

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

7 OAKS A

0.36 multi-use trail miles

Alternative A follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation and Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Even though adjacent to the river, proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible.



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 17% TS 1; 11% TS 5; 71% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure; proximity to highway would make soft surface difficult to impossible to maintain.
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$5,828,861 High, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

7 OAKS B

0.42 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the primary 7 Oaks subdivision road through the neighborhood to the boundary of OST property, Crystal River Parcel 1.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation and Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** Minor impact to RR and Wagon Road



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would share a road and bridge with local subdivision traffic (low speed/volume); use interface with driveways
- **Trail User Types:** Slower traffic speeds and lower traffic counts would allow most users to co-exist
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Brings trail users into a more "private" subdivision environment and away from scenic river, but also away from the Hwy 133.
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Existing soft surface road possibly replaced with asphalt surface, minor drainage improvements; replace one short roadway bridge. Typical Sections: 99% TS 0; 1% TS 8.
- **Geotechnical:** Road appears stable in most locations; will need to be drilled at vehicular bridge location
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Existing road is already soft surface, requiring no new surface
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$935,910 Low; due to road/trail platform already in place
- **Maintenance:** Maintenance can remain as currently exists, would need to be worked out as part of an agreement
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Would require use agreements between County and road owners

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

CRYSTAL RIVER PARCEL A

0.29 multi-use trail miles

Alternative A follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation and Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users will be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail and may limit use by equestrians.
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Even though adjacent to the river, proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail.
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible, potential to use Open Space to gain more separation from highway



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Typical Sections: 73% TS 2; 27% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure; proximity to highway would make soft surface difficult to maintain
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required in some locations



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$1,976,876 - Moderate, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW and OST property

CRYSTAL RIVER PARCEL B

0.22 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B traverses Crystal River Parcel OS beginning on the original Rock Creek County Road down to the railroad grade along the river.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to high-quality riparian habitat and river frontage
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Most of the alignment follows existing social trails or roads where vegetation is disturbed and no new impacts to vegetation communities or riparian vegetation would occur. Passes through an upland area with a diverse native plant community, where a social trail exists. The fringe wetlands along the ditch may be avoided using bridges or other trail design criteria. The alignment may cross through FSS Harrington's penstemon and Grand Mesa penstemon habitat, but there is a low risk of impacts to these species.
- **Wildlife and Vegetation Mitigation:** Clearance surveys for species of concern, plant surveys, specific best management practices (BMPs) for construction and weed management, seasonal construction windows, design considerations for engineering and placement of improvements.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to Rock Creek County Road and ditches
- **Cultural Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be fully separated from vehicular traffic
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would traverse Open Space and look down on river
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Follows route of Rock Creek County Road; alignment on hillside crosses several ravines/drainages; may require additional study to determine best connection down to existing RR grade. Typical Sections: 7% TS 1; 53% TS 2; 33% TS 3; 6% TS7.
- **Geotechnical:** Variable terrain, potentially unstable in some areas
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$799,635 - Moderate, follows route of Rock Creek County Road; access somewhat remote and wooded/vegetated
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** OST property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

NETTLE CREEK A

0.84 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians.
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail.
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** High, due to limited space, many complex structural options available. Typical Section: 21% TS 2; 33% TS 5; 46% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure; proximity to highway would make soft surface difficult to impossible to maintain.
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required.



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$9,908,676 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options.
- **Mitigation:** Opportunities are available to realign Hwy 133 to allow for a less expensive trail typical section.
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property; more complex if highway realigned

NETTLE CREEK B

0.86 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the historic Rock Creek County Road alignment through private property on the east side of the Crystal River.



