan Standard for this area is that over-the-snow vehicles are allowed, but they are restricted to designated routes and snow play areas. In some areas, use is further restricted by permit only. Winter Alternative G includes the Columbine Ditch Road as a designated route and includes the snowplay area at the end of the road. Thus Alternative G complies with the Forest Plan direction for the Chicago Ridge area. Some of the area in question is blocked by private land and th Forest Service has no authority to designate routes across private land unless it holds an easement. At this time, the Forest Service has no easements across the Climax Mine property. The final alternative will not change.	Planning Document (Rule, EIS, etc.)
235	40	deadhorse trail	You claim to need to "protect" the Lynx against snow compaction. The study you use has been discredited by a much more We [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] request that additional routes through restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added: Route 5 – Deadhorse Trail #620.1/Tie Gulch area: This route would provide important access to open snowmobiling areas from the east end of Glenwood Canyon and was proposed by local club members. While there is not consistent snowfall at the bottom end of this route, it would provide important access in the years there is sufficient snowfall. While we understand it would require coordination with BLM for the first half-mile or so, we believe it could potentially provide improved access so	Based on the route passing through winter range and the inconsistent snowfall, this route will not be designated for snowmobiles. It is also only a short distance to the Coffee Pot Road which provides access to the same area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
455	38	deadhorse trail, tie gulch	We [Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition] request that additional routes through Restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added.	Based on the route passing through winter range and the inconsistent snowfall, this route will not be designated for snowmobiles. It is also only a short distance to the Coffee Pot Road which provides access to the same area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	17	deadhorse, tie gulch	Route 5 – Deadhorse Trail #620.1/Tie Gulch area: This route would provide important access to Open snowmobiling areas from the east end of Glenwood Canyon and was proposed by local club members. While there is not consistent snowfall at the bottom end of this route, it would provide important access in the years there is sufficient snowfall. While we [Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition] understand it would require coordination with BLM for the first half-mile or so, we believe it could potentially provide improved access so therefore put the idea forward through this process. This route is located in a 5.41 MA.	Based on the route passing through winter range and the inconsistent snowfall, this route will not be designated for snowmobiles. It is also only a short distance to the Coffee Pot Road which provides access to the same area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
67	1	eagle county	Deadhorse Trail #620.1/Tie Gulch area: This route would provide important access to Open snowmobiling areas from the east end of Glenwood Canyon and was proposed by local club members. While there is not consistent snowfall at the bottom end of this route, it would provide important access in the years there is sufficient snowfall. While we [Buena Vista Snowmobile Club] understand it would require coordination with BLM for the first half-mile or so, we believe it could potentially provide improved access so therefore put the idea forward through this process. This route is located in a 5.41 MA.	Thank-you for your comment.	General Support
455	27	east vail	As expressed by the Eagle County Comprehensive Plan, the appropriate and conscientious management of public lands and associated trails in Eagle County is paramount to the quality of life and recreation opportunities enjoyed by all residents and visitors alike. To this end, the Board of County Commissioners depends on the hard work of the ECO Eagle Valley Trails Committee to review proposals related to trails and access in Eagle County. We [Eagle County] believe their detailed analysis reflects the sentiment of the citizens of Eagle County and we would hope that you would carefully consider their comments and recommendations contained in their letter to you dated December 23, 2008.	Thank-you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
235	29	east vail	We once again thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. Eagle County and Public Land Managers should continue to collaborate to provide high quality amenities such as trails and recreational experiences that promote Eagle County as the absolute finest place to live and visit. We fully support your efforts as you strive to balance the desires of the public against the need to protect the quality and integrity of our public land for generations to come.	Thank-you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	24	eiseman	Area 5 – East of Vail Resorts: We [Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition] are okay with the proposed change from Open to Restricted. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	Thank-you for your comment.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
481	25	gates, estin	Area 5 – East of Vail Resorts: We are okay with the proposed change from Open to Restricted. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	Thank-you for your comment.	Document Composition (clarity/grammar/selling/punct.)
249	4	gis-mapping	Eiseman Hut. We [Hut Association - 10th Mountain Division] support Alternative G because it provides a closure point that is relatively easy to understand and enforce, protects the integrity of the winter non-motorized hut experience around the Eiseman Hut, and provides valuable snowmobiling opportunities. In short, it provides a good recreational experience for all users. Alternative G provides for extensive snowmobile use of the adjacent Red and White area and there is no need to include FDR 719 leading to the Eiseman Hut as a snowmobile route because FDR 719 does not provide a loop experience, Gates and Estin Huts. Again, Alternative G provides a decent recreational experience for hut visitors and snowmobilers because it creates shared and separate routes/play areas based generally on topographic/vegetative boundaries that are relatively easy to understand and enforce.	The area in question is designated as "Restricted - Motorized Routes Only" under the preferred alternative during the winter. The Land and Resource Management Plan for the White River National Forest designated the area as Management Area - 5.41 Deer and Elk Winter Range. In this area the standard is "Over-the-snow vehicle use is restricted to designated routes and play areas unless authorized by special use permit or for emergency use." The only designated route in the area in question is the Berry Creek Road starting in Edwards and then the June Creek Road to the open snowmobile area in the Red & White Mountain area. Therefore, the area south of Wildridge and east of Singletree is in essence non-motorized during the winter. Therefore, the final alternative will not be modified. This comment refers to how features are labeled on the map layer and do not effect the preferred alternative and is thus outside the scope of this analysis.	Mapping, GIS
249	12	gis-mapping	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request:	This comment refers to how features are labeled on the map layer and do not effect the preferred alternative and is thus outside the scope of this analysis.	Mapping, GIS
249	13	gis-mapping	Benchmark Lake Reservoir and Benchmark Lake Dam on all maps should read "Nottingham Lake".	This comment refers to how features are labeled on the map layer and do not effect the preferred alternative and is thus outside the scope of this analysis.	Mapping, GIS
249	14	gis-mapping	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request:	This comment refers to how features are labeled on the map layer and do not effect the preferred alternative and is thus outside the scope of this analysis.	Mapping, GIS
372	2	heart lake	There are other various labels within the Town of Avon that don't appear to be accurate (i.e.: Metcalf Ditch, Avon, Avon Siding, Beaver Creek, Eagle Valley, Nottingham and Puder Ditch). Please consult Town staff.	The final alternative does close some spurs, but access is still provided to most areas.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
232	9	homestake	It appears that many spurs on the Flat Tops south and east of Heart Lake are recommended to be closed. It's a fantastic place to car camp and nice to spread out given that many users have motor homes, campers, generators and ATV's. The non-ATV camper can have a chance at an at-large experience too if a good sampling of the short spurs are left available.	The Forest Service will make every effort to make the regulations understandable on any signs.	Structures (Bridges/culverts/gates/signs, etc.)
