

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/26/2022 6:00:00 AM

First name: Derrick

Last name: Nehrenberg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: _____

USFS added letter text from attachment for coding purposes:

General Comment

I moved to Crested Butte to ride, hike, ski trails, and join a fantastic little community. We have a tremendous network, but there is still a lot of room for improvement. CBMBA has built a great working relationship with the Forest Service and STOR, and we are all grateful for the fruits of your partnership. However, as I dug into the North Valley Trail Plan (NVTP) documentation, I can't help but wonder if the NVTP is getting a fair shake because some trail alignments were removed before the public comment period opened.

I wish the Forest Service didn't remove trail alignments before the public comment period. For example, how can the Forest Service know that connecting Upper Cement Creek Trail to the Crystal Trail "would not add much (if anything) to the user experience" without making the proposed trail open for comment? I feel like this trail, along with another accepted connector between Lower Cement Creek to the Caves trailhead, would have created one of the best trail experiences in the whole valley. Imagine riding single track from Star Pass to the Caves trailhead.

People in our community are inevitably going to have conflicting opinions. And the least desirable outcome is for the NVTP process to weaken strong working relationships that have taken years to build. Open, empathetic communication is the bedrock of successful relationships. I have great respect for the Forest Service and the tough decisions they face. I simply wish the process was more open.

Trail Specific Comments

1.

Lake Irwin Road Parallel Trail

1.

Proposed Action plan)[mdash]Accepted with modifications

FIGURE: [screen shot of the scoping PA refinement map for Lake Irwin Trail of the changes]

1. Comment: I have mixed thoughts about the IDT modification. I understand the rationale for not replacing the existing trail. However, the existing trail is poorly aligned, and hence, many riders will skip it in favor of the road. I believe the new alignment proposed by CBMBA would encourage more riders off the road. I support carrying forward the proposed trail north of 26.1C.

2.

Upper Upper to Brush Creek Trailhead

1.

Proposed Action Plan[mdash]Accepted with Modifications

FIGURE: [screen shot of the scoping PA refinement map for Upper Upper to Brush Creek Trail of the changes]

1. Comment: The proposed alignment was removed before the public could comment, and I believe the Proposed Action and IDT Modification is based on faulty assumptions. First, looking at the map, one might assume that the user experience will be equal between the two alignments. It won't be equal. Users want to be separated from the road, not adjacent to it. I believe most users will continue using the road if the modified route is implemented. Second, I don't think I've ever seen a cow on the side of that hill in all my years riding and driving out Brush Creek Road, so I don't understand how the proposed trail adversely affects grazing. Plus, I believe seasonal closures were offered to mitigate grazing disturbances. Third, both trail alignments cross the watershed, so the watershed disturbance assumption appears to be a wash. Fourth, the IDT modified alignment runs right through a RMBL research plot. RMBL is a valued community partner, so it's hard to imagine how this trail gets built if it will negatively impact RMBL. Fifth, I believe both trail alignments run through an existing designated recreation corridor, and it seems like the scales should tip in favor a better recreation experience, especially after conceding so many other trails in the area to ranching interests. If a seasonal is an option, and a trail can be built that will lure users off the road and avoid RMBL's research plot, and the area has already been designated for recreation, I don't understand why the original trail alignment was removed before public comment. This project has significant potential for separating the non-motorized and motorized users and benefit recreation experiences. I would like to see the original alignment reassessed by the Forest Service and reopened for public comment because I think it meets the Purpose and Need better than the modified action.

3.
Strand Bonus to 409

1.
Proposed Action—Accepted

1. Comment: I fully support this proposed trail. It will get lots of use.

4.
Budd Connection — Ambush to Tent City

1.
Proposed Action—Accepted

1. Comment: I believe this proposed trail meets the Purpose and Need, and it already exists. Might as well make it official.

5.
Deer Creek to Tent City

1.
Proposed Action—Accepted with Modifications

FIGURE: [screen shot of the scoping PA refinement map for Deer Creek Trail of the changes]

1. Comment: I agree with the Proposed Action. While I hate to lose a shot a groovy single track, I understand the

Forest Service's position.

6.

Teocalli Extension

1.

Proposed Action—Accepted with the addition of 409 connector spur trail

1. Comment: I support the Proposed Action. Teocalli extension obviously meets the Purpose and Need, and the 409 Spur trails already exists.

7.

Reno Divide Road Parallel Trail

1.

Proposed Action—Accepted

1. Comment: I support the Proposed Action. There are legitimate safety concerns. Furthermore, the proposed trail is one of the few [ldquo]accepted[rdquo] opportunities that meet the Purpose and Needs and offers an opportunity to create a more exciting trail. I believe travel should be restricted to downhill only.

8.

Cement Creek Trail [ndash] Upper Cement Creek Trail to Crystal

1.

Proposed Action—Removed

1. Comment: I wish the Forest Service would not have removed this trail prior to receiving public comment. It's removal is at least partly based on the incorrect assumption that it wouldn't [ldquo]add much (if anything)[rdquo] to the user experience. Our community has spent years building towards the dream of riding a continuous singletrack trail from Star Pass to the Caves Trailhead. The experience would be unrivaled and impossible to achieve in any other drainage. This is our one shot, and it has been removed before the Forest Service could hear how important this trail is to our community. I would like to see this trail get accepted for further analysis. I feel like the Forest Service's assumption that the trail won't add much, should be tested by accepting open comments about the dreams of our community.

9.

Cement Creek Trail [ndash] Lower Cement Creek to Caves

1.

Proposed Action—Accepted

1. Comment: I agree it is a great fit for the Purpose and Need. This one is a no-brainer. It's probably tied with the Upper Upper to Brush Creek Trailhead trail as far as positive impacts go.

10.

Bear Creek Reroute

1.

Proposed Action[mdash]Accepted with modifications

FIGURE: [screen shot of the scoping PA refinement map for Bear Creek Trail of the changes]

1. Comment: I agree with the modification.

11.

Dr. Park Reroute

1.

Proposed Action[mdash]Removed

1. Comment: I participated in a CBMBA trail workday to repair the wet areas, digging pits to fill in turnpikes, and I was incredibly disheartened by feeling that all our hard work was for naught during my next ride on the trail. The trail is irreparable. All the repair work represents sunk costs, and I[rsquo]m not motivated to sink more volunteer time into an unsustainable trail. I wish the Forest Service would reconsider its proposed action and accept the proposed alignment for further analysis.

Thank you for accepting my comments.

Derrick Nehrenberg