ENVIRONMENTAL*

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur. Riparian vegetation is present along the road, but the trail would result in no new impacts.*
- **Cultural Resources:** Not Evaluated



USER EXPERIENCE*

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be fully separated from vehicular traffic
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would follow Rock Creek County Road route and look down on the river
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING*

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; most of trail is old transportation platforms. Typical Section: 36% TS 0; 32% TS 1; 42% TS 2.
- **Geotechnical:** Existing road grades are likely stable
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS*

- **Construction Costs:** \$943,521 - Low; most of trail is old transportation platform
 - **Maintenance:** Coordination with property owner necessary
 - **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Would require use agreements between County and homeowners
- * No on-the-ground surveys occurred across private property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

RED WIND POINT A

0.93 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Moderate to high, due to limited space, many complex structural options available; mix of easy and difficult. Typical Sections 1% TS 1; 33% TS 2; 21% TS 3; 3% TS 5; 42% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure; proximity to highway would make soft surface difficult to impossible to maintain.
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$9,810,034 - Moderate to high, due to limited space, many complex structural options available
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

RED WIND POINT B

0.95 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the Rock Creek County Road/RR grade through Forest Service, OST's Red Wind Point Open Space and the Crystal River Flats Rec Easement.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Impact to undisturbed habitat and river frontage, and proximity to bighorn production area
- **Wildlife Mitigation:** Monitoring to see if the area is used for lambing, permanently close upper bluffs to humans, stock tank/guzzler water for supplemental water, extension of seasonal closure and mitigation commitment to monitor yearly if the ewes and lambs are present or absent before a seasonal closure is lifted.
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing trail/RR grade and construction footprint would be limited to trail when possible. Minimal native and riparian vegetation would be removed. Weed control BMPs would reduce the risk of noxious weeds spreading. Wetlands would be avoided where possible, and any impacts would be mitigated.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to East Mesa Ditch, railroad, and Rock Creek County Road.
- **Cultural Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be fully separated from vehicular traffic
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would follow Rock Creek County Road route and old RR grade and look down on the river.
- **Seasonal Use:** Seasonally closed for wildlife protection, Dec. 1 - April 30



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; most is on RR grade. Typical Sections: 2% TS 1; 80% TS 2; 17% TS 4.
- **Geotechnical:** May be some rockfall areas
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$2,255,690 - Low; most is on RR grade
- **Maintenance:** May be some rockfall areas
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** OST and USFS property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

CRYSTAL RIVER COUNTRY ESTATES A

0.45 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 29% TS 2; 3% TS 5; 68% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$8,144,590 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

CRYSTAL RIVER COUNTRY ESTATES B

0.61 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the subdivision road to where it meets with private property before entering the Mertz recreation easement, which borders WRNF lands.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** Least Impactful



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would share a road with local subdivision traffic (low speed/volume); low number of driveways, separation from the highway
- **Trail User Types:** Steep grade at south end may not meet ADA
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Most of alignment along the river; south end brings trail users into a more "private" subdivision environment and away from scenic river; very close to one home and garage

- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; most is on existing road or RR grade. Typical Sections: 76% TS 0; 7% TS 1; 2% TS 2; 15% TS 5.
- **Geotechnical:** Existing road grades are likely stable
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Existing road is already soft surface, requiring no new surface
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Not at river; replacing road with asphalt surface will slightly increase runoff



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$856,118 - Low, most is on existing road or RR grade
- **Maintenance:** Maintenance can remain as currently exists, would need to be worked out as part of an agreement
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Would require use agreements between County and homeowners

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

ANDREWS A

0.61 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 29% TS 2; 1% TS 4; 70% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** More impact with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) section than other structural sections. Further analysis required



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$9,410,595 - Moderate to high, due to limited space, many complex structural options available
- **Mitigation:** Opportunities are available to realign Hwy 133 to allow for a less expensive typical trail section.
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (road debris); structures need to accommodate snow removal equipment
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

ANDREWS B

0.48 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the RR grade through Forest Service lands and OST's Andrews Open Space before entering private lands along the east side of the river.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to undisturbed river frontage
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing RR grade, and construction would be limited to the footprint wherever possible. Tree removal would be avoided if possible. Adjacent riparian vegetation would not be disturbed. Habitat for FSS Grand Mesa penstemon is present, and it is likely that Harrington's penstemon is present. Mitigation for impacts to FSS species, if present, would reduce impacts.
- **Cultural Resources:** Least Impactful



