

# Revised Scoping Report May 2016

## Introduction

This document uses the following acronyms, Proposed Action (PA), San Juan National Forest (SJNF), Forest Service (FS), Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

***This report is revised from the version posted on the San Juan Forest website. This version narrows the scope of analysis to 1) topics carried forward for detailed analysis (listed in Chapter 1 of this DEIS) and 2) topics not carried forward for detailed analysis. This report also lumps similar comments and paraphrases further compared to the version 1 of this report. Listing an issue comment does mean that the Forest Service agrees or disagrees with the statement or that it is factual. Rather this report lists whether or not the topic was analyzed in detail.***

## NEPA Regulations

The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act are found at 40CFR1500-1508. These regulations include the following, “There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. ...As part of the scoping process the lead agency shall: ... Determine the scope and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth... [and] identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review, ...” 40CFR1501.7.

Forest Service NEPA procedures are found at 36CFR220. “Scoping shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 1501.7.”

## Scoping Comments in the NEPA Process

Public comments were received during a scoping period which occurred between December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and January 30<sup>th</sup> 2015, for the Rico West Dolores Roads and Trails (Travel Management) Project. Scoping input was received as a result of a press release resulting in articles in local papers, and letters and e-mails to those who had previously expressed interest in the project, and letters to private landowners in the Rico West Dolores (RWD) area. During the scoping period, the Forest Service presented a preliminary proposed action as a starting point for the NEPA process. The scoping period generated approximately 276 written responses.

Some commenters provided ideas for how to meet the purpose and need in a different manner than the proposed action. These suggested alternatives are listed as either 1) carried forward for detailed analysis (all or part) and 2) eliminated from detailed study.

**Format of this Report**

There were recurring topics mentioned throughout many of the comments that are grouped together by theme. The Forest Service has reworded comments to show a cause/effect statement.

The tables have been revised (consolidated) from the previous version of this report. Table 1 is Topics/Issues and Table 2 is Suggested Alternatives. The second column in each table describes if or how the topic/issue or suggested alternatives was addressed in the DEIS.

New issues or analysis topics may be identified as a result of further analysis. This scoping report (version 2) is a ‘snapshot in time’ as of May, 2016.

**Table 1 – Topics (Issues) Analyzed in Detail**

Motorcycle Opportunities (Loops, Connections, Experience) Comments	
<p>Opportunities for Loading Pen connection, Spring Creek connection, connection to the Town of Rico,</p> <p>Road riding versus trail riding experiences (example, Ryman closure creates more road riding)</p> <p>Loop one is Lower Bear Creek to Grindstone to Hillside to Little Bear and back out Lower Bear Creek. Loop two is Morrison to Aspen Loop to Gold Run to Bear Creek and down Bear Creek to the trailhead.</p> <p>Connections between landscapes (to Haycamp Mesa/Rico-West; Hermosa/Rico-West; Telluride, Ophir/Rico-West; Groundhog/Rico-West; Boggy-Glade/Rico-West.</p> <p>Removing motorcycle use on RWD trail may increase traffic of Forest Roads and ATV trails</p> <p>Loop ride North Calico, East and West Fall Creek, Winter - this loop is lower elevation and somewhat easier riding than the Calico ridgeline</p> <p>Little Bear and Rough Canyon trail are only downhill routes for motorcycles and mountain bikes – There are large ‘steps’ in the trail and portions of the trails are very steep.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Issues section of Chapter 2 and Recreation section of Chapter 3.</p>

<p>The proposed small loops of East and West spring trails are too short for motorcycles</p>	
<p>Taking away less technical trails may cause inexperienced riders to attempt trails beyond their experience level</p> <p>Motorcyclists (especially less experienced riders) get stuck, either in the mud or stopped by ruts or rocks, and can't navigate through on some segments of trails.</p>	<p>Partially addressed through design features related to educational materials. However, it is also rider's responsibility to choose appropriate trails</p>
<p><b>Recreation Settings and Experience (All Types of Use) Comments</b></p>	
<p>"Once motorized use is allowed there will be a defacto 'emphasis' on motorcycle riding and a 'de-emphasis' on other types of use especially if numbers are expected to increase" ... "Once a trail becomes popular for motorized users, nearly all other "quiet" users go elsewhere to avoid such impacts"</p> <p>"As motorcycle use has increased on Calico, West Fall and Winter trails I have stopped taking horse groups there..."</p> <p>'Burnett trail is a poor choice for emphasizing nonmotorized recreation opportunities because the road up is rocky and pretty arduous'</p> <p>Dolores District lacks areas with single track trails for motorcycle riding and other uses.</p> <p>the SJNF Resource Management Plan ("RMP")... provides significant additional nonmotorized areas expanding the extensive opportunities for these activities that already exist"</p> <p>"High elevation motorized single track is a very scarce and precious recreational resource"</p> <p>The Dolores District lacks areas with with single track trails in nonmotorized settings. "In looking at the MVUM for the Dolores District, I don't see many areas where isolation from motorized can be found and certainly not trails"</p> <p>"Bear Creek is one of the best trout fisheries in the SJNF and anglers deserve a quality experience"</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Issues section of Chapter 2 and Recreation section of Chapter 3.</p>

<p>“Regionally, drainages, with rivers, contain roads or motorized trails. Bear Creek is a unique mountain forest area and one of the only drainages of it's kind without a road running through it.”</p>	
<b>Scope of Analysis (Nonmotorized Trails) Comments</b>	
<p>The designation of “new” non-motorized routes is outside of the scope of this project based on the published Purpose and Need</p> <p>The PA does not provide any single track trails on the east side of Rico. There is no FS trail (nonmoto) connection from Rico to the Colorado Trail.</p> <p>The PA misses an opportunity to emphasize hike/bike trails around Rico and RWD area which could improve local economy – example Telluride trails are popular around the Town of Telluride</p> <p>The Groundhog Stock Driveway is shown entering the Lizard Head Wilderness at two locations west of the Cross Mountain Trail. It is our understanding that the Wilderness boundary was intended to be established adjacent to the Driveway so that the Driveway would be located outside of the Wilderness boundary.</p> <p>A nonmotorized trail around Dunton and this is problematic because of total cost of 3 new bridges under the PA, also lynx habitat may be affected.</p>	<p>Scope of analysis was refined to eliminate most new nonmotorized trail proposals. These would be addressed under separate NEPA analysis. There is not decision at this time to implement or not implement these proposals.</p> <p>Wilderness boundary map corrections were made separately.</p>
<b>Trail Feasibility (tread, grade) Comments</b>	
<p>‘trails get churned up mud in wet areas and loose rocks on steep sections’</p> <p>‘Motorcycle wheels create a cupped trench and its very hard for a horse to walk in the trench and also difficult for a horse to straddle the trench.’</p> <p>Many of the trails designated for motorcycle travel in the PA are too steep</p> <p>Keeping the north section of Calico open to motorcycles allows loose rocks to be kicked up by motorcycles</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail see Issues section of Chapter 2 and Trail Maintenance section of Chapter 3. Also the Watershed Riparian and Water Resources section and Geology/Soils section of Chapter 3.</p>