509	103	homestake, no name, Yoder	We understand you intend to close the Homestake road to smaller sized OHV's which we can understand, however we would ask that the signage clearly specify OHV as we have licensed/plated motorcycles and have been harassed by people who don't understand that these cycles are dual purpose and not simply OHV.	The final alternative has been modified to use Forest Road 705 as the west boundary for the open snowmobile area.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
481	23	huts	Homestake-No Name Area/Holy Cross RD The Yoder Gulch Open Motorized Area needs to be bounded on the north, west and south by FSR 705 – otherwise there is no clear demarcation to keep riders out of the Holy Cross Wilderness Area.	Thank-you for your comment.	Preferred Alternative (Alternative G)
481	26	jakal, fowler/hilliard	10th Mountain believes that Alternative G does a good job of providing a quality experience for all users including hut visitors and snowmobilers in the areas of the Eiseman, Gates, Estin, Jackal, and Fowler/Hilliard Huts.	Thank-you for your comment.	Action not Specified

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action																																			
489	6	janet's cabin	Janet's Cabin Area The Restricted-Motorized Routes Only designation for this area creates an excellent wilderness hut experience, which was too often violated by motorized Vail Pass users on the high route to Searle Pass. The new designation will insure hut users a tranquil backcountry area.	The White River National Forest will analyze and determine winter travel management in the Vail Pass area in a separate analysis based on impacts on Lynx from snow compaction and current/projected levels of recreation use. Until this separate analysis is complete, current winter travel routes will not change.	Designation of Lands																																			
251	2	june creek	I have lived in Eagle County for over 30 years and have hunted in the June Creek and Red and White area for most of those years. I have seen roads already shut down (June Creek) and now understand that the wild Ridge entrance into June Creek will be shut down. Access to that area would be harder and make it difficult for hunters to use that area.	Forest Service Road 717.1A which connects Wildridge Subdivision to the June Creek Road (717) is not proposed for closing during snow-free periods of the year from May 1 until after the last rifle season in mid-February. Therefore, the preferred alternative does not change current access in this area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal																																			
249	2	june creek	The Town council of the Town of Avon, Colorado request: Emergency egress should be provided for Wildridge subdivision via June Creek starting point located in Singletree subdivision. Access for full sized vehicles should be recognized for safety and for Wildfire Mitigation and response.	The route that connects the Singletree Subdivision road system with the June Creek Road (NFSR 717) was closed by the Forest Service several years ago to motorized vehicles because the Singletree Subdivision closed their section of the connection to motorized vehicles. The Forest Service has validated that it does not have an easement across Singletree property and therefore has no legal authority to designate a road across the land. As a result, the preferred alternative will not be modified.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
235	27	minturn, grouse	Area 3 – Minturn/Grouse Creek areas: This large area is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which is heavily used by local riders. It must remain Open for winter motorized use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	Alternative G proposes to close the Grouse Creek area to snowmobiles and to designate the Meadow Mountain area instead. This will lead to some separation of use. Also the Grouse Creek Trailhead is small and does not provide adequate trailer parking as compared to the Meadow Mountain Trailhead.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
455	25	minturn, grouse	Area 3 – Minturn/Grouse Creek areas: This large area is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which is heavily used by local riders. It must remain Open for winter motorized use. [See map on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	Alternative G proposes to close the Grouse Creek area to snowmobiles and to designate the Meadow Mountain area instead. This will lead to some separation of use. Also the Grouse Creek Trailhead is small and does not provide adequate trailer parking as compared to the Meadow Mountain Trailhead.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
501	6	minturn, grouse	Minturn/Grouse Creek areas: This large area is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which is heavily used by local riders. It must remain Open for winter motorized use.	Alternative G proposes to close the Grouse Creek area to snowmobiles and to designate the Meadow Mountain area instead. This will lead to some separation of use. Also the Grouse Creek Trailhead is small and does not provide adequate trailer parking as compared to the Meadow Mountain Trailhead.	Designation of Lands																																			
339	1	mittchell creek loop	Off of 7-705.1 no name road a portion of which is Wurts Ditch Road is an old trail now used by mountain bikers that connects with the Colorado Trail, 7-756W.1, at the old narrow railroad grade. It is two miles long and follows the Mitchell Creek Loop Winter use trail shown by ...on the attached map because this trail is regularly used it should be approved with a group lead by Lee Rimel and Kent Rose (the Wednesday night mountain bike/snowshoe group, 20 years together with our sons, 30+ joining us) are happy to enter into an adopt a trail agreement to upgrade and maintain this trail. We will map it, GPS, obtain Forest Service approval of the route, re-vegetate damaged areas and build the trail to Forest Service Specifications.	Thank you for your assistance. Note: The Ranger District is working with this group to update the mapping.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
535	14	mud springs	Mud Springs – Formalize trail designation, show on Alternative G. Manage as open to Mountain Bike, Foot, and Horse. Provides single-track route between, to and from McCoy Park to Arrowhead.	This area is within the Ski area prescription and will be part of the ski area management plans for summer operations.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
230	5	north avon	I am disappointed to see the proposal to close the trails north of Avon and Vail (i.e. 7-700.1, 7-734.1, 7-433.1, 7-717.1, 7-778.1 and 7-1881.1a).	Based on comments received and the management needs for the area, the final alternative has not been modified to allow ATV use on the roads mentioned by hunters, there is motorized access for licenced vehicles.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal																																			
535	21	old fulford road	Bellyache Ridge/Eagle Area: Old Fulford Road: Shown as proposed to be closed to all motorized vehicles and mechanized (Mountain Bike) uses. Sub-committee members believe the route serves a purpose as part of a good mountain bike loop ride that involves riding up to Fulford on the new road and come back down the old road.	This route will be decommissioned as it is a parallel route and not needed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
537	6	ranch creek	Ranch Creek Trail/Road. Gate/Fence should be amour plated because this is a temping route for the motor heads. Nor should this be a mountain bike route. It is too steep to climb and it connects with no other trails. Ranch Creek is a winter route only.	The current preferred alternative is to close this road to motorized use and place it under a special use permit to the 10th Mountain Hut Association. The final alternative will be modified to close the road to mountain bikes as it is too steep to ride.	Road and Trail Classification/Management																																			
537	5	ranch creek	Ranch Creek Trail/road; <table><tr><td></td><td>FSV</td><td>ATV</td><td>Motorcycle</td><td>Mountain Bike</td><td>Animal</td><td>Hike</td></tr><tr><td>7-755.1</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td></tr><tr><td>7-755.1</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td></tr><tr><td>7-2134W.1</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td></tr><tr><td>7-2134W.1A</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td><td>P</td></tr></table> All are the same Trail/Road. I recommend decommission/close except for administrative use. This road is the access route to the 10 nth Mountain Jackal Hut. This Road/Trail should be significantly gated and fenced at the bottom of the road where it leaves Camp Hale. Fencing on either side of the gate to prevent 4-wheelers, ATV's motorcycles from circumventing the gate.		FSV	ATV	Motorcycle	Mountain Bike	Animal	Hike	7-755.1	P	P	P	A	A	A	7-755.1	A	A	A	A	A	A	7-2134W.1	P	P	P	P	P	P	7-2134W.1A	P	P	P	P	P	P	The current preferred alternative is to close this road to motorized use and place it under a special use permit to the 10th Mountain Hut Association. The final alternative will be modified to close the road to mountain bikes as it is too steep to ride.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
	FSV	ATV	Motorcycle	Mountain Bike	Animal	Hike																																		
7-755.1	P	P	P	A	A	A																																		
7-755.1	A	A	A	A	A	A																																		
7-2134W.1	P	P	P	P	P	P																																		
7-2134W.1A	P	P	P	P	P	P																																		
427	2	rec-alt	Subsequent to receiving the Proposed Travel Management Plan materials, we [Nova Guides, Inc.] met privately with the Holy Cross District Ranger, Brian Lloyd, on December 24, 2008. In this meeting we discussed our concerns with Alternative G, specifically, the extensive road closures involving ATV use in the Camp Hale area, Piney area, Red and White Mountain area; basically, all of the roads and trails proximal to the Vail area. The outcome of this meeting lead us to understand and draw the conclusion that our access to primary roads within the WRNF could be preserved, if through the thoughtful re-working of a combined format of ideas behind Alternatives G and F. Our preference is to utilize Alternative F, exclusively; yet we remain open to further conversation an on-going discussion that will further advance the idea of combining the two alternatives in a	The final alternative has not been modified to allow unlicensed vehicles in these areas. This is based on the small network of roads, lack of a quality riding experience, and the fact access is allowed for licensed vehicles. However, holders of special use permits may be allowed limited use for guided tours.	Alternatives (add, change, delete)																																			
427	4	rec-mixed users	Alternative G odes not benefit anyone wishing to utilize, yet make a living from the use of roads and trails in our area of the WRNF. We [Nova Guides, Inc.] strongly object to the implementation of Alternative G, as it stands; and we also stand to lose a great share of revenue if Alternative G passes, jobs will be lost, etc., creating financial hardship for many. Also worth mentioning, given the present state of the economy and the financial status of the USFS, we feel that the Forest Service, as an income-producing entity, can and will be negatively impacted, financially. A combined measure of both Alternatives, in our	This is a statement of opinion and does not raise a specific issue which requires a response. Response to alternatives in general can be found in the programmatic response to comment section.	Alternatives (add, change, delete)																																			

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
427	3	rec-mixed users	Horses have been replaced by ATVs, Mountain Bikes, and Motorcycles. Hunters who utilize all of these roads would be restricted from access to the forest if Alternative G is exclusively in place. As a resident of Camp Hale and as a Tour Operator/Owner, offering guided and unguided activities throughout the Camp Hale area, we [Nova Guides, Inc.] have witnessed and experienced that the use of ATVs, motorized vehicles, mountain bikes, hikers, etc., side-by-side, can and do coexist harmoniously.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on all roads in the Camp Hale valley floor. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on these roads and mitigation was not possible. In fact several roads in the valley floor are paved and ATV and dirt bike manufacturers state that it is unsafe to operate these machines on paved roads. Therefore, the designation of roads will not be modified in the final alternative with the exception of a one mile section of Forest Road 702 from property owned by Nova Guides to	Activities on Public Lands (General)
