

Date submitted (UTC): 7/15/2016 8:07:27 PM

First name: Mark

Last name: Levin

Organization: Outlook Resources

Title: President

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: PO Box 1511

Address2:

City: Idaho Springs

State: CO

Province/Region:

Zip/Postal Code: 80452

Country: United States

Email: mark.levin@minenv.com

Phone: 3035701207

Comments:

1) This is to re-state my comments as entered into the record for the 2009 Rico-West Dolores Travel Management Plan process. See attached letter. The maps referenced in the attached 2009 letter are already in the possession of the USFS and should be used for planning this TMP. Several well-documented historic County roads in the Rico area have been left off the maps in all alternatives - that should be corrected. These include the Silver Creek Road and the Union Carbonate road.

These well established historic public roads cross both patented mining claims and USFS mineral fractions, and should be clearly indicated as accessible for motorized use.

The Burns Canyon Road (well documented as a former segment of state highway) running past the Saint Louis Tunnel and continuing to USFS and private lands to the north, is also omitted and should be included in the map. It is presently gated off, blocking lawful public access. This gate should be removed.

Additionally, there is ample evidence in the referenced maps to demonstrate that the Aztec mine road and the Horse Creek road are well established historic public roads used to access patented mining properties and lands open to mineral location - those should be designated for motorized access as well.

2) Among the listed alternatives, A would be preferable, however, more motorized access is desirable.

3) In many cases, there is little or no difference between what a motorcycle can access and a small single rider ATV can access. It should be clarified that motorcycle access includes single rider ATVs.

4) Similarly, there is little difference between what a modern 2-person ATV can access and what a historic small width Jeep or similar very small 4x4 rig can access (example, a Willys CJ-2A has only a 59 inch width, versus a Polaris RZR 900 at 60 inches and Kawasaki Mule at 64 inches). It should thus be permissible to drive a very small Jeep or similar vehicle on the same trail as designated for a 2-person side-by-side ATV, since the dimensions are similar (in fact, some side-by-side ATVs are up to 66 inches wide).

The criteria for what is allowed to be driven should be based on a max width. Probably, if some 2-person ATVs are in the 66 inch range, just set that as a vehicle width limit for the trails instead of specifying type of vehicle. Allowing small jeeps will have less impact than the side-by-side ATVs anyway, they are quieter and they go slower! That criterion would still keep the bloated, modern SUVs off those trails.