<p>Johnny Bull has a number of steep sections (on portions rerouted from the old freight road) and is not sustainable [for motorcycles].</p> <p>Trails were not originally designed for motorized vehicle use (examples steep uphill straightaways and sharp switchbacks)</p> <p>Since water is the biggest factor for trail erosion and August is the wettest month at higher elevations in this region it does not make sense to have so many miles of [motorcycle] single track trails at these higher elevations.</p> <p>The northern section of calico from the meadows to Margarite creek is virtually impassable for foot travel because of conditions – wet places – The last 4 miles of the Calico Trail (where it terminates in the Dunton Meadows):</p>	
<p><b>ATV and UTV Opportunities Comments</b></p>	
<p>Closing old logging roads in the Black Mesa area - “This is a huge closure to this area!”</p> <p>The Black mesa is a gorgeous trail ride</p> <p>hunter, would like to be able to ride ATVs on old logging roads to access hunting area.</p>	<p>Analyzed in detail. See Issues section of Chapter 2 and Recreation section of Chapter 3.</p>
<p><b>Hunter Experience Comments</b></p>	
<p>ATV use causes elk to leave area and spoils hunting (no fresh elk sign last year). The old roads are level and easily walkable. Riding ATVs only hurts hunting and wildlife</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Hunting section of Chapter 3.</p>
<p><b>Motorcycle Riding Areas Comments</b></p>	
<p>The PA does not include a motor vehicle riding ‘area’ with riding on cow trails, game trails, skid trails or other pathways in the forest.</p> <p>A review of the Dolores District will show that previously designated motorized ‘areas’ existed across the District. These were the ‘f’ designation areas that allowed cross-country travel.</p>	<p>See Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail</p>
<p><b>Timing Restrictions and Hunter Experience Comments</b></p>	

<p>The PA does not restrict motorcycle use during bow season and bow hunters need to get closer to their game</p> <p>proposed timing restriction does not allow game to ‘settle down’ prior to archery season</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Hunting section of Chapter 3.</p>
<p><b>Timing Restrictions and Motorcycle, ATV or UTV Riding Experience Comments</b></p>	
<p>The PA does not allow motorized users to enjoy the fall which is a gorgeous time in the mountains</p> <p>I would think closure at the beginning of first rifle season to be adequate for the hunting experience and thus giving at least three months of usage to motorized users.</p> <p>The seasonal restrictions described in the PA do not provide enough time to clear trails so that after time is spent clearing trails the riding season would be too short (or nonexistent). “Also, other types of users may hike, or ride horses or mtn bikes around deadfall creating trail braiding. Although July 1 is reasonable to assume for getting over the Calico ridgeline by that time we have typically spent a month clearing trails below the snowline.”</p> <p>The PA restricts motorcycle use on days when there is no hunting season. Hunting seasons are not continuous from September 9th to mid-November.</p> <p>Support a restriction on <u>ATV</u> use during hunting season</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Chapter 2 Issues section and the Recreation section of Chapter 3</p>
<p><b>Timing Restrictions Related to Elk Habitat Comments</b></p>	
<p>The PA does not restrict motorized use during the post-calving time period</p> <p>Under the PA, timing restrictions do not include the start of the rut/mating season for elk. Disruption of the early part of rut results in later spring births and an increase in winter mortality of the calves</p>	<p>Not carried forward. See definition of production habitat.</p>
<p><b>Elk Habitat Comments</b></p>	

<p>The spaces between the roads and trails may be inadequate for wildlife security in some places. Need to run GIS maps to see the security area patches.</p> <p>Upper Calico, Johnny Bull and Eagle Peak system of trails fragments a key big game production and security areas.</p> <p>Groundhog OHV trail appears redundant [check overall route density in the area].</p> <p>Wildlife will be disturbed by motorcycles at meadows and wildlife will be unable to use the meadow(s) for forage. Specific locations mentioned in comments include, 1) portion of East Fall Creek trail that passes through large meadow, 2) Bear Creek drainage openings 3) Meadow at top of Grindstone, 4) Valley on the upper end of Stoner Creek trail (between WTwin and Eagle Peak trail) passes through large meadows (with some Beaver ponds)</p> <p>Wildlife in the Johnny Bull drainage would be disturbed by the proposed motorcycle use of the JB trail. JB drainage provides wildlife connectivity and 'good' habitat</p> <p>The proposed road and trail system in the northwest corner near Lone Done may impact wildlife travel between the adjacent Grand Mesa Uncompahgre Forest, Colorado Roadless area and the Lone Cone State Park</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail see Terrestrial Wildlife section of Chapter 3</p>
<b>Other Wildlife Concerns Comments</b>	
<p>There is a concern that the travel plan will not be enforced and that will lead to development of user-created routes that would fragment habitat.</p> <p>Fragmentation from user created routes has occurred in 'some parts of the forest'. Encourage the FS to be aggressive in identifying and addressing user created routes.</p> <p>Concerned that the ATV loop in the proposed location would cause riders to venture off trail onto the old logging roads that connect to that area.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Chapter 3 in the following sections, Assumptions of Analysis, Watershed, Riparian, and Water Resources, Terrestrial Wildlife, Administration and Enforcement.</p>
<b>Elk Habitat Topics Not Analyzed in Detail Comments</b>	
<p>The PA does not discuss winter elk habitat and its relationship to seasonal restrictions</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because small areas of winter habitat are mapped in the RWD landscape some of which is located on the Hwy145 corridor. The majority of use by elk</p>