198	1	rec-motorized	I notice that the Eagle County Area seemed to get totally wiped out for ATV use and the rest of the WRNF still has lots of ATV areas. This makes no sense and does not make for good management especially if you look at multipurpose use. I also noticed that special use permits are not impacted by this plan. So I can't go there with an ATV or vehicle but others can. I look forward to hearing how that will improve the resource conditions and how you plan to enforce that and so much for	The final alternative does allow some ATV use where it was determined to be safe and appropriate.	Designation of Lands
198	5	rec-motorized	There is no reason to close the roads below to ATV travel. 405.1 700.1 744.1 433.1 717.1 780.1 78.1 783.1 774.1 734.1 786.1 786.1A 719.1 719.2C 728.1 708.1 N708.2 702.1 714.1 730.1 737.1 710.1 755.1 737.1 751.1	The final alternative will not be modified to allow unlicensed vehicle travel as explained in response to other comments.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	77	rec-motorized	Winter Routes: The winter use map in Alternative G designates all non-wilderness areas as either Restricted – Motorized Routes Only or Open Motor Vehicle Use. The designated winter routes are the same routes as those designated for summer travel then Alternative G does meet the objective of distribution of winter recreation users into higher elevation play areas with designated routes through lower winter range habitats where the impact to wildlife will be decreased. The DOW would also support and work with the USFS in efforts to further delineate designated routes to winter play areas.	Thank-you for your comment and support.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
198	6	rec-motorized	You have to provide a way for people to connect from the main routes to other smaller roads like Red Sandstone, Shrine Pass. It makes no sense to close parts of these roads so you can't get from point A to point B. Nothing in the plan shows that the FS will provide any parking areas at these roads for people to park and unload their machine for recreation or hunting.	Where appropriate, the Forest Service will provide parking areas to unload unlicensed vehicles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	55	rec-motorized, rec-hunting	Eagle Ranger District General Comments Doing a rough calculation there appears to be a loss of over 70 miles of roads to all motorized travel and over 140 miles of additional routes closed to ATVs for a total of over 200 miles of routes where ATVs will no longer be allowed to travel in the South Eagle Ranger district. There will be a closure of 33 miles of motorized travel routes in GMU 44 and a closure of a total of 146 miles of routes that are currently approved for ATV use. With the exception of the Red Tables and the Old Man's Gulch area, ATV travel is almost entirely excluded in Game Management Unit 44. Mixed use on many of these motorized travel routes provides the best method of achieving a variety of goals. Some of the routes designated as licensed motorized are almost impassable to all but modified licensed vehicles. Routes that go into Lettuce Patch and Big Park are two examples of roads that may not be driven or checked by DOW because of a high probability of vehicle damage.	While this may be a statement of fact concerning the preferred alternative in the Supplemental Draft, the final alternative has been modified to allow some additional ATV use south of Eagle. This change is documented under the response to other comments.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
425	1	rec-Nonmotorized	There is a miscommunication or difference in the type of travel management between the BLM and USFS or a miscommunication between the DOW and the BLM on the direction of their travel plan. The BLM currently allows for mixed I would like to request that the Forest Service consider designating one basin or quadrant near the Eagle Valley as open only to non-motorized travel during the wintertime. As a resident of Eagle, I am in constant search for an area where I can enjoy the peace and quiet of our forests in the winter. Most of our designated wilderness areas are either too remote or avalanche prone to access during the winter months. Access points like Vail Pass, Red and White Mtn., Meadow Mtn., Castle Peak, Brush Cr., Gypsum Cr., Hardscrabble Mtn., Coffee Pot Rd. and almost every other area nearby are all open to motorized winter travel. Please consider allocating one or two areas in the Eagle River Valley where those of us who choose human-	The Forest Service believes the final alternative does provide this opportunity in areas such as Grouse Creek, above the Wildridge Subdivision, and the south side of Hardscrabble Mountain.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
535	7	rec-process	We [ECO Eagle Valley Trails Committee] respectfully request a review meeting with Holy Cross and Eagle Ranger district staff to discuss some of the recommendations of Alternative G. The committee believes some of the routes are viable to remain open, and can provide background information for your consideration. We would also like to discuss ideas for	The Forest Service believes it has met this request.	Meetings/Collaboration (Public)
427	1	rec-special uses	As a private Outfitter/Owner operating our business within the White River National Forest, we [Nova Guides, Inc.] feel compelled to express our concerns regarding the proposed Travel Management Plan, specifically (Alternative G). We derive our livelihood from this business which relies heavily upon our permitted access to the Trail System within the WRNF; and further, we see this as a severely restrictive measure with great potential to cause unnecessary and avoidable financial hardship upon us, in both a business sense as well as impacting us in a negative fashion, as residents at Camp Hale. We have successfully and safely offered both guided and unguided ATV, Jeep and Hummer Tours and Rentals within the WRNF for nearly (26) twenty-six years and counting. Our track record speaks for itself. We are cognizant of the relevance of and sensitivity to the evaluation of environmental impact, and the footprint we leave behind in utilizing the trails we are permitted on. It is our strong belief that as responsible Operators, we cannot accept Alternative G for what it is. The proposed Travel Management Plan not only penalizes, but places a strangle hold upon Outfitters such as Nova Guides, Inc.	As a permit holder, the Forest Service can exempt the holder from the travel management plan for guided tours on roads that are unsafe for mixed use on a limited basis, providing certain mitigation measures are employed. This can be discussed once a final decision is made.	Specialty Permitted Uses (resorts, outfitters, etc.)
346	1	red and white	I heard from word of mouth that Red and White Mountain will [be] closed to dirt bike and ATVs. I feel it would [be a] burden to the community if it was closed. Hundreds of people from around the surrounding areas come here to enjoy these roads and trails, not only would hurt our recreational users of our National Forest but could also hurt our economy. Please don't close these trails for me and the community.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
464	1	red and white	Please don't close red and white.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District.	General Opposition (suspend/stop)
286	2	red and white	I am sure the following speaks for many of the local riders in this valley and how they feel about this plan. Your new proposed management plan shows the general public nothing. That is nothing, after all these years trying to come up with a plan, you have done nothing. How absurd "it's closed unless marked open". I am sure this plan was decided on due to budget cuts and lack of staffing. In fact, it is so lame that the Forest Service could drive up Red Sandstone on the morning after you pass your plan, mark Red and White Road open and then go home and take the rest of the season off. I am sure nobody will complain, anyone who rides or drives anything other than a bike will ignore it and continue riding the great trail system around Red and White Mountain. By the way if you want to know how passionate the single track riders are, many of my friends from the Front Range and California are already planning rides around here for July and August. If you would like to see how great these trails are, join us. We plan to ride all of the usual single track trails around Red and White even if the Forest Service Plan is I suggested looking at how the trail systems are managed in Summit County and the Gunnison Forest around Taylor Park.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District.	Planning Document (Rule, EIS, etc.)
286	1	red and white	These areas have great open single-track riding, as do we in the White River National Forest. Red and White Mountain is an example in my neighborhood of a great existing single track system. Sure, some of the off-shoot trails could be closed and others could be re-routed to avoid more erosion. Brian mentioned that since 2002 when these plans first came out, no local user group has stepped up to help organize or maintain the trails. This may be true but just because an off-road-friendly movement has not started in this valley yet, does that mean the established single track trail system should just be shut down? And let me emphasize 'established'. These trails have been around for a long, long time. Brian says it is not the Forest	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District.	Meetings/Collaboration (Public)
183	1	Red and White, Camp Hale, Hardscrabble	The closing of Red and White, Hardscrabble, and Camp Hale to dirt biking is unjust and unfair to riders and small business shops like Eagle Motorworks, the Clinic in Minturn and Boys Toys in Eagle. [They] depend [on] people being able to ride here. Our reason for living here is to enjoy the great outdoors and by riding we get to see places that a lot of people do not. Our families ride too. By seeing these places we have a greater respect for the national forests and keeping them open for all to enjoy. Our OHV tags help keep these places going. By closing spots like these forces people to ride fewer places with more people causing more accidents (not good). If maintenance is a problem then maybe you should hire people to maintain trails instead of enforce unjust closures. We live to ride, so please reconsider the closing of these areas.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District. The final alternative has been modified to allow unlicensed vehicles on Forest Roads in the Hardscrabble Mountain area as it connects to a system of trails on the BLM. On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on The Forest Service met with and received comments from the Eagle County Commissioners on the Travel Management Plan. The comments did not carry any more weight or importance than those of the general public.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
536	1	red and white, hardscrabble, camp hale	It seems that the Eagle County Commissioners have already decided to close riding (dirt bikes, snowmobiles) in areas like Red and White Mt., Hardscrabble, and Camp Hale with little or no input from the people who ride, or the business owners who will be affected by these closures. (Eagle Motorworks, Boys Toys & Sons, the Clinic in Minture, and Nova Guides at Camp Hale). Proper signage and enforcement are much better alternatives then overreacting and shutting down areas to all, because of a few bad apples and close minded thinking towards dirt biking. I, like many of the people I ride with are		Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
397	1	red and white, hardscrabble, camp hale	There are no good reasons to close trails on Red and White, Hardscrabble, or Camp Hale. We just need to promote safer and smarter riding habits.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District. On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Roads in the Camp Hale area. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on the roads in the valley floor. Therefore, the final alternative will not be There is no legal public access to Area 2. The road up Nottingham Gulch cross private lands and the Forest Service does not possess an easement through the land to the area. In addition, Area 2 is located in Deer and Elk winter range. Any designated route in this area would negatively effect deer and elk. At the present time, there is no legal snowmobile use of the area and a designated route would be a new impact to the deer and elk. Therefore, the final The Forest Service will monitor this situation and make any changes needed to protect the resource.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