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be fully separated from vehicular traffic on FS and OST lands
- **Trail User Types:** Steep grade at north end may not meet ADA
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would follow rail grade route and look down on the river
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; on RR grade. Typical Sections: 33% TS 1; 65% TS 2; 3% TS 7.
- **Geotechnical:** Existing RR grade likely stable
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes, may be limited in some areas
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$793,859 - Low; on RR grade
 - **Maintenance:** Low
 - **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Open Space, USFS, and private property. Would require use agreements between County and homeowners
- * No on-the-ground surveys occurred across private property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

PERHAM A

0.40 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Moderate to high, due to limited space, many complex structural options available; mix of easy and difficult. Typical Sections: 12% TS 2; 73% TS 3; 5% TS 5; 10% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Likely, more analysis needed (where adjacent to river)



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$2,185,668 - Moderate, due to limited space, many complex structural options available
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (road debris); structures need to accommodate snow removal equipment
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

PERHAM B

0.34 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the old RR grade along the east side of the river through private lands.



ENVIRONMENTAL *

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing RR grade where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** Not evaluated



USER EXPERIENCE *

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be fully separated from highway traffic, may need to share platform with private driveway
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would follow rail grade route through trees and meadows and look down on the river
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING *

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; most is on existing road or RR grade. Typical Sections: 60% TS 0; 13% TS 2; 28% TS 4.
- **Geotechnical:** Existing road/RR grades are likely stable
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS *

- **Construction Costs:** \$746,825 - Low; most is on existing road or RR grade
- **Maintenance:** Coordination with private property owner may be necessary
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS and private property. Would require use agreements between County and homeowners

* No on-the-ground surveys occurred across private property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

JANEWAY NORTH A

0.51 multi-use trail miles

Alternative A follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor buffer impacts to elk and bighorn winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane, multiple driveway crossings
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Much is on grade, with only minimal on structure. Typical Sections: 44% TS 1; 10% TS 2; 6% TS 3; 30% TS 5; 10% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Likely at southern end where highway is near river, more analysis needed



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$2,199,618 - Much is on grade, with only minimal on structure
- **Maintenance:** Low to moderate, depending on barrier type between highway (road debris); structures need to accommodate snow removal equipment
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

JANEWAY NORTH B

0.72 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the old RR grade through Forest Service Lands along the east side of the river.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Impact to high-quality, undisturbed habitat including potential T&E/FSS species
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment intersects a high-quality, diverse riparian forest with habitat for federally-listed and FSS species. Footprint of trail would be limited to the existing trail/RR grade, and disturbance to wetlands would be avoided. Impacts to wetlands would be avoided if possible, and mitigated if necessary. Removal of trees and native species is likely, and the trail would result in permanent loss of riparian vegetation along the trail width. Tree removal would be avoided to the extent possible. Weed control BMPs (Best Management Practices) would reduce the risk that noxious weeds would increase.
- **Mitigation:** Clearance surveys for species of concern, orchid and wetland surveys, seasonal construction windows, design considerations for engineering and placement of improvements.

- **Cultural Resources:** Least Impactful



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would have a separate route on the east side of the river
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Trail would follow railgrade route through trees and riparian area
- **Seasonal Use:** Seasonally closed for wildlife protection, Nov 15 to May 1



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low to moderate at north end. Typical Sections: 76% TS 2; 24% TS 4.
- **Geotechnical:** Some complexities toward north where no RR grade exists
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Limited width on old RR grade
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Not likely



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$1,722,610 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

JANEWAY SOUTH A

0.59 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor buffer impacts to elk and bighorn winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway will negatively impact the scenic quality from the trail
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Mostly on structures, many structural options available. Typical Sections: 12% TS 1; 23% TS 2; 14% TS 5; 12% TS6; 52% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Likely due to proximity to highway, more analysis needed



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$8,097,627 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options, mostly on structures
- ↓
- **Mitigation:** Opportunities are available to realign Hwy 133 to allow for a less expensive typical trail section.
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS; possibly more complex if highway realigned