	occurs in the winter months when over-ground travel on roads and trails is minor or not possible because of snow.
Bear Creek drainage provides important wildlife connectivity between Hermosa side and Dolores side of the LaPlatas	Not analyzed in detail because no CPW mapped wildlife travel arrows or corridors are shown for Bear Creek specifically. However habitat connectivity in all areas is analyzed in detail.
Commenter wrote, four years ago, Forest Service Maps indicated that Elk Production Areas (in the landscape impacted by this Proposed Action), were primarily on Taylor Mesa. Now the entire landscape appears to be designated Elk Production Area, even above timberline. The elk production habitat map is flawed .... Commenter disagrees that production habitat occurs as high as 12,000 feet, rather higher elevations are summer range, not production habitat.... The flawed mapping has led to proposals for seasonal restrictions which it should not....	Not carried forward because the location of habitat is determined through CPW mapping per the Forest Plan page 36. The FS will use the latest CPW mapping in the analysis. Habitat maps by themselves do not predetermine the outcome of the analysis (for example forage and cover were also examined). In addition, wildlife habitat is just one of many criteria for decision making.
Barlow OHV route increases route densities in the area and fragments habitat	Route densities are already low in the area, However, field review in summer 2015 found extensive wetland complex so the proposed trail was eliminated for further study
<b>Wetlands or Fisheries Comments</b>	
<p>The PA does not go far enough to address user-created routes in riparian areas such as Willow Creek And Fish Creek. Illegal use is common and destructive Need more physical barriers and enforcement</p> <p>Illegal motorized use is one of the largest fisheries impacts in this travel analysis area. Riparian Areas such as Fish Creek And Willow Creek Are examples of problem areas.”</p> <p>The Johnny Bull trailhead is a narrow bench above a riverbank in a riparian and sensitive area.</p> <p>There is also a concern that multiple crossings of Spring Creek could degrade the stream bed, which could result in poor water quality</p>	Analyzed in Detail. See Chapter 2 Issues section and Chapter 3 following sections, Watershed, Riparian and Water Resources, Fisheries.

<p>Spring Creek is classified as Colorado Outstanding Waters, A non-degradation water quality standard, and has a genetically pure strain of native Cutthroat Trout in it</p> <p>There are many stream crossings and cutthroat trout in the East Fork – [so trail should be nonmotorized]</p> <p>Much of the dispersed camping between Dunton and Burro Bridge is close to the water’s edge and is damaging the riparian environment.</p> <p>We have seen tracks of motorcycles and ATVs over the berm at the end of FS149 towards Colorado Trail</p> <p>Campers have also driven full-size vehicles through wetlands/meadow areas to the east of FS149</p>	
<b>Alpine Areas Comments</b>	
<p>‘The PA allows motorcycle riding above treeline and motorcycles above treeline create unstable soils, destroy cryptobiotic soils’.</p> <p>‘Alpine areas are very fragile and hard to restore once they’re damaged. Motorcycles and other motorized vehicles shouldn’t be allowed in this area’.</p>	<p>Analyzed in detail under the Rare Plant section of Chapter 3.</p>
<b>Motorcycle Sound Emissions, Tires Comments</b>	
<p>The PA does not include design features like noise laws, type of tires, engine size, etc.</p> <p>“The average motorcycle engine size has dropped as quieter water cooled bikes replace air cooled engines. There are noise laws now and people are keeping stock pipes. Many of our local guys are going to trials tires to avoid the digging damage that the open knobies cause and it's catching on.”</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail. It is outside scope of FS to manage tire or muffler size. The State of Colorado already regulates sound emission standards.</p>
<b>Wildlife Viewing Comments</b>	
<p>‘Wildlife will be disturbed [by motorcycle presence and noise] at local meadow sites and decrease the ability to <u>view wildlife</u> in these meadows’. Locations for this issue include, Burnett trail, Portion of East Fall Creek trail that passes through large meadow, Bear Creek</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail see Recreation section of Chapter 3.</p>

openings, Meadow on Grindstone, Valley on the upper end of Stoner Creek trail (between WTwin and Eagle Peak trail) passes through large meadows (with some Beaver ponds),	
<b>Livestock Management Comments</b>	
<p>At these high elevations horses have to work harder and if cattle scatter down the steep slopes it's an effort to get them back. Permittee has had a couple instances where motorcycle riders scattered livestock over the side of steep slopes.</p> <p>In the Spring Creek area, when a path is created by motorcycles the cattle find the path and use it. This causes distribution problems between two pastures.</p> <p>There is no fence between these pastures so we rely on the dense vegetation and blowdown to keep cattle from moving between pastures.</p>	Analyzed in Detail see Issues section of Chapter 2 and Rangeland and Weed Management section of Chapter 3. Design features were added to include fences and trail cattleguards.
<b>Private Landowner Concerns</b>	
<p>Some private landowners prefer nonmotorized uses in the vicinity or across their property. Trails that could be affected include Morrison, Horse Creek, Calico, East and West Fall Creek, and Johnny Bull.</p> <p>The Proposed Action may lead to increased vandalism of the cabin located adjacent to the Barlow Cree</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail – see Chapter 3 Compatibility with Adjacent Populated Areas. See Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Study</p> <p>No changes proposed in vicinity of Barlow Creek</p>
<b>Easement language Comments</b>	
The term 'quiet enjoyment' in the easement language for the West Fall/East Fall trail private land area may be older terminology that cannot be applied to trail uses.	Research found this comment to be correct. Proposals for removing motorcycle use from portions of East and West Fall creek trails are made for other reasons
<b>Safety Comments</b>	