235	26	red and white-winter	Area 2 – Avon access point: This area provides important access from Avon to the Red and White riding area and must remain designated as Open for motorized use. Members of the Holy Cross Powder Hounds in the Avon area use this area for their access and are interested in signing and grooming a route through this popular access point. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]		Road and Trail Classification/Management
198	10	red and white-winter	Winter travel; Why is there no protection for the riparian areas up along Red and White the snowmobiles have packed every inch of riparian acre down flat? There is no way that is good management of a resource.		Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
565	2	red cliff	How will these closures ever be enforced? Historically these closures have resulted in vehicles going around the gates (Holy Cross Wilderness, Benson's cabin road on Shrine Pass) and end up destroying land that would not have been normally disturbed.	This is a general comment and does not include any site-specific issues that can be addressed in the Travel Management Plan. However, it should be noted that based on public comments the Benson's Cabin Road (Forest Road 758) will remain open to licensed vehicles in the final alternative.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
565	1	red cliff	I am having a difficult time with this plan considering what the possibility is of destroying any portion of businesses that have thrived over the last few years on these trails. The guide companies are just the beginning of the pyramid of those affected. Please consider the businesses that are at the end of the road. The Town of Red Cliff is a perfect example. Several businesses rely upon those traveling along these roads as recreation. Motels, restaurants, etc... The Town of Red Cliff has very few sources of income and the latest plan has been to increase business in town to allow for rebuilding infrastructure. Taking away those sources of revenue is not something that should be done particularly during financial times like we find ourselves in today.	This is a general comment and does not include any site-specific issues that can be addressed in the Travel Management Plan. However, it should be noted that the main Forest Service Road into Redcliff (Shrine Pass) will remain open to licensed vehicles in the final alternative.	Activities on Public Lands (General)
198	9	snowmobile-hunting	Winter travel; There needs to be more open routes for those of us that prefer to hunt in December to access the elk herds. The entire Muddy Pass, Power line, Elk Ridge, High Trail, and June Creek should all be open until the day after the hunting season.	The preferred and final alternative does not change current access during hunting seasons for the roads listed in the comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
235	28	south fork, middle fork, spraddle cr	Area 4 – South Fork/Middle Fork/Spraddle Creek areas: This large complex is an extremely popular snowmobiling area which provides important snowmobiling opportunities. It must remain Open for winter motorized use. [See Maps on Page 6 and 7 of letter]	The South Fork, Middle Fork and Spraddle Creek areas are located within the Spraddle Creek Roadless Area as identified by the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan - 2002 Revision. This roadless area was determined to be capable and available for wilderness. The majority of the restricted area is not rideable due to terrain and timber. The only winter route into the restricted area is the Spraddle Creek Road, which is a cherry stem into the roadless area. Any play areas off of the Road would be in the Roadless Area. In addition, the summer travel management plan for the area is to decommission the road above Spraddle Creek Ranch. Thus in the future, a travel route would not exist. The road to the trailhead is not always plowed in the winter, making it difficult to get a trailer to the trailhead. The preferred alternative would remove approximately 2.8 miles of current road. On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 709. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road. Therefore, the designation of this section of road will not be modified in the final alternative. In order to provide snowmobile access from Sweetwater to the open snowmobile areas on the White River Plateau, the Cross Creek Trail will be a designated winter route. The current travel management plan has this trail as a summer motorized route and the Management Area Prescription is 5.4 which allows snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
230	6	south vail pass	An area I hope you will reconsider is south of Vail Pass. These roads are easy for people like my father and wife to ride ATVs on and feel comfortable on due to the trails' non-aggressive nature. It would be a great loss to my family to lose these trails to ATV access.	On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule". The rule requires a study be completed by a qualified engineer on any higher standard road where mixed use (licensed and unlicensed vehicles) is being considered. Such a study was completed on Forest Road 709. The study determined that mixed use was not safe on this road. Therefore, the designation of this section of road will not be modified in the final alternative. In order to provide snowmobile access from Sweetwater to the open snowmobile areas on the White River Plateau, the Cross Creek Trail will be a designated winter route. The current travel management plan has this trail as a summer motorized route and the Management Area Prescription is 5.4 which allows snowmobiles.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
235	39	sweetwater	We [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] request that additional routes through restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added: Route 4 – Sweetwater/Falls Creek access: This route was proposed to be added through the restricted area by local club members. The route currently exists on the ground and provides important access to significant Open snowmobiling areas in the Flat Tops. This route is located in a 5.4 MA.	In order to provide snowmobile access from Sweetwater to the open snowmobile areas on the White River Plateau, the Cross Creek Trail will be a designated winter route. The current travel management plan has this trail as a summer motorized route and the Management Area Prescription is 5.4 which allows snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	16	sweetwater, falls cr	Sweetwater/Falls Creek access: This route was proposed to be added through the restricted area by local club members. The route currently exists on the ground and provides important access to significant Open snowmobiling areas in the Flat Tops. This route is located in a 5.4 MA.	The Forest Service has requested a map of the proposed route. As of May 26, 2009, no map has been received. Until a map is received and the route evaluated, no change will be made.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	37	sweetwater, falls cr	We [Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition] request that additional routes through Restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added. Route 4 – Sweetwater/Falls Creek access: This route was proposed to be added through the Restricted area by local club members. The route currently exists on the ground and provides important access to significant Open snowmobiling areas in the Flat Tops. This route is located in a 5.4 MA.	In order to provide snowmobile access from Sweetwater to the open snowmobile areas on the White River Plateau, the Cross Creek Trail will be a designated winter route. The current travel management plan has this trail as a summer motorized route and the Management Area Prescription is 5.4 which allows snowmobiles.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
537	3	tennessee pass, camp hale	Winter Alternative G. You show green, open motorized area paralleling Highway 24 from the top of Tennessee Pass North to camp Hale creating a narrow snowmobiling corridor along the road. This should be pink, restricted motorized routes only. 1. There is nowhere to ride a snowmobile on either side of Highway 24, forest on the East, a steep drop-off and railroad on the west. 2. I have never seen a snowmobile. In this area except at 7-726.1, Old highway, which should be redlines in the pink area you create, restricted motorized routes only.	Based on this comment and the logic provided, the narrow strip of green along highway 24 will be changed to pink and no designated routes will be shown. The final alternative will be modified to show this change.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
548	1	vail pass	I have been a member of the Vail Pass Task Force, Inc. for 18 years and it has been our attempt to leave the main open area of West Tenmer Creek non-motorized below the Shrine Pass Road. The Plan G Winter map shows this, however, the non-motorized corridor looks too narrow for this valley to be adequately protected and to remain quiet as it is now. Can you please widen that corridor to the west?	The Ranger District will continue to work with the task force to address issues at Vail Pass	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
103	2	vail pass	In 2003, the WRNF provided a map to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that indicated the entire VPWRA [Vail Pass Winter Recreation Area] as an area with compacted snow conditions. We [US DOI] believe snow compaction alters the landscape and reduces the competitive advantage of lynx over other predators during the winter. Lynx are highly adapted predators for deep snow conditions as are snowshoe hares, their primary prey. Compacted snow conditions permit greater freedom of movement to other predators (i.e., coyote) which are less competitive in deep snow conditions. Compacted snow conditions may provide access to some predators (i.e., bobcat and mountain lion) otherwise excluded by deep snow conditions. The presence and freedom of movement of these competing predators may result in lower prey densities during the winter months and may result in the inability of lynx to effectively compete for a limited prey base. Extensive areas of compacted snow conditions may result in large areas of lynx habitat becoming non-functional for lynx during the winter. On December 11, 2007, the WRNF provided the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with an assessment of current conditions within the VPWRA as they relate to Canada lynx. The WRNF assessment concluded that winter recreation within the VPWRA is adversely affecting lynx. The we agree with your determination, and believe that, due to extensive snow compaction within the VPWRA landscape, lynx have lost their competitive advantage over other predators. Reduction or elimination of their movement to other predators (i.e., coyote) which are less competitive in deep snow conditions. Compacted snow conditions may provide access to some predators (i.e., bobcat and mountain lion) otherwise excluded by deep snow conditions. The presence and freedom of movement of these competing predators may result in lower prey densities during the winter months and may result in the inability of lynx to effectively compete for a limited prey base. Extensive areas of compacted snow conditions may result in large areas of lynx habitat becoming non-functional for lynx during the winter.	As a requirement under Forest Plan consultation with USFWS, the WRNF developed a winter snow compaction map to serve as the baseline for compaction in Lynx Analysis Units. The compaction map displayed the entire Vail Pass area as compacted as there was open use at the time, and the entire area was considered a play area. Meanwhile a task force was developed to address conflicting uses. This resulted in the map used today which shows where motorized are allowed and where non-motorized use is emphasized (including trails). Play areas were reduced and in some locations motorized users must stay on designated routes. To help enforce the designations Forest Service staff is assigned to the area which is in part funded through the REA program. Some routes are groomed, which in turn keeps the majority of people on "track". The actual areas that are being compacted are less than what is depicted in the original baseline compaction map. This area receives a high number of winter recreationists as it has been traditionally and continues to be a very popular destination for use. Current travel management for Vail Pass is the result of public and Forest Service cooperation. Management is see above response for vail pass	Winter Motorized (snowmobiling, etc.)
