

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/18/2023 2:34:49 AM

First name: Steven

Last name: Dewey

Organization:

Title:

Comments: First, and foremost, there should be no designated camping on CR292. This is a public road that serves as an emergency route of unparalleled value to the residents of Alpine, St. Elmo, and Chalk Creek Canyon if CR162 is impassable due to disaster.

And key to each of the proposals is the necessary ranger supervision to "police" each area. That has not been addressed.

Without trying to add contentiousness to the commentary, the language describing the plan to designate campsites in the San Isabel National Forest, particularly the Leadville and Salida Ranger Districts, is a bit confusing.

It is clear that there is a plan to create five new campgrounds in the areas described.

What isn't clear is what it means to "designate" a campsite. From my understanding, the forest service has found specific sites along the remote county roads where campers are almost always seen between Memorial Day and Labor Day. I wholeheartedly agree these sites already exist.

If by "designating" a campsite, the Forest service is holding accountable the individuals who are camping at that site, then by all means, designate the campsite. By specifically creating a fire ring, and parking area, hopefully the risks to the surrounding forest will be reduced significantly, and new damage to existing forests limited by such designation.

And, if, as such, car camping will only be allowed in those designated areas, the absolute number of car campers will be limited, that's a fantastic idea. It will save a lot of damage that would occur if someone decides to create a new campsite illegally.

If, however, the forest service is going to clear out new 'designated' car camping sites along the road, then that just creates the problems that everyone wants to avoid-destruction of the very forest we want to see preserved, increased problems with trash and human waste, and, worse, a horribly increased risk of fire that would endanger the lives of not only the campers, but the canyon residents dependent on CR 162 and CR292 to evacuate.

Most important to this plan is some form of legal enforcement/monitoring of these designated campsites. What good does it do for the forest service to go to such lengths to preserve the forest and the experience for all, when the rules will go unenforced? That virtually begs a malcontent to build a fire out of the fire ring, leave trash abundant, and use the forest as their personal toilet.

Trash removal will always be a challenge. I would strongly recommend a fee system by which the camper is required to fill out an envelope with the dates camping, license plates, driver's license numbers, etc., and placed in a lock box at the campsite to help pay for the trash clean-up. I would expect removal to still be the burden of the camper. Human waste is the other issue of concern, and how the service would attend to that is much more challenging. A porta-potty is a reasonable solution, but obviously difficult to service in a remote area.

Another problem is the threat of squatting. By designating a campsite, I would put a limit to the number of nights a camper could stay continuously. Would a week be too long? Could they come back to the same spot later in the year? Certainly. But could they stay more than a week? No. If they could manage a longer stay

backpacking in the wilderness, I wouldn't know how to address that. However, a designated campsite would allow them to live there, simply by setting up camp, then using a car to drive in and out of their designated campsite.

AND-We desperately need a hiking footbridge across the creek coming down from Deer Canyon about 100 to 150 yards up the Antero Road (CR277) from CR162. A few years ago, the highway department rerouted the creek, and it now washes over the road. It is impassable, unless one climbs well above the road and finds a dangerous log spanning the creek to scramble over. I'm happy to provide a guided tour of the area if it would be helpful.