<p>By closing Wildcat, Horse Creek and Burnett trails to motorcycle riding, the PA does not provide an ‘emergency out’ from the Calico ridgeline down the mountain slopes on the Hwy 145 side for motorcycles in case of storms, lightning, injury or mechanical failure.</p> <p>Some trails may have potential for mtn bikes or motorcycles to startle horses.</p> <p>Some of the trails we have been using [with horses] for many years have recently been used by bicyclists which on steep and or narrow trails can be quite dangerous for horses when they are surprised by someone coming in the opposite direction at high rates of speed, especially on corners and ridges.” [Author lumps mountain bikes and motorcycles]</p> <p>Bear Creek trail has long downhill straightaway sections of dirt trail with few rocks which allows motorcycles to go fast and increases the potential for ‘close calls’</p> <p>For certain segments of Calico Trail - On the narrow sections of the Calico trail a hiker can step off to allow a horse to pass or a bicyclist can remove their bike to allow a hiker or horse to pass but a motorcycle cannot yield because of the size and weight of the machine</p>	<p>Motorcycle connection was Analyzed in Detail see Issues section of Chapter 2 and Recreation section of Chapter 3 and Safety section.</p> <p>Mountain bike/horse interactions were not carried forward because scope of this analysis was narrowed to motor vehicle use of trails.</p>
<p><b>Economy of Local Communities Comments</b></p>	

<p>The PA does not provide easy access to the Town of Rico by motorcycles which will lessen the amount of revenue from sale of fuel, food, and/or vacation rentals or hotel rooms for out of area riders, and also lessens access from riders that live in Rico.</p> <p>Hunters would not visit Rico if motorized use [on trails] continues... which would cause economic impact</p> <p>hunters would not visit Rico if motorized use is prohibited [trails or roads]</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail. See Issues section of Chapter 2 and Socio-economic section of Chapter 3 and Hunting section of Chapter 3.</p>
<p><b>Horse Creek Road Comments</b></p>	
<p>The PA puts the Horse Creek TH downslope closer to highway which increases the length of trail (road) the public must navigate to reach the upper elevations.</p> <p>‘Don’t make us walk, ride horses, or mtn bikes for that distance when the old trailhead location can be used’.</p>	<p>Trailhead development became an alternative considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2.</p>
<p>The PA puts the trailhead at the first intersection with private land. This leaves a section of Forest Road to maintain for public use and potential resource damage to surrounding forest. Prefer trailhead be placed as close to highway as possible</p>	<p>Trailhead development became an alternative considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2</p>
<p><b>Rico and FR422 Comments</b></p>	
<p>Putting FR422 on the Motor Vehicle Use Map as an ATV only route makes it appear as if the FS is emphasizing ATV recreation opportunity on this steep and hard to navigate route.</p> <p>Rico resident who lives at the base of Expectation Mountain states, “we have noticed a significant increased use in 4-wheelers and dirt bikes on our intersecting streets, which is a through access to the roads on Expectation mountain behind our house.”</p> <p>I regularly drive my Jeep up to Engles cabin</p>	<p>Proposed Action refined to show FR422 as road and not ATV/UTV trail under all action alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Bear Creek Guided Trips Comments</b></p>	

<p>Motorized travel is no longer compatible with the other recreational uses in [Bear Creek] area. Writer notes that numbers of motorcycles and size of bikes has increased to point of noncompatibility.</p> <p>Outfitters bring clients for llamas, flyfisherman, horse packing. When there is a group of motorcycles navigating down Gold Run each must take turns because it is difficult, then they take turns riding up and out on Grindstone so that noise could occur for hours before the group passes.</p> <p>Our groups in Bear Creek that have encountered motorcycles report risk management issues with 10-15 large and powerful motorcycles needing to pass a group of 12-15 backpackers on a steep trail such as Gold Run.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail see Chapter 3 Recreation section</p>
<p><b>Forest Roads 358 and 208 Comments</b></p>	
<p>The proposal to close FR358 to public use would remove access to dispersed camping and actually FR358 is in fairly good condition except for the last mile which is in poor condition. FR208 on the other hand is severely rutted, in bad condition and bisects an extensive beautiful meadow and would be a better candidate for decommission.</p>	<p>A field check in summer 2015 verified this comment was correct. The proposed action was refined to keep FR358 open to public use under all the action alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Camping on ATV/UTV Trails Comments</b></p>	
<p>Under the Proposed 62 inch width for ATV trails that would allow for UTV vehicles. Camping along trails may be increased because UTVs have the ability to carry more gear.</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail. Camping with UTVs is uncommon.</p>
<p><b>62-Inch Trail Proposals Comments</b></p>	
<p>Illegal use of 62 inch trails by jeeps could cause effects different or greater than ATV/UTV effects.</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because rules would prohibit jeeps on the OHV (ATV/UTV) trails.</p>
<p><b>Trail Miles by Type of Use Comments</b></p>	

<p>The PA provides more miles of nonmotorized trail than motorized trail</p> <p>The PA provides too many miles of motorized trails because nonmotorized users greatly outnumber motorcycle users. “NVUM data says there are 10 times more quiet users”</p>	<p>Not carried forward because miles by themselves are a poor indicator of recreation experience.</p> <p>Not carried forward because lands managed for multiple use provide for a variety of opportunities regardless of the majority versus minority types of use.</p>
<p><b>'Justifying' Closures Comments</b></p>	
<p>Without resource impacts there is no 'justification' to close trails to motorcycle use</p>	<p>The purpose and need is not to respond to resource concerns alone, but to take a 'fresh look' at the road and trail system from a variety of viewpoints (recreation experience, forest management, long term maintenance burden etc.).</p>
<p><b>Motorcycle Use on 'single track' trails Comments</b></p>	
<p>'single track trails should not be used for motorcycles rather motorcycles should use the many roads and atv trails in the area. Keep motorized uses on the road system.'</p>	<p>Not carried forward because it's within the mission of the Forest Service, as well as a stipulation of the Forest Plan, to allow motorcycles on single track trails in some places. For example, Section 3.2.3 of the Plan p. 175.</p>
<p><b>Need for Travel Management</b></p>	