103	3	vail pass	To minimize the impacts on lynx and other wildlife resources, we recommend that the WRNF designate the entire VPWRA [Vail Pass Winter Recreation Area] as non-motorized, and restrict over the snow motorized use to designated routes and play We [US DOI] believe there is an inconsistency in the management of deer and elk winter range (5.41) and forest landscape linkages (5.5) in the VPWRA [Vail Pass Winter Recreation Area] compared to other areas in the forest. The Travel Plan generally closes winter motorized use and reduces play areas with management areas 5.41 and 5.5 of the WRNF. However, within the VPWRA, winter motorized travel is permissible across the entire area. Although allowable under the Forest Plan, we believe that the current situation within the VPWRA is detrimental to wildlife resources.	see above response for vail pass	Designation of Lands
103	1	vail pass	We [US DOI] find the area indicated below acceptable to motorized use because we have determined that these sites can be managed compatible with lynx persistence. Other than recommended below, all motorized play areas should be confined to smaller open areas where there is no, or very limited tree cover. Vail Pass Area (East) - Designate Shrine Bowl as a play area, bounded by the existing Shrine Pass Ski Trail to the north and FS Trail 75 to the south and the toe of the steep slope below the ridgeline at the upper elevation of the bowl on the west. - Designate FS Trail 75 as a motorized use trail. - Designate the Shrine Pass Road and Hanks Gulch Road as motorized use trails.	see above response for vail pass	Designation of Lands
103	5	vail pass	We [US DOI] find the area indicated below acceptable to motorized use because we have determined that these sites can be managed compatible with lynx persistence. Other than recommended below, all motorized play areas should be confined to smaller open areas where there is no, or very limited tree cover. Vail Pass Area (East) - Designate Shrine Bowl as a play area, bounded by the existing Shrine Pass Ski Trail to the north and FS Trail 75 to the south and the toe of the steep slope below the ridgeline at the upper elevation of the bowl on the west. - Designate FS Trail 75 as a motorized use trail. - Designate the Shrine Pass Road and Hanks Gulch Road as motorized use trails.	see above response for vail pass	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
103	6	vail pass	We [US DOI] recommend that the WRNF does not designate the utility corridor 8.32 as a play area, so that this area can serve as a buffer for the deer and elk winter range.	see above response for vail pass	Designation of Lands
103	7	vail pass	We [US DOI] recommend that the WRNF not designate the Lime Creek Road (FS roads 743 and 728) open for motorized use. This route should be effectively closed to winter motorized use by all practicable means to reduce impacts to lynx.	see above response for vail pass	Road and Trail Classification/Management
103	4	vail pass, camp hale	We [US DOI] find the area indicated below acceptable to motorized use because we have determined that these sites can be managed compatible with lynx persistence. Other than recommended below, all motorized play areas should be confined to smaller open areas where there is no, or very limited tree cover. Camp Hale Area (West) - Designate the 3.1 allocation (Special Interest Areas) for Camp Hale as a play area. . - Designate Resolution Creek Road, 4-Mile Road, Fowler/Hilliard loop Hornsilver Mountain Road, Wearyman Creek Road and Turkey Creek road as motorized use trails.	see above response for vail pass	Road and Trail Classification/Management
262	5	vail pass	We have served 3 years as Citizen Scientist for the Wildlife Bridge project on Vail Pass. We are concerned about motorized traffic in national forests – often motorized vehicles not only bring destruction to vegetation and drainage areas, but the noise disturbs wildlife migration routes, feeding routes, etc.	Thank-you for your comment. The forest analyses take in to consideration these concerns.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
282	1	vail valley	It is my understanding that there is a proposal to eliminate dirt bike riding on Forest Service land in the Vail Valley. I'm not sure what has brought about this plan. I believe that if the issue is people not staying on designated routes or traveling at an unsafe speed. Those people should be dealt with on an individual basis. If their on a dirt bike, four wheeler, jeep, horse, or pick-up, it doesn't seem fair to eliminate dirt bikes because of the actions of a few. I know from riding up in red and white over the years that a lot of people don't know where to ride and not to ride. If there was a way to prosecute the people who are breaking the rules and punish them with community service to close and re-veg trail that are closed. I think a lot of the trail closed signs have been removed.	The only open areas for dirt bikes is on Forest Roads as there are no designated single track motorcycle trails in the Red & White Mountain Area. However, over the last few years a network of single track motorcycle trails have been created and maintained illegally in this area of the District. This clearly is an indicator that the current road system does not provide a quality recreation experience. The trails are creating many environmental problems such as soil erosion and are not located in areas that can sustain them ecologically. As a result, Alternative G does not allow unlicensed motorcycles in this area of the District.	Enforcement/Funding/Staffing
421	4	wearyman	I had no idea the Travel Plan would close such established historical routes like Wearyman.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek and in some places actually in the creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the road is proposed for decommissioning under Alternative G.	Action not Specified
232	6	wearyman	We see on Alternative G the closure of Wearyman Gulch which is such a great, historic road, which really affords a wonderful family 4wd experience. Why would that have to be closed? By closing that section of Wearyman Gulch you will effectively ruin the family oriented motorized experience that is enjoyed currently in the area. Going up Resolution is a 2wd adventure and going up and down McCalister is a more extreme experience. Why would you close a section of such a marvelous loop? The river crossings are mostly rock and seems like minimal disturbance. Please reconsider this closure.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek and in some places actually in the creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the road is proposed for decommissioning under Alternative G.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
438	5	wearyman, camphale	My family and I are opposed to the proposed closure of Wearyman Gulch. My uncle logged in that area. It is a great motorized family experience and "loops" Resolution with McAllister. I do not believe your closure of currently manageable and enjoyable roads reduces the number of people wanting to enjoy the national forests. It merely pushes them to other areas which will not be able to sustain overpopulation and then there will be a call to close those places. The closures of parts of Camp Hale have pushed a lot of the people over into the Homestake Valley which cannot support the heavy usage - and the cycle of closure, concentration, population overuse and closure will continue. Our family - with its history connected to Camp Hale - would like to see the Camp Hale area developed into a Recreation Area like the Bonanza area in Rio Grande or the Fourmile area of San Isabel.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek and in some places actually in the creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the road is proposed for decommissioning under Alternative G.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
330	1	wearyman, Yoder	Encourage more oversight especially with volunteer organizations, but please - no more closures! Concerning the WRNF Travel Management Plan Alternative G; looks like closing that section of Wearyman's Gulch effectively destroys the quality of the experience for motorized recreationalists. Also seems like Yoder could be kept open to ATVs and motorcycles without the damaging effects the jeeps have had on it. Please reconsider those closures and continue to permit motorized use on historical byways.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek and in some places actually in the creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the road is proposed for decommissioning under Alternative G. The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
430	1	wearyman, Yoder	I have ridden and enjoyed Wearyman Gulch and Yoder Gulch my whole life and would like you to reconsider closing this area I go up in that area at least once a year and really enjoy it.	Wearyman Creek is part of the municipal water supply for Red Cliff (on Turkey Creek). The road is within the Water Influence Zone of Wearyman Creek and in some places actually in the creek, and contributes sediment to both Wearyman and Turkey Creeks. The sediment negatively impact fish populations by smothering spawning beds, and eliminating habitat for aquatic insects, which are the primary food source for trout. Fish surveys conducted in 2003 in Wearyman Creek resulted in only 2 fish in 400 feet, which indicates the stream does not fully support aquatic life and therefore does not support the State-designated beneficial use for the stream (aquatic life, municipal water). As a result, the road is proposed for decommissioning under Alternative G. The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no	Designation of Lands

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
207	2	winter motorized, grouse, south fork middle, straddle cr	I do have some specific comments about winter snow machine use. Considering the small number of snowmobilers in the state (about 12000) the use of area #1 is very light but considering the access to over the snow machines in this area is very limited to begin with any additional limitations seem unwarranted. I feel that restricting access from Avon and closing the grouse creek South Fork Middle Fork and Straddle Creek areas to motorized use is unwarranted and just wrong. These areas have little overall use and to put even more areas in this very restricted area off the map would be a poor decision.	The South Fork, Middle Fork and Spraddle Creek areas are located within the Spraddle Creek Roadless Area as identified by the White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan - 2002 Revision. This roadless area was determined to be capable and available for wilderness. The majority of the restricted area is not rideable due to terrain and timber. The only winter route into the restricted area is the Spraddle Creek Road, which is a cherry stem into the roadless area. Any play areas off of the Road would be in the Roadless Area. In addition, the summer travel management plan for the area is to decommission the road above Spraddle Creek Ranch. Thus in the future, a travel route would not exist. The road to the trailhead is not always plowed in the winter, making it difficult to get a trailer to the trailhead. The preferred alternative would remove approximately 2.8 miles of current The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with the Yoder Road, the final alternative will not change the decommissioning of this road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
