

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/31/2022 1:32:11 AM

First name: Robert

Last name: Meyer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To: Derek Padilla

From: Robert Meyer

RE: Dolores Recreation Access and Infrastructure Improvement Project #62582

Dear Derek,

I support most aspects of this project as presented.

The re-routes of the single track in the Boggy area are a preventative measure requested by SWCCA and related to their objections to the Salter EA. They propose to reroute the trails where they are currently laid on top of old 2 tracks that will be turned into timber haul routes. By getting these re-routes implemented ahead of the harvesting, the aesthetic qualities of the trails will be protected.

The additional parking/TH in Boggy area is a good idea. Provision of portable latrines at parking areas should be considered.

In the Chicken Creek area, establishing a trailhead and parking on RD 41/FSR 385 is a much needed infrastructure improvement. It will relive pressure on the the RD 40 parking/trailhead year round. The advantage really is in the winter. The proposed parking is at 7820' and the one on RD 40 is at 7685'. That 135' of elevation makes a big difference in early season snow cover. If CCNORDIC moves their equipment shed there, they will have easy access to the Rush connector and higher elevation terrain earlier in the season. It's a win for recreation, especially in the winter. Latrines at trailheads are important to be considered with each new parking area.

The improvements at Transfer are also a good idea. They'll benefit recreation in general and equestrians in particular. Not sure if additional latrines are necessary as there are already latrines at the campground across the road.

On area I have concerns about is increasing the width of the ATV trails to accommodate vehicles up to 62" in width. My vintage Jeep CJ-5 is 60" wide and so it would be allowed to travel these trails. Certainly there is a push from industry to allow the new side-by-sides on these routes. My concern is that it sets a precedent of widening ATV trails in general. I fear there will knock-on effects beyond this project. For example, there was a timber decision a few years ago that will reopen all of the the aspen loop ATV trails to become haul routes for timber harvesting where the aspen are mature enough to harvest. Is it the policy of the district to widen ATV trails in general to 62" when the opportunity occurs? This seems to be an ad-hoc way changing current trail uses. It seems that the issues of widening ATV trails from 50" to 62" should be addressed district wide with public input rather than in this ad-hoc fashion.