<p>The previous 'A', 'B' and 'F' designations along with specific trail designations depicted on the 2005 Visitor maps (and previous maps) already meets the intent of the travel rule to designate a system of roads and trails. There is no need to undergo Travel Management Planning for the RWD area.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because the previous 'F' designation did not meet the intent of the travel rule unless the areas covered by the old 'F' designation were adopted as Motor Vehicle Areas under the new rule.</p> <p>The previous 'A' and 'B' areas could have fit the travel rule, however, the SJNF chose to take this opportunity to review its road and trail systems for all areas of the forest.</p>
<p><b>Rico Special Management Area Comments</b></p>	
<p>The three-mile 'motor free' zone may not have been vetted with the Rico citizens.</p>	<p>The scoping period and upcoming formal comment period will allow for Rico citizens to comment on proposed road and trail management on NF lands around the Town of Rico. The PA is not a 'motor free zone'.</p>
<p><b>Other Laws Comments</b></p>	
<p>The Proposed Action may be inconsistent with the National Trails System Act of 1968, (16 U.S.C.A. 1241-49)</p> <p>Roads and Trails in Colorado are public highways under Colorado State Law. Other than Federal and State Highways within a County the other Public Highways, (roads and trails) are under County jurisdiction CRS 43-2-201. CRS 43-2-201.1 Closure of Public Highways requires a legal process to be followed to close any public highway.</p>	<p>Not Carried Forward because this project does not propose to establish new National system trails, nor does it propose to change the status existing National system trails.</p> <p>Not Carried Forward because Forest Service roads and trails do not fall under CRS 43-2-201</p>
<p>The Travel Management Plan subsection 212.55, of the Final Rule; requires responsible officials in making decisions to recognize valid existing rights including valid outstanding or reserved rights-of-way for a road or trail.</p>	<p>Valid and existing rights are being addressed.</p>
<p>If the roads don't provide a connection for unlicensed vehicles (such as between the county portion of the West Fork Road and Hwy 145.),</p>	<p>Not Carried Forward because the proposed action can be clarified to explain that it is the</p>

<p>the Forest Service can't say that the trails provide "connections" or "loops." Many of the trails connect to the county easement portion of West Fork Road, where bikes must be "street legal." Commenter stated that most bikes used for technical trail riding in the Rico-West Dolores area are unlicensed.</p>	<p>rider's responsibility to know when licenses are required. In addition, the alternative maps will display these roads with a different symbol for clarity. The type of motorcycle does not dictate whether or not it can be licensed. Many trail riding bikes in the RWD area are licensed.</p>
<p>Ryman Trail is needed as a cross-over route from the East that connects to the Hermosa drainage especially as it relates to new legislation which establishes Coral Draw Trail to remain open particularly for the Ryman Trail connection</p>	<p>The Hermosa legislation does not call out specific trails by name or even specific connections on the Dolores District side of the LaPlata mtns. The PA connects Corral Draw trail to FR564.</p>
<p><b>Calico NRT Report Comment</b></p>	
<p>In order to maintain the values for which [Calico Trail] was designated, the amount of use of that trail should be managed at the levels that occurred at the time of designated which are described as 'an estimated total 200 visitors per year and 'a few motorcycles'. Commenter feels that any more than a 'few motorcycles' detracts from the values of the trail.</p>	<p>The establishment report for the Calico National Recreation Trail does not describe future use levels. Initial review of Calico Trail values did not result in a key issue.</p>
<p><b>Off Trail Use on East Fork Trail Area Comments</b></p>	
<p>Use of the East Fork trail by motorcycles as proposed create the potential for off trail use (even illegal) by motorcycles from the EF trail into fragile fens just north of the Farney property</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because the area north of Farney property containing many of the fens and other types of riparian areas falls within the new Grizzly RNA where motor use is prohibited. In addition, illegal off trail travel has not been identified as a key issue on the East Fork trail. The area has been closed to off-trail travel for many years.</p>
<p><b>62-Inch Trails Comments</b></p>	
<p>The PA proposes 62 inches for ATV trails but some jeeps and military vehicles are 62 inches so this would create impacts beyond ATV/UTV impacts.</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because these trails would be open to ATV/UTVs only.</p>

<b>Distance for Dispersed Camping Comments</b>	
<p>The 300 foot allowance for driving off a designated route to camp is excessively large and problematic. We recommend analysis of existing sites and designation and marking of those that are sustainable as system routes with minimal off route travel allowed</p>	<p>Not carried forward or analyzed in detail because 1) the 300 foot distance provides consistency across the Forest 2) the 300 foot distance can be reduced for special circumstances found during the analysis and 3) driving on routes not shown on the MVUM would be illegal under the PA.</p>
<b>Over Snow Comment</b>	
<p>The PA does not include oversnow analysis but a recent court case that requires the FS to do oversnow analysis.</p>	<p>This is not a key issue because oversnow recreation is outside the scope of this analysis. The court order regarding over snow travel does not mandate that over snow travel analysis must be done in conjunction with over ground travel analysis, only that it must be done at some point if it hasn't already. The SJNF will be conducting over snow analysis at a later date.</p>
<b>Physical Impacts of Decommissioning Roads Comments</b>	
<p>[physical] Decommissioning of Roads, Routes or Trails is detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the general public...and... creates more damage to habitat than simply placing a closed sign on those roads and trails under Forest Service jurisdiction that are to be closed</p>	<p>Analyzed in Detail, see Design Features 'Implementation Tree'.</p>
<b>Width of future re-alignments Comments</b>	
<p>Allowing existing routes to be realigned up to 440 yards on either side is excessive. That amount of distance potentially can modify the impacts of that route significantly.</p> <p>The description of trail alignments does not specify that a route alignment may include placing recreation use onto roads and if reroutes included placing use on roads then the recreation experience is diminished.</p>	<p>The distance was changed to 500 feet for any future realignments (all alternatives). Also the situations where realignment would occur was described in more detail – see Design Features section.</p>
<b>Rico Connections Comments</b>	