232	7	Yoder	A road in the area that we see you want to close with Alternative G is Yoder. We have watched this road deteriorate over several seasons. We have seen the destruction the jeeps have caused on that road but rather than closing it to all motorized why not allow it to be open to a specific group and maybe more seasonal openings because of the moisture in the area. There could be a gate like in Rio Grande that allows for motorcycle, bike, horse and foot travel. The main destructive force that really wreaked havoc with that road this summer was a breach in the beaver damn that re-routed the creek down the road and the jeeps just tore through it, I don't know if forest service was made aware of that but as stewards of that road we could watch for problems and prevent the damage from occurring. It's really a wonderful road for motorcycles and not such a desirable road for hikers or horses particularly with the railroad track access. The toughest water area is still open for access I'd like to see restricted access and seasonal closures be a solution to Yoder Gulch rather than closure to all motorized vehicles. Perhaps a gated bypass like in Rio Grande to allow for usage by motorcycle, ATV, bike, horse and foot travel. Lighter vehicles would not do the damage that jeeps can and seasonal openings (or closings) due to high water could further reduce road damage. Web sights to inform users of the status and volunteers to ride the roads and keep Forest Service aware of the condition of the roads could serve as solutions to issues.	The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with the Yoder Road, the final alternative will not change the decommissioning of this road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
438	6	Yoder	I'd like to see restricted access and seasonal closures be a solution to Yoder Gulch rather than closure to all motorized vehicles. Perhaps a gated bypass like in Rio Grande to allow for usage by motorcycle, ATV, bike, horse and foot travel. Lighter vehicles would not do the damage that jeeps can and seasonal openings (or closings) due to high water could further reduce road damage. Web sights to inform users of the status and volunteers to ride the roads and keep Forest Service aware of the condition of the roads could serve as solutions to issues.	The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with the Yoder Road, the final alternative will not change the decommissioning of this road.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
232	8	Yoder	Allow roads like Yoder to be adopted and maintained by special interest groups, like COHVCO. Volunteers could also provide the manpower to open/close roads as necessary due to weather/natural phenomena such as snow, tree fall, beavers etc... We know SCORR focuses on Summit County trails, but how about a similar group to adopt a road like Yoder and maintain it for a motorcycle experience?	The Yoder Gulch Road (705.1P) is proposed for closure for several reasons. For the last several years the bottom of the road has been impassable because of a beaver pond. In addition, should one get past the beaver pond, the road below the railroad tracks connecting to Highway 24 no longer exists. People who have gotten past the beaver ponds have no choice but to drive along the railroad tracks for over a mile to Highway 24. The railroad considers this an illegal action. Therefore, by the leaving this road open the Forest Service would in essence be promoting an illegal act. Further, in order to rebuild the road from the railroad tracks to Highway 24 would require the Forest Service to obtain an access permit from the State of Colorado. Based on the number and scope of the issues with the Yoder Road, the final alternative will not change the decommissioning of this road.	Meetings/Collaboration (Public)

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
2	1	245	I agree with your proposals for the area that I hunt, along 245 (the NewCastle-Buford Road), near Clark Ridge. There are several 'roads' there that you plan to close to ATV traffic, but they should be marked as such, so that fewer hunters will roar their ATVs all the way down to Deep Creek.	There will be an implementation plan developed for the Travel Management Plan, making use of a variety of strategies such as signs, gates, boulders and increased forest service presence.	Motorized (ATV, OHV, Snowmobiles, etc.)
167	1	245.1	This comment is directed to Road 245.1, the Buford- New Castle Road on the Rifle Ranger District. In proposal G-Summer routes this road is closed to all ATV use. I do accept the issue that mixed use of Full Size Vehicles and ATV's on this road could be a safety concern. A large contributing factor to this situation is the speed that Full Size Vehicles are traveling this route. This route is used a lot by ATV's during the summer and during hunting season. I can foresee that enforcement of this closure will be costly and difficult for the Forest Service. In light of these issues, the Forest Service could be a little proactive by providing an alternative route for ATV use along this road. This would decrease and enforcement problem and provide a good riding opportunity.	Thank you for your comment. The speed of full-sized vehicles is a major factor in the determination to prohibit both licensed and unlicensed vehicles on the Buford-New Castle Road. We agree that an alternative ATV route is a good idea and we are currently exploring the idea of just such a trail.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	84	8-2152.1, 8-2157.1, 8-2158.1, 8-2158.1a, 8-2158.1b, 8-2158.1c, 8-2158.1e, 8-2256.1, 8-2256.1a, 8-2256.1d, 8-2256.1f, 8-2291.1, 8-2293.1	<p>[Wilderness Workshop, et. al]</p> <p>ROUTES TO BE DOWNGRADED, DECOMMISSIONED OR RE-EXAMINED</p> <p>FST 2152.1 West Elk Stock Driveway/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2157.1 Main Elk/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2158.1 Last Chance Trail/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2158.1A/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2158.1B/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2158.1C/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2158.1E/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2256.1 Cherry Creek/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2256.1A/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2256.1D/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2256.1F/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2291.1 Mansfield Ditch/Rifle RD</p> <p>FST 2293.1/Rifle RD</p> <p>Further analysis is needed to determine the suitability of any of this 36-mile network of Elk Creek-Deep Creek-Mansfield Creek trails for mountain biking. Some are clearly unsuitable due to the steepness of the terrain, others may be unsuitable due to the very ruggedness of these canyons. Simply designating them for this particular use because someone thinks they would be fun to ride is irresponsible, or at least premature. Old stock trails and ditches are usually suitable candidates for bike routes but until each of these routes has been properly studied for its current condition and foreseeable future maintenance needs, none of them should be designated as mountain bike routes. Doing so encourages random use and personal trail clearing with resultant resource damage and unnecessary injury to unwary riders. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend a separate detailed and site specific EA to study this whole 36-mile trail network before any of it is prescribed for this use.</p> <p>Specifically, 2158.1 and 2158.1C include significant sections up to 1 km long with a 30% grade, and 2157.1 has an average 13% grade over 2.5km straight</p>	<p>These routes are very popular with the mountain biking community and it has been requested that we continue providing a challenging mountain biking experience. The Rifle Ranger District is planning to improve and maintain these routes to meet forest service trail standards. We are working on building partnerships with local mountain biking groups to assist in achieving this goal.</p>	Road and Trail Classification/Management
356	30	8-2156.1	8-2156.1, Cherry Creek Trail. This route is the most popular mountain bike route outside of New Castle. New Castle residents have adopted it as their own, putting in many hours of trail maintenance each summer. RFMBA [Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association] recommends not decommissioning this existing high value recreational route.	We are not proposing to decommission Cherry Creek Trail to mountain biking use, in fact we are designating it for mountain bike use. It is known that residents in New Castle, and throughout the valley enjoy using this trail, and we appreciate efforts made to maintain the trail, however, the forest service requires that a volunteer agreement be in place before any action is taken. Please contact the Rifle Ranger District if you are interested, or know someone who is interested in signing up as a volunteer.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	95	8-2293.1	<p>Rifle Ranger District</p> <p>Game Management Unit 33:</p> <p>Forest road 8-2293.1 proposes to allow motor vehicles less than 50 inches in width to travel on this trail. The Division of Wildlife does not support motorized travel on this trail since it is non-necessary route that fragments wildlife habitat.</p>	It was proposed as a ATV route in at least one of th	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	93	8-245.1, 8-819.1, 8-N222.1, 8-245.4J, 8-820.1, 8-245.4A, 8-245.4C, 8-860.1, 8-245.4D, 8-830.1, 8-822.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 33: In Alternative G, Forest road 8-245.1, and several spur roads leading from 8-245.1, including 8-819.1, 8-N222.1, 8-245.4J, 8-820.1, 8-245.4A, 8-245.4C, 8-860.1, 8-245.4D, 8-830.1, and 8-822.1, are proposed to be open to licensed motorized use only. The restriction of non-licensed motorized use on these roads will likely impact harvest during the big game hunting seasons. Dispersed camping and the ability to travel to other parts of the forest in this area along the Buford/New Castle road will be significantly impacted. For example, forest road 8-860.1, commonly called Lake Park road, would be illegal to travel on with an ATV. This area is a popular place for hunters to camp. It also provides access to hunting areas in the vicinity, such as Huffman Gulch. Alternative G would essentially make many hunters "illegal" by prohibiting them from using ATV's on this road. The same scenario holds true for forest road 8-822.1, commonly called Clark Ridge road. Additionally, the restrictions placed on these roads will dramatically increase the burden of enforcing laws regarding ATV use on public land. Enforcing ATV travel restrictions in areas where there is legitimate resource damage and habitat destruction is complicated enough without adding additional travel routes. The Colorado Division of Wildlife supports a decrease in ATV use on the Rifle Ranger District, but not a decrease in use on a FSR 245.4D Joe Mule Park/Rifle RD	The decision to prohibit unlicensed vehicles on FDF Road and Trail	Classification/Management
