

APPENDIX: PUBLIC SCOPING RESPONSES

We received the following comments:

1. Wendell Funk, 3-10-03
2. Colorado Division of Wildlife, 3-25-03

The following are public comments:

1a. “Purpose and need - How is visual quality improved by: Enlarging gravel pits, improving travel speed and commercial use on scenic byway?”

Response: For enlarging gravel pits see the Visual specialists report.

Improving travel speed: The speed limit on the roads would not change with increased maintenance of the roads. Increase maintenance would reduce the dust concentrations, and therefore increasing the scenic quality of the byway.

Commercial use: Commercial use as well as recreational use is a contributing factor to the wear on the road surface. These public roads are open to commercial, recreational and private use.

1b. “Roads - Washboards and dust would not long be suppressed by a coat of gravel.”

Response: see Transportation report in Chapter 3.

1c. “Why should the national public’s resources (i.e. gravel and visual quality) be used to enhance commercial use without compensation?”

Response: see 1a.

1d. “Reduce road mileage would save funds for improving naturalness, scenic, wildlife habitat and backcountry recreation.”

Response: Reducing road mileage has already been decided in the “Travel Management for the Parks and Yampa Ranger Districts”.

1e. “Proposed Action - The map (poor): where are the gravel pits and Dunckley Pass road?”

Response: We apologize for the quality of the map. The small scale was due to the large area covered by the project. The gravel pits are located on the map and the legal is listed in the letter. Dunckley Pass road goes by all the listed stockpile sites and the northern most pit.

1f. “How much (acres) would the pits be enlarged and how many miles of roads are to be graveled?”

Response: See the propose action, Chapter 1, for gravel pit sizes and the transportation report for miles of roads.

1g. “Are these improved (?) roads of key value to the national public?”

Response: These roads are much more enjoyable if you can see the vistas (no dust). Safer road surfaces decrease vehicle damage and increase the enjoyment of scenic driving.

1h. “What is envisioned a rehabilitation for the pits?”

Response: The pits will be reseeded. This might be completed by hydro mulching (spraying of seed and fertilizer). The road into the Rough Creek Pit will be recontoured.

1i. “What are the alternatives under consideration?”

Response: See Chapter 2, Alternatives.

1j. “Land and Resource Mgt. Plan – How does the proposed project truly enhance 1.32, 4.2 and 5.11 management areas?”

Response: See the purpose and need for compliance with the forest plan and objectives.

1k. “Must we destroy the landscape (enlarge gravel pits & improved (?) roads) in order to save it (cira-vietNam villages!)?”

Response: The pit enlargements would be rehabilitated. If these pits are not reentered we would not have the funds to rehabilitate them. The effects are temporary and they are minimized with mitigations.

1l. “Preliminary issues - Even with good intentions

Response: See Chapter 2, Alternatives.

2a. “There should be no key impacts to wildlife. However there may be impacts on some hunters from the projects operation of the pits, the crusher and road maintenance. To mitigate this impact, we encourage you, if at all possible, to avoid operation during the hunting seasons, which run from the third weekend in October through the middle of November.”

Response: See best management practices. It is unlikely that any operations would be performed at that time of year due to weather. The crushing operation is planned for the early field season.