<p>PA does not provide for local single-track motorcycle users to directly access the RWD trail system from their summer homes in Rico.</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because it is not the mission of the FS to provide connections to residents themselves, and usually FS trailheads are located on FS land</p>
<p><b>Affordability Comments</b></p>	
<p>The current PA may not be implementable from a budget perspective – need funds for signs, visitor contacts, trail maintenance, enforcement, education, etc. bridge construction trail re-routes etc.</p>	<p>Analyzed in detail see Trail Maintenance section and Road Maintenance section of Chapter 3.</p>
<p><b>Snow Shoveling Trails Comments</b></p>	
<p>We have been on the Calico Trail at the end of June even in a low snow year and have seen where motorcyclists have shoveled through snow banks to provide a route through the snow bank for riders. Unfortunately, what this tends to do is trap the snowmelt within the shoveled trench so that it runs down the trail and saturates the soil for a distance within and beyond the snow bank.</p>	<p>Not analyzed in detail because allowing users to shovel pathways prevents off trail travel to go around patches of snow. Water drainage does not appear to be altered by shoveling trails.</p>
<p><b>Off Trail Use (Illegal Use) Comments</b></p>	
<p>[single track] trails are highly erodible, narrow and encourage [motorcycle] riders to go off-trail, creating helter-skelter rutting and alternate "trails"</p>	<p>Current and Potential for illegal off-trail travel is Analyzed in Detail – see Chapter 3 Rare Plants, Watershed, Riparian and Water Resources, Terrestrial Wildlife. However, high levels of illegal cross-country use by motorcycles has not been the case in this landscape.</p>
<p><b>Sockrider 6 Trail Comments</b></p>	
<p>Sockrider 6 is one of the most scenic spots on the Calico Trail that should available for motorcycles. Riding this route is much safer than the steep hillside route proposed. Writer disagrees that the trail over Sockrider is not suitable for motorized use</p> <p>We [Mountain Bike Club] support the addition of the non-motorized Sockrider Trail as a system trail, but suggest that it should be designated for hikers [closed to mtn bikes], only, due to the steep ridgeline grades and dangerous conditions for other users</p>	<p>Motorcycle use of this trail not analyzed in detail because this trail is best suited to hiker only as an alternate route parallel to the Calico Trail but not suited to mountainbikes or motorcycles.</p>

<b>Firewood Comment</b>	
Converting roads to 62 inch trails (which occurs in the Lone Cone area) eliminates the ability to use these roads to collect firewood	Analyzed in Detail as part to Forest Products section of Chapter 3.
<b>Roadless Areas Comment</b>	
The PA provides for motorcycle riding on trails within Colorado Roadless Areas. Specifically, motorized uses should continue to be barred from roadless areas to ensure they remain just that: roadless. Ryman area is an Upper Tier Roadless Area.	Analyzed in Detail as Part of Roadless Areas section of Chapter 3. Note that Roadless Areas restrict roads not trails.
<b>Search and Rescue Comment</b>	
The proposed closures would greatly and negatively impact my ability to perform life saving Search and Rescue measures. [near Rico]	This issue is not Key because route designation applies to general public use only and does not apply to search and rescue activities.

**Table 2 – Suggested Alternative Actions From Public Comments**

<b>Suggested Alternative Action</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>
Consider designating a motor vehicle <u>area</u> within the RWD landscape for riding <u>motorcycles</u> on game trails, cow trails, other pathways in the forest. “There is an image of motorcycle riders that is simply not true. No user group stays on a trail more than the single track motorized users because it’s the easiest place to ride. When a motorcycle goes off-trail it isn’t to wander off into the woods aimlessly, it’s to follow another trail that someone, something (equipment) or some animal has already created and more often than not it is a cattle trail, an abandoned road, a logging road, a miners route, a game trail, a power line easement, an abandoned railroad grade, etc. The point is, it is something that already exists.	Carried Forward as Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study see Chapter 2.
Consider a ‘no action’ alternative that includes the ‘f’ designation areas from the 2005 Visitor Map. i.e an alternative that would be the current situation without the temporary closure order that eliminated cross-country travel.	Carried Forward as Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study see Chapter 2.

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
<p>'Zones' for nonmotorized emphasis should be Bear Creek area, Ryman area, Rico Area, Adjacent to Lizardhead, Calico Spine area, Upper Stoner with E&amp;W Twin Springs area, and 'Zone for motorized emphasis should be Lower Calico Taylor Mesa and Willow Divide/Black Mesa.</p> <p>We request that one of the Proposed Alternative Actions include the closure of all motorized activities in the Calico Trail, Bear Creek Trail and East Fork Trail drainages. Non-motorized users need separate zones where only quiet uses are allowed.</p> <p>East Fork trail nonmotorized because it's the only trail in a large unroaded/untrailed area and motorcycles have other options. Make this trail nonmotorized creating a large block of nonmoto experience.</p> <p>Commenters provided map of suggested 'zones'.</p>	<p>Some of these suggestions were incorporated in Alternatives D and E.</p>
<p>If a spur road is needed add one to ensure camping at the corrals at the top of Ryman.</p>	<p>Added to actions common to all alternatives – requires field check and separate NEPA because ID team did not reach this spot during 2015 field season</p>
<p>Reroute a portion of the EFall and WFall Trails around provide land and provide for motorcycle use on the entire length of these trails.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because proposals to remove motorcycle use are not only based on private land easement language.</p>
<p>Suggest noise testing be provided at Dolores District Offices or randomly at various trailheads to ensure all motorcycles meet the USFS requirement. The best possible solution to this problem is to test noise levels when the OHV permit is purchased to ensure that all OHMs and OHVs meet the 96Db requirement.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because this is outside scope of FS mission and is better conducted by State agencies.</p>
<p>As a backpacker, I would like to see some loop trails accessible to pedestrians only.</p>	<p>Pedestrian only trails were not carried forward because Forest Plan calls for multiple types of recreation opportunity.</p>