509	45	8-245.4d	The rationale for maintaining full size vehicle travel on this two-track to a stock pond is Reason 11, "To provide access to scenic views." We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] find this reasoning suspect since the views are not remarkably better than from 245 itself, and recommend that this minor spur be decommissioned.	We considered this, but ultimately decided that this area needs dispersed camping locations.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
361	6	8-602.3	The following are roads in Alternative G identified as open to motorcycle use that should be changed to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide in Alternative G. 8-602.3, this trail is currently open to ATV's and should remain that way. Exclusive use by motorcycles is unreasonable when both users can be on the trail at the same time.	Alternative G already does show this route as open to ATVs.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	96	8-603.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 33: Forest road 8-603.1, just north of 8-603.1P, shows a small spur road leading south from Cold Spring. According to the map, the spur road continues further than what is currently on the ground. It is unclear whether or not this is an error on the map.	Thank you, it is a map error and it has been corrected.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	59	8-603.1a	FSR 603.1A Rifle RD This road serves no essential purpose and should be decommissioned.	This road is slated for decommissioning in Alternative G and the Final.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	92	8-631.1	Rifle Ranger District 631 The Bowen Loop Road should be closed to FSV's. The Bowen Loop sees minimal use by FSV's as it is a rough road even on ATV. A closure to FSV's may increase wildlife use in the area and help reduce damage to the road.	We consider this road a jeep trail and have determined that its continued status as such has value in the recreation opportunity spectrum.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	63	8-631.1a	8-631.1A No Name Road/Rifle RD There is no essential need to maintain this substandard road along No Name Creek as a full size vehicle route. It should be made part of the 1847.1 Jessie Weaver Trail down No Name Creek for foot and animal traffic only.	We agree and have amended the map to reflect this change for the final.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
561	1	8-635.1	There was concern expressed for the proposed closure of Dolan Gulch road, otherwise known as road 8-635.1 on map alternative A, where it is considered "the only public access going into this country". This is a high use area for variety of users, especially for hunters and sheep permit tees. They would like to see this road stay maintained for full-size vehicles. They feel the overall decision to close 8-635.1 would create access issues for fire (2 in the recent past) and compliance issues because of the high demand.	Actually in the draft for Alternative G, 8-635.1 is shown as a foot-horse-bicycle trail. The district intended to maintain 635 as an ATV trail and we have amended the final to reflect this change. This should address the concerns expressed.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
361	5	8-635.1, 8-635.2a	The following are roads in Alternative F identified as open to licensed and unlicensed use that should be changed to Motorized vehicles less than 50" wide and added to Alternative G. 8-635.1, 8-635.2A, these roads are narrow, steep and provide good ATV access to traditional hunting areas.	Actually in the draft for Alternative G, 8-635.1 is shown as a foot-horse-bicycle trail. The district intended to maintain 635 as an ATV trail and we have amended the final to reflect this change. We do not support adding 635.2A to our trail system. As you point out, it is narrow and steep and should have real value as an area for walk-in hunting.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	64	8-636.1	FSR 636.1 Boiler Creek/Rifle RD 636.1A (also Boiler Creek) is closed, obliterated and scheduled for decommissioning. 636.1 itself is physically closed at UTM292493E 439985N, a mere 400m past the start of 636.1A. The entire remaining open part of the original Boiler Creek road network is a mere 2.3 miles with a demanding, ledgy beginning and an easily eroded grassland continuation where illegal cross-country travel is easy, inviting and virtually impossible to monitor. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend closing and decommissioning the remainder of this route. The only legitimate attraction of this route is a spectacular view of Adams Lake a mere ¾ mile from its start at FSR 651.1 Burnt Ridge.	The closure of the area going south to Spring Hill and on Boiler Creek and the area north of Spring Creek has been one of the most successful travel management efforts undertaken by the Rifle Ranger District. This area has become highly valued by serious hunters as an area undisturbed by motorized vehicles. In our opinion, the legitimate attraction of this route is to get people back to the boundary area of this roadless area in order to gain access. The end of the road near the junction of the old 636.1A is a popular camping area and conversation with the District Wildlife Manager confirms its importance to access a significant elk population in the area south and east of there.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	97	8-636.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 33: Forest road 8-636.1, south of Adams Lake, appears on the map to extend well past the current road closure. The Division of Wildlife supports the restriction of travel in this area to foot and horse as it currently exists on the ground.	The travel map incorrectly shows the road extending down to Spring Hill. The closure will be maintained at its current location; this will be corrected on the final map.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	65	8-637.1e	FSR 637.1E/Rifle RD This short spur in the Keyser Creek area receives such little use that it is barely visible and should be decommissioned.	We agree, and in fact feel this was a mistake on the map, 637.1E will be decommissioned.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	66	8-648.1b	FSR 648.1B/Rifle RD This is a highly redundant road in an area laced with unnecessary two-tracks. Alternative D recommended that this route become an ATV route, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend that it be decommissioned.	We agree that this area has a number of unnecessary two-tracks and we are planning, through the travel management plan process, to decommission a lot of these routes. We chose to keep 648.1B for motorized access and decommission the surrounding two-tracks.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	67	8-651.1	FSR 651.1 Burnt Ridge/Rifle RD We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend decommissioning the first ¾ mile of this route from FSR 603.1 Clinetop to its junction with FSR 652.1 Connelly Lake in favor of 652.1, which is a better connection to 603.1, especially during the fall and spring mud seasons.	This piece of road is incorrectly shown on the draft map for Alternative G, it has actually been scheduled for decommissioning the past two years and only scheduling difficulties with the Forest road crew has prevented its completion.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	68	8-653.2a	FSR 653.2A This redundant spur road serves no essential purpose and should be decommissioned.	We considered this, but ultimately decided that this area in particular, because the Clinetop Road essentially traverses an open park, needs an area for dispersed camping.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	101	8-801.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 42: The following roads should be open to ATV traffic: 8-801.1 (Uncle Bob Mtn. / Coal Ridge to Mosquito Creek) - This road is a good road due to gas and oil development in the area; therefore it is not a problem to use full sized vehicles for transportation. However, many hunters use the route to go from camps in Brook Creek or Horse Park to hunting spots beyond the head of Mosquito Creek. Both ends of their travel route are much better for ATV use than full sized vehicles with regard to minimizing road damage and surrounding habitat destruction. Vehicle traffic on 8-801.1 is usually slow moving and therefore there is little risk of vehicle accidents.	The efforts to begin travel management planning initiated with National Forest Service Direction to manage OHV recreation use across the country. With this direction came policy that each forest engineer department complete a safety study to evaluate dual use on forest service roads. It was determined that OHV use would not be permitted on level 3, 4 and 5 roads due to various safety reasons as, speed, sight distance, blind corners, steep slopes, etc. With the new oil and gas development and the improvements made to FSR 801.1, we are restricted to what vehicles we can allow on this road. With the heavy industrial traffic on Uncle Bob, and the future oil and gas development plans for the area, we don't anticipate future OHV use on this route.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
480	100	8-804.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 42: The following roads should be open to ATV traffic: 8-804.1 (Coal Ridge to Horse Park) - This road is very rough in spots with large, consistently muddy areas. Full sized four wheel drives are much more damaging to the road and surrounding habitat as they try to drive around and through mud holes. ATV's are not only more convenient on this road but will cause less damage than licensed vehicles. There is little traffic on the road and what traffic occurs will be moving slowly, dictated by the roughness of the road. Therefore, there is little risk of injury due to vehicle accidents.	This decision is connected to the "Mixed-Use" Road Survey of FDR 801, the Uncle Bob Road. The determination of the survey was that there is unacceptable risk in allowing both licensed and unlicensed vehicles on FDR 801. That decision makes it impractical to manage unlicensed vehicles (e.g. ATVs) on the spur roads coming off 801. The road is still open to licensed vehicles, in this case, potential conflict between vehicle classes was not the determining factor.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
480	99	8-807.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 42: The following roads should be open to ATV traffic: 8-807.1 (Clear Creek) - This road is rough and hard to navigate in a full sized four wheel drive vehicle. ATV use is preferred in order to decrease habitat disturbance. There is no through traffic on the road and therefore the chance of injury due to vehicle accident is small.	This road has actually been closed at the Forest boundary for many years and should never have been under consideration.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
