

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/18/2023 8:32:46 PM

First name: Melanie

Last name: Roth

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The Leadville and Salida ranger districts are to be applauded for taking a proactive approach to dealing with the current and future camping pressures in the national forest. Given the relatively short distance from the front range, this area that is close to the continental divide will continue to be a favorite "playground" for recreationists.

-Beth Davis was an excellent choice to be the primary spokesperson in public meetings.

Specific comments to Chalk Creek and CR 162:

I.

The area below St. Elmo (East) and above Cascade Hill in the canyon was not open to vehicle dispersed camping by Federal Regulation 261.50. Vehicle Dispersed camping was allowed above St. Elmo on 295 and on 162 on the Tin Cup Pass road. I am not sure what happened to Chalk Creek & 162 that previously closed areas were opened up in 12/2019. To my knowledge the public, and especially residents of Chalk Creek, were not consulted on this very important change to public usage in the canyon. Signage is still up in the canyon stating no camping in these areas unless it is in an improved campground.

To allow vehicle dispersed camping east of St. Elmo invites conflicts between recreationists and property owners:

-Visitors often have no understanding of maps and regulations and without a firm knowledge of the area, it is certain there will be many conflicts. There is a long history of campers pulling up at night and camping on private property, or next to creeks without benefit of facilities, as they either could not understand the rules or chose to ignore them.

-Although the proposed rules say no fires, it will happen under this new plan along with camping too close to the creek and not practicing safe hygiene and leave no trace practices. These camp sites were recorded as part of the Envision program.

-There are not enough boots on the ground to monitor these campsites for camping on private property, having an illegal fire and Leave No Trace infractions. The occasional presence of a law enforcement officer (USFS and County) helps but does not occur frequently enough.

This area is such a draw because residents and interested parties have worked diligently to preserve and maintain historic sites and buildings throughout the canyon. To increase the threat of fire risk and resident - tourist conflicts by increasing the amount of dispersed camping puts an already vulnerable area at greater risk.

Perry Edward's comment on limiting dispersed camping to above St. Elmo was a welcome comment during a follow up public meeting. I hope that results in the removal of this area from dispersed camping consideration.

II.

The potential to make no camping/no campfires on CR 162 permanent except in campgrounds would greatly protect the area from the wayward camp fire.

III.

Under Antero, the provision to Install barriers to contain sites along Hancock to prevent erosion from camping

activities is confusing. Which drainage are you addressing?