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
<p>A Pro-Recreation Alternative would include the following characteristics in addition to the current proposal: 1. Dispersed camping within 300 feet of all existing routes. 2. Use of seasonal closures, where required, to protect the environment and wildlife with the intention of keeping routes open for the summer recreation season. 3. All of the existing routes are needed as OHV routes due to the cumulative effects of all other closures. 4. Additional OHV routes are needed to address the growing popularity of OHV recreation and the greater needs of the public for access and motorized recreation. 5. In order to reasonably meet the needs of the public for motorized recreational opportunities we request that the proposed alternative include the following: a. Interpretative routes to preserve the mining heritage in the area. b. Provides the type of long-distance figure 8 routes, loops and side destinations desired by OHV recreationists i. Loops ranging from 20 to 60 miles ii. Many stops and side destinations, iii. documents and preserves the historic nature of the area, iv. Additional use of dual-use routes so that OHVs can connect with trails systems, v. Grants could be used for signing at each site and the development of interpretative literature, brochures, and maps. vi. Grants could be used where required for route improvements.</p>	<p>Portions of these suggestions are found in Alternatives B, C, D and E.</p> <p>The alternatives may fall short of the vision described here for loops and side destinations.</p>
<p>Allow motorcycle use on Salt Creek Trail to provide a trail connection to Hwy 145 from the Roaring Fork Road and lessen miles of road riding needed for that connection.</p>	<p>Carried Forward as Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study</p>
<p>The northeast 4 miles of [Winter] trail could be kept motorized and a connector trail to added about 1 mile east of Dunton Resort that comes out on FR471. Instead of closing the whole trail, just close the area next to private land to give them a buffer zone. OR A trail re-route or technical enhancement to the current trail at the head of Winter Trail (North end) could mitigate resource issues</p> <p>Provide new nonmotorized trails around Dunton and keep Winter trail open to motorcycles.</p>	<p>Not carried forward in order to protect wetlands, provide a wildlife space and semiprimitive nonmotorized patch between Dunton road and FR471.</p>
<p>As per the previous EA analysis connect the upper end of Spring Creek Trail 627 across the old trail alignment to the end of FR 692 so that a connection could be made by single-track and other users of all other types across to Priest Gulch trail 645.</p>	<p>Carried forward in Alternatives C, D and E.</p>

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
<p>Suggest a great hiking loop from high camp hut to Bolam Pass and down the East Fork Trail.</p> <p>Due to the Hut system, the [East Fork] trail is popular with mountain bikers. It's also used by hikers and horseback riders. Let's keep it a quiet use area!</p>	<p>Not carried forward because scope of analysis narrowed to focus on motorized trails so new nonmotorized trails are not part of this analysis</p>
<p>Don't have timing restrictions rather let the motorized use season be governed by the weather. Snowfall provides an adequate restriction on motorcycle use of single track trails so that additional timing restrictions are not necessary [to maintain elk production habitat effectiveness].</p>	<p>Carried Forward in No Action Alt.</p>
<p>I would think that a much more reasonable seasonal closure order would be to eliminate any OFF-TRAIL uses during the elk calving period. Of course this would apply to pedestrian and equestrian users as well.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because analysis focuses on motor vehicle use, however, nonmotorized disturbance effects to wildlife are noted. See Terrestrial Wildlife section of Chapter 3</p>
<p>One of the problems is that no matter what time of year, trails and roads are severely impacted in a negative way by not only motorized vehicles, but also by horses and bikes if used when it is very wet. With resources so limited to repair trails, I believe that they should be restricted to protect them and prevent erosion where needed. Bikes and horses can be damaging as well and maybe should be restricted from certain trails or at certain times like when it is especially wet.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because restricting certain trails at certain times as condition based closures is costly to administer.</p>
<p>Consider Burnett Creek Trailhead as shown in the 2009 decision or Consider alternative trailhead for Burnett trail so that trailhead is outside of the neighborhood (to allow motorcycles to connect to Hwy 145 and then ride 145 to town, or to park and walk in.... Keep Burnett Creek 641 as designated single-track multiple-use, with some adjustments made for a new trailhead.</p> <p>Upgrade road and increase size of parking area at the existing or new trailhead location. Or keep road in current condition and emphasize firewood cutting, high clearance vehicle access to trailhead. Improve trail alignment</p>	<p>New trailheads were considered but not analyzed in detail. Options to keep Burnett trail open to motorcycle use with a new connecting trail around Rico is described in Alternatives C, C and E.</p>

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
The PA places the trailhead at the first intersection of private land on FR423 Horse Creek. Putting a parking area here would be damaging to land. We (landowners) prefer the trailhead be located as close to highway as possible and 'well on' NF land.	New trailheads were considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis.
Make East Fall Creek nonmotorized and West Fall Creek Motorized. The Meadows along the East Fall Creek Trail are used by big game; for wildlife and quiet use resources it makes sense for one of these two drainages to be non motorized.	Both East and West Fall Creek trails would be nonmotorized in Alternative E.
Driving off the designated route more than one vehicle length should be prohibited along motorized trails. Dispersed camping should not be permitted off motorized trails, which would be encouraged with the proposed increase in OHV trail width to accommodate 2 seat, multi-wheel cargo-carrying UTVs.	Not carried forward because camping along trails is expected to be light and because of the added administrative cost of this type of restriction.
Consolidate the parallel routes in the Willow Divide area to lessen route density for wildlife habitat	Not carried forward because the routes are separated by topography that creates a physical separation and because wildlife habitat patches exist on either side of these two trails.
Recommend closing FR 611A On the North Side of the high point on Black Mesa, Before it wraps into the cut,... approx.. 1.5 miles up from closure shown on PA map. To improve WL security, improve walk-in hunting, and discourage illegal ATV use	Not carried forward in order to continue to provide road access to portions of Black Mesa.
For Fish Creek and Willow Creek areas, recommend pulling route closures and dispersed camping further back from riparian areas and streams and implementing impassable "hard" Barriers as necessary to prevent motorized trespass into closed areas. Hard closures should be installed on all closed routes to eliminate this illegal use. Increase enforcement presence and consequences for illegal use;  FR616 is unnecessary give the presence of 611 and 616 crosses high elevation meadow	Barriers at the head of Fish Creek are carried forward under all actions alternatives  FR616 is maintained open under all alternatives as connection to the GMUG forest and for recreation opportunity
Motor bikes could use the forest roads to get back down to the Dolores River instead of coming down Priest Gulch.	Not carried forward because motorcycles prefer trail riding experiences and because