JANEWAY SOUTH B

0.50 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the old railroad grade and previous Rock Creek County Road through Forest Service Lands.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to undisturbed habitat and river frontage
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Trail is adjacent to riparian area on south side, but would not result in new impacts to vegetation. No wetlands are within alignment. The plant community is diverse and dominated by natives, with noxious weeds present. Design criteria would reduce or eliminate impacts by containing the trail footprint and construction activities to the existing RR grade.
- **Cultural Resources:** Least Impactful



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be on the east side of the river on the Rock Creek County Road/old RR grade, through a large meadow
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic trail route through a large meadow with a historic structure
- **Seasonal Use:** Seasonally closed for wildlife protection, Nov 15 to May 1



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low. Typical Sections: 18% TS 1; 68% TS 2; 6% TS 3; 9% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Some potentially unstable slopes above at south end
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Not likely



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$1,355,195 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS, OST property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

AVALANCHE A

0.97 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Overlook of rapids below (could offset proximity to highway and noise from highway)
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult; locations exist that could potentially provide some separation from the highway



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 5% TS 1; 43% TS 2; 1% TS 3; 16% TS 5; 35% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Potential rockfall hazards from opposite side of highway
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Possible in some areas



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$8,155,968 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options.
- **Mitigation:** Opportunities are available to realign portions of Hwy 133 to allow for a less expensive typical trail section.
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (road debris); structures need to accommodate snow removal equipment
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property, possibly more complex if highway realigned

AVALANCHE B

1.35 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B pulls away from the river along the realigned Avalanche Creek Road, crosses the creek and then follows the old Rock Creek County Road alignment toward the river.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Impact to elk winter range, bighorn migration corridor, and undisturbed high-quality habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** The alignment north of Avalanche Creek is in a previously disturbed area and would not result in new disturbance. The alignment south of Avalanche Creek intersects a diverse and mostly-native plant community with several CNHP species and a variety of forbs, shrubs, and trees. High-quality habitat for native species and for FSS Harrington's penstemon and Grand Mesa penstemon, as well as the rare plant large flower globemallow are present throughout the area.
- **Wildlife and Vegetation Mitigation:** Extend seasonal closures to match other areas with similar management concerns (closed to people Nov 15 - May 1), commitment to enforcement to help with current issues; clearance surveys for species of concern, plant surveys, seasonal construction windows, design considerations for engineering and placement of improvements.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to Rock Creek County Road
- **Cultural Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail user would share road platform until crossing Avalanche Creek, then very secluded trail
- **Trail User Types:** Steep grade after Avalanche Creek may not meet ADA
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Extremely scenic trail corridor, away from highway, creek crossing
- **Seasonal Use:** Avalanche Creek Road is seasonally closed to dogs and vehicles for wildlife protection, Nov 15 to May 1, the road remains open to humans year-round.



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low to moderate, follows Rock Creek County Road and RR grade. Typical Sections: 24% TS 1; 58% TS 2; 3% TS 3; 4% TS 5; 11% TS 7.
- **Geotechnical:** Potential rockfall hazards from above
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Not at Avalanche Creek, but elsewhere at high flows



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$5,058,441 - Moderate, access may be difficult
- **Maintenance:** Potential rockfall at several locations
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS and private property. Would require use agreements between County and homeowner

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

NARROWS A

0.58 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way through a very narrow section of the corridor.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Overlook of rapids below (could offset proximity to highway and noise from highway)
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult to impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 4% TS 1; 23% TS 2; 3% TS 3; 71% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Potential rockfall hazards from opposite side of highway
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$10,838,585 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