509	71	8-808.1	FSR 808.1 Clear Fork/Rifle RD Unless reasons are explicitly given, we [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] don't find it credible that an outfitting service requires a restricted 1.44-mile spur into a roadless area in order to carry out its business. Nor do we see a need for more mountain biking opportunities in this remote area. We recommend that this route be limited to non-mechanized travel or simply closed and decommissioned if there is no real demand for maintained access in this immediate area.	FSR 808.1 and 810.1 are not open to public access. On 808.1 just passed Little Beaver Creek and the oil and gas well, there is a gate prohibiting public access. This 1.44- mile spur is out of the roadless area and not permitted by the outfitter and guide service.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	72	8-810.1	FSR 810.1 Little Beaver Creek/Rifle RD As a spur of 808.1, our [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommendation for this route follows that for 808.1.	Neither 808 or 810 is open for public access.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	73	8-821.1	FSR 821.1B/Rifle RD This route was physically closed with tree trunks and posted prior to 2001 at UTM 280198E 4409166N, not far from its junction with 601.4D. What purpose and need is served by reopening it now, and how is that to be accomplished? If another recreational loop route near Meadow Creek Lake is desired, it makes more sense to reopen 601.4D than 821.1B. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend that this route be kept closed and decommissioned.	This area of the district is very popular with motorized recreationists and a need was seen to provide loop trails. We accounted for protection of watershed health and wildlife disturbance, by scheduling for decommission any route that we felt was detrimental to these considerations. At the same time, Meadow Lake will continue to be a high-use recreation area.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	74	8-821.1f	FSR 821.1F/Rifle RD This "road" is a sketchy, user-created two-track across a meadow in an area that has far too many such routes. This route should be decommissioned before it becomes a maintenance nightmare.	Thank you. We have made a correction for the final, this route was intended to be decommissioned.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	75	8-821.1i, 8-821.1j, 8-821.1k, 8-821.1l	FSRs 821.1i, 821.1j, 821.1k, 821.1l/Rifle RD This nest of short, user-created spur routes needs to be decommissioned, not adopted as a useless little mountain bike playground that is more likely to be abused by motorized users.	The majority of the routes listed are marked for decommissioning. FSR 821.1i will remain open for mountain bike travel to connect to the Cherry Creek and Mansfield loops.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
509	76	8-822.1	FSR 822.1 Clark Ridge/Rifle RD Clark Ridge is a superfluous road that is essentially impassable when wet, rendering it useless for most recreational purposes. We [Wilderness Workshop, et. al] recommend decommissioning it along with its numerous spur routes as recommended in DEIS Alternative E.	Clark Ridge is open to provide vehicle access to the foot and horse trail and for dispersed camping opportunities. From that point, the road is closed to motorized use. This road is not recommended to drive on when wet due to the high density of clay in the soil.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	94	8-822.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 33: Forest road 8-822.1, commonly known as Clark Ridge road, appears on the map to allow motorized use further than what is currently allowed on the ground. Without the ability to look at an aerial photo, it cannot be determined whether or not this is an error on the map.	We believe this was an error on our map, and intend to correct it when the final map is produced. Thank you for your comment.	Mapping, GIS

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
509	77	8-823.2b	FSR 823.2B/Rifle RD This two-track vehicle trail is part of an overgrown network of such routes in the Meadow Creek Lake area and should be decommissioned as recommended in DEIS Alternative D.	823.2B is slated for decommissioning in Alternative G	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
480	98	8-835.1	Rifle Ranger District Game Management Unit 33: Forest road 8-835.1 shows a small loop on the map traveling through private property. Both sections of the loop road leading onto private property have locked gates on them, prohibiting public motorized use.	We believe this was an error on our map, and intend to correct it when the final map is produced. Thank you for your comment.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	14	blue lake	Blue Lake area: This route southwest of Blue Lake has been proposed by local club members to provide a route across this restricted area. The route exists on the ground and has been used by local riders in the past. This route is located in a 5.43 MA.	We support the addition of a route through this area and have added it to our final map.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
235	37	blue lake	We [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] request that additional routes through restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added: Route 2 – Blue Lake area: This route southwest of Blue Lake has been proposed by local club members to provide a route across this restricted area. The route exists on the ground and has been used by local riders in the past. This route is located in a 5.43 MA.	Refer to response above, #2132	Road and Trail Classification/Management
372	1	grizzly creek	Please identify the connector trail between No Name Creek trail and Grizzly Creek trail, both located east of Glenwood Springs for improvement, specifically to include a bridge over Grizzly Creek. This trail was built as a cooperative effort between USFS and local volunteers several years ago and has been allowed to deteriorate and is barely usable now on the downhill side of the saddle to Grizzly Creek due to oak brush and now seeing overgrowth on the west side due to aspen. We were told by a USFS employee a few years back that a bridge project was being considered and was funded, but no one had time to implement. And if there was no bridge over Grizzly Creek, USFS was reluctant to maintain the connector trail and encourage use as it can be hazardous for people to ford the creek, particularly between May and July. This may be a good time to contract out that work if USFS capital projects are funded under the new administration. This trail would get quite a bit of use given its location and that use would keep the brush growth more under control. Local scout, trail, hiking or neighborhood groups are also available to assist with maintenance. It would also help take some pressure off other heavily used trails (e.g. Hanging Lake) or trails that are under threat of potential future closure due to private land issues (e.g. Scout to Doc's Loop in Glenwood) or trails that aren't looped (e.g. Burnt Tree to Hanging Lake).	We appreciate your comment and recognize that the bridge has been out for some time now. Thus far, the substantial money to undertake replacement has not been there. The connector trail you identify, however, will remain a component of the Forest trail system. We have not abandoned this trail and would certainly make use of donated labor to help bring this trail back up to standard and we will continue to seek funding for replacement of the bridge.	Road/Trail Maintenance, Construction, and Removal
501	13	johnson cr, bugle lake	Johnson Creek/Bugle Lake areas: There are two routes which have been proposed by local club members that should be added as routes across the Canyon Creek Restricted area. These routes exist on the ground and have been used by local riders in the past. They are located in a 5.43 MA.	We support the addition a route through this area and have added it to our final map.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
235	36	johnson cr, bugle lake	We [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] request that additional routes through restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added: Routes 1 – Johnson Creek/Bugle Lake areas: There are two routes which have been proposed by local club members that should be added as routes across the Canyon Creek Restricted area. These routes exist on the ground and have been used by local riders in the past. They are located in a 5.43 MA.	Refer to response above, #2135	Road and Trail Classification/Management
44	1	meadow lake	This comment addresses information on documents G-Summer Route table and DEIS map A. Meadow Lake area. I am asking that 8-601.4D remain open for ATV use. It was last proposed that 601.4D would be open to ATV use so it could tie in with 821.1B and 2293.1 and 821.1. This was shown as a possible choice on Alternative D and Alternative C on the previous public comments. I do not believe that there were any discussions from the Rifle Ranger District that this would not be a viable way to treat this route. This would provide a longer loop and this route already exists on the ground and would require no work to connect to the other routes.	We agree and have included 601.4D as open for ATV use in our corrections for the final map.	Road and Trail Classification/Management

letterNumber	commentNumber	category	comment	Response	action
386	6	rec-winter nonmotorize	<p>Thank you for designating these areas as winter non-motorized or winter motorized restricted:</p> <p>Hoosier Pass West Hoosier Pass East Blue Lakes Road – 850.1 Upper McCullough Gulch Road – 851 Lower McCullough Gulch Road - 852.1A Fredonia Gulch Road - 600.1 Spruce Creek Road and Crystal Lake Road - 800.1 and 803.1 (as a former hut administrator and hut user, I am thrilled about this one) Burro Trail - 80.1 Peaks Trail - 45.1 Baldy Mountain Road and Surroundings (this is some of the very best skiing in the area, for both touring and turning, and returning it to the non-motorized user is welcome) Little French, French Pass, Black Gulch (also some of the very best skiing in the area and deserves protection)</p>	We have attempted to provide both motorized and non-motorized winter recreation opportunities across the White River and protect wildlife in winter range areas that may be sensitive to disturbance.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
235	38	upper grizzly	<p>We [Colorado Snowmobile Association, Inc.] request that additional routes through restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added:</p> <p>Route 3 – Upper Grizzly Creek area: This route was proposed to be added through the restricted area by local club members. It is referred to as the Grizzly Cow Camp cut-across; a cross-route exists on the ground. This route is located in a 5.43 MA.</p>	We support the addition of this route through the Grizzly Creek area and have added it to our final map.	Road and Trail Classification/Management
501	15	upper grizzly	Upper Grizzly Creek area: This route was proposed to be added through the restricted area by local club members. It is referred to as the Grizzly Cow Camp cut-across; a cross-route exists on the ground. This route is located in a 5.43 MA.	Refer to response above, #2139	Road and Trail Classification/Management
455	36	upper grizzly cr, grizzly cow camp	<p>We [Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition] request that additional routes through Restricted areas in the Flat Tops area of the WRNF be added.</p> <p>Route 3 – Upper Grizzly Creek area: This route was proposed to be added through the Restricted area by local club members. It is referred to as the Grizzly Cow Camp cut-across; a cross-route exists on the ground. This route is located in a 5.43 MA.</p>	Refer to response above, #2139	Road and Trail Classification/Management