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
	issues were not identified for Priest Gulch trail and its current use by motorcycles.
There are much better areas in the region for motorized recreation around Cortez, Stoner Mesa, and other drier zones that would have reduced potential environmental and social impact. It appears that where the recreational season is the longest, and the soil the driest, there are the least amount of trails for motorized users. We urge the USFS to consider moving motorized uses to those areas, reserving the fragile, often-wet high country trails for only non-motorized users	Not carried Forward because Desired Conditions in Forest Plan provide recreation experiences at higher elevations, which includes the ability to drive on Forest roads to camp, picnic, or access a trailhead and to ride ATVs or single-track motorcycles.
Closure of trails to motorcycle use should be 'off set' by miles elsewhere. - we feel strongly that there can be "no net loss" of motorized recreational opportunities with the Rico West Dolores Roads and Trails Project	Not carried forward because miles by themselves do not create a quality recreation experience
Consider separating uses and making some trails with an emphasis on motorcycle use and other trails with an emphasis on horse and still other with an emphasis on mountain bike etc.	Not carried forward because SJNF Forest Plan directs 'shared trail' management page 175 Desired Condition 3.2.3. Also NVUM survey respondents did not list overcrowding as an issue on the SJNF and overcrowding is not anticipated in the future on the RWD trails.
Currently there is no TH parking on lower end of Stoner Creek. Creating a parking area on Highway 145 and rerouting the lower section of Stoner Creek [around the private land] to this parking area would also provide for a nice quiet use experience. [Horse group]	Not carried forward because analysis narrowed to focus on motor vehicle use of trails and Stoner Creek is a nonmotorized trail.
Set a new 'desired condition' for Bear Creek. Emphasize a future 'gold?' catch and release native trout fishery. A gold medal fishery experience includes nonmotorized settings and also requires careful management of non-motorized activities to promote stream health and fish habitat	Not carried forward because fisheries managed by CPW, however Bear Creek would have a semiprimitive nonmotorized setting in Alternatives D and E.

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
<p>Increasing horse camping at Burro Bridge Campground would be a plus. There are two small corrals there, but maybe we can work together to add more, that are a bit larger, while making sure the area is conducive to rigs getting in and out.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because campground developments are outside the scope of this analysis. This idea has been forwarded to recreation staff for possible separate NEPA analysis in the future.</p>
<p>Regarding the proposed ATV and Side by Side loops and trails proposed to be open for vehicles less than 62", I would propose that full sized vehicles be allowed to use these loops and trails also. My reasoning behind these suggestions are; 1. As shown on the accompanying chart, the pressure, in pounds per square inch, placed on these roads is only slightly more for a full sized jeep than it is for an ATV and less than for a Side by Side. 2. Since most of the proposed loops and trails are on Class 1 Roads, which were constructed to carry heavy truck traffic, the width and base are capable of carrying full sized vehicles.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because nearby roads exist in the areas of the ATV trails so jeep riding opportunities are maintained. Its not just pounds per square inch but the width of full size vehicles that could result in increased trail maintenance to keep the route as a trail.</p>
<p>[Horse group writes] We'd love to see a nonmotorized trail designated connecting the lower sections of Section House, School House and Tenderfoot, so quiet users do not have to ride on the highway when accessing these trails. That would also provide a nice quiet, looped experience.</p>	<p>Not carried forward because scope of analysis was narrowed to not include new nonmotorized trails. In addition, this trail connection was evaluated in the field by recreation staff and terrain was too difficult for a trail alignment.</p>
<p>Recommends a 300 foot minimum set-back for dispersed camping from riparian areas and streams and this should be noted on MVUM. See also Fish Creek/Willow Creek high priority for camping setbacks.</p> <p>At the very least dispersed motorized camping should be prohibited along certain segments of routes where it is will result in resource impacts, result in conflict with private land or is impractical or unsustainable</p> <p>Use 300' setback from the West Dolores River and within 300' of open road should be used to guide where dispersed camping may be allowed</p>	<p>Carried forward at specific locations but not area-wide. Design features were added for specific roads with fens or unverified fens where parking for the purposes of dispersed camping would be eliminated. Nonsystem routes along the West Fork of Dolores River were also evaluated.</p>

Suggested Alternative Action	How Addressed
<p>Allow nonmotorized recreationists to access Winter trail through the Dunton property - Currently Dunton allows hikers to traverse the Resort to access Fall Creek road and the winter trail by traveling through Dunton and over the historical bridge over the West Fork. Most of the hikers on the Winter Trail are Dunton Resort guests. Without motorcycles on the trail as proposed, there is little need for the Winter Re-Route</p>	<p>Not carried forward because trailheads and new nonmotorized trails were eliminated from detailed study. Pursuing an easement for public parking would be a separate NEPA analysis and decision.</p>
<p>The PA current [Horse Creek] trail not only crosses our property without easement, but literally is at our doorstep. Re-routing of a portion of a single-track trail well around the dwellings would be greatly valued.</p>	<p>A realignment was not carried forward because of topography</p>
<p>I would love to see some work done on several trail heads to accommodate the parking of vehicles and trailers. The Johnnie Bull, School House, Section House, Wildcat, Tenderfoot trail heads are all ones that come to mind.</p>	<p>Outside Scope of Analysis – forwarded to recreation staff for possible future NEPA analysis and decision.</p>
<p>In the 2009 EA a “future opportunity” trail corridor was proposed to connect Winter Trail to Burro Campground. This should be considered as well. Commenter does not agree with location of nonmotorized trail around Dunton.</p>	<p>The 2009 idea was for a motorized/shared trail connection from Winter to FR535, not the nonmotorized connection proposed in PA that was later eliminated from further analysis.</p>
<p>Silver Creek/Circle Trail: A possible mountain bike and hike route with some work. Clustering quiet use makes more sense to me</p>	<p>Scope of project was narrowed so that new nonmotorized trails are not analyzed. In addition, there are no easements across private land for public recreation access to the adjacent NF lands on the east side of Rico.</p>
<p>Why not connect Lower Ryman 734 to a section of Salt Creek 733 leaving both 733 and 734 nonmotorized use only. Close the west intersection of trail 735 and 734 so that nonmotorized and motorized use traffic do not come in contact with each other. Provide better signage at the east intersection of 735 and 734 or maybe a turn style gate, access point</p>	<p>The main stem of the Ryman trail is positioned on soil layers in a manner that promotes ‘downcutting’ .</p>

<b>Suggested Alternative Action</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>
that is clear that 734 is only for foot traffic [and keep the main Ryman trail735 open to motorcycles]	
Wildcat/Smugglers Gulch to Montelores Bridge as shown in previous analysis should be considered...[for multiple use that includes motorcycles]	Not carried forward because of trail conditions and impacts to livestock distribution.
It would make more sense to have the proposed OHV extension (FS 496) continue on, the relatively short distance, to connect back to FS 578 at the south end of the extension	Not carried forward because field review in summer 2015 resulted in wetland impact concerns so a proposed OHV trail extension from FR496 was not analyzed in detail.