

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/13/2026 4:25:16 AM

First name: Eric

Last name: Lovely

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Aspen Alley is a trail loved by many. Having hiked there with a child on my back and ridden the same trail aggressively on a mountain bike, I understand the current conflict because I participate in both user groups.

We all know Aspen Alley was originally built as a multi-use trail with strong bike-oriented design characteristics. The trail name, fall colors, social media exposure, and easy access from Breckenridge caused it to explode in popularity. Conflict was inevitable. The ironic part is that it is not even the most impressive aspen grove in the area. The name itself factors into the attraction.

What concerns me most is that this proposal absorbs the environmental and financial cost of major new trail construction without fully resolving the actual problem.

The proposed trail appears to mirror the existing corridor with a new, wider alignment while still maintaining mixed-use interaction. That means new disturbance, construction impacts, rehabilitation of the existing trail, and continued daily user conflict afterward. If the Forest Service and Town are already willing to fund significant new trail construction, why not pursue a solution that truly separates users instead of rebuilding a mixed-use corridor that will continue generating the same issues?

There are several alternatives that deserve more serious consideration:

1. User-specific days, similar to systems used successfully on Front Range trails.
2. Construction of a separate hiker-oriented trail while preserving Aspen Alley as the existing bike-oriented flow trail.
3. Renaming the trail to reduce destination-driven social media traffic during peak leaf season.

The first option would cost very little and could be implemented almost immediately through signage and public outreach. While it would not eliminate all conflict, it would reduce it substantially at minimal impact and cost.

The second option would likely provide the best long-term solution. If major trail funding is already available, true user separation makes far more sense than rebuilding another mixed-use corridor nearby. A more simple hiking trail could likely be constructed with less impact than replacing the existing bike flow trail. The mountain biking community would also likely contribute substantial volunteer labor toward such a project.

The proposal also fails to meaningfully address existing switchback-cutting behavior. Hikers already shortcut portions of the current trail, contributing to ongoing maintenance issues. Without stronger user separation and management strategies, many of the same impacts will continue on the new trail as well.

I support taking action. I support investment in trails. I support reducing conflict. But this proposal does not appear to fully solve the actual issues driving conflict and resource damage in the first place.

Please reconsider alternatives that reduce conflict more effectively while minimizing unnecessary new disturbance and preserving the existing character of Aspen Alley.