NARROWS B

0.62 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the old RR grade at the base of the steep hillside.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Impact to winter ranges, bighorn migration corridor, and undisturbed habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Construction footprint would be limited to the existing trail/RR grade disturbance. High-quality vegetation, which is characterized by sparse native shrubs and trees, is present along the trail but would not be removed or disturbed. Weed control BMPs would reduce the risk of noxious weeds spreading. Habitat for FSS Harrington's penstemon and Grand Mesa penstemon is present, but it is not likely that these species, if present, would be impacted by the trail.
- **Wildlife and Vegetation Mitigation:** Seasonal closures to match other areas with similar management concerns (closed to people Nov 15 - May 1), using lower grade for trail instead of upper grade, plant surveys, design considerations for engineering and placement of improvements.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to Rock Creek County Road / railroad
- **Cultural Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail user would have separate route on the east side of the river
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Extremely scenic trail corridor, above river, views up pass
- **Seasonal Use:** Currently no seasonal closures



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low, follows Rock Creek County Road and RR grade; may require additional study to determine "low" or "high" bench alignment. Typical Sections: 97% TS 1; 3% TS 2.
- **Geotechnical:** Potential rockfall hazards from above
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$442,822 - Low; Access may be difficult
- **Maintenance:** Potential rockfall onto trail several locations
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS and private property. Would require use agreements between County and homeowners

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

FILOHA A

1.04 multi-use trail miles

Alternative A follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way past Penny Hot Springs.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and highway crossing
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane.
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Views across the river and up the pass would be nice, proximity to highway traffic would be impactful
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult, OST property could potentially provide a location for separation from highway



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Mix of low to high sections; Penny Hot Springs likely most difficult location. 28% TS 2; 3% TS 3; 30% TS 5; 38% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Many unknowns until drilled; potential rockfall hazards from opposite side of highway at Penny Hot Springs
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Possible in isolated areas



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$10,474,103 - Mix of simple and difficult sections; Penny Hot Springs likely most difficult location
- **Maintenance:** Low to moderate, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS, OST property

FILOHA B

1.18 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the current seasonal use trail and old Rock Creek County Road alignment through Filoha Meadows Open Space.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Impact to undisturbed habitat and bighorn mineral lick
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing trail/RR grade through degraded vegetation community dominated by non-native species and noxious weeds. Previous disturbances and the distance from wetlands/riparian areas would minimize impacts to vegetation community. Weed control BMPs would be used, and revegetation/restoration after construction would use native vegetation. This may have the potential to improve vegetation community characteristics.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to Rock Creek County Road and stage stop
↓
- **Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail user would have separate route on the east side of the river
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Extremely scenic trail corridor, through large meadow, views up pass
- **Seasonal Use:** Seasonally closed for wildlife protection, Oct. 1 - June 30



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low. Typical Sections: 100% TS 2.
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$1,460,428 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low (no maintenance needed during seasonal closure)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** OST property

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

WILD ROSE A

1.22 multi-use trail miles

Segment follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way up to the Redstone North Bridge.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk highway crossing and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be directly adjacent to highway traffic lane
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Overlook of rapids below (could offset proximity to highway and noise from highway)
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use difficult



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Structural options are available. Typical Sections: 7% TS 1; 22% TS 2, 5% TS 3; 30% TS 5; 36% TS 6.
- **Geotechnical:** Rockfall hazards from opposite side of highway; mudslides
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Not where trail is on structure
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Possible in some areas on south end where highway is closer to river; more analysis needed



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$13,615,192 - High, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high; yearly rockfall and mudflow are anticipated
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW, USFS property

WILD ROSE B

1.27 multi-use trail miles

Alternative B follows the old Crystal River RR right-of-way easement through the Wild Rose Subdivision.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** Least Impactful



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would share a road and bridge with local subdivision use
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic neighborhood and views up the pass
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low-moderate, quite narrow in some areas. Typical Sections: 72% TS 0; 28% TS 2.
- **Geotechnical:** Likely none
- **Potential for adjacent soft surface:** Yes
- **Hydrologic Impact:** Not at river; replacing road with asphalt surface will slightly increase runoff



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$1,321,909 - Low; due to road/trail platform already in place
- **Maintenance:** Low to moderate depending on the seasonal use
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Recreation easement held by Pitkin County

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

CASTLE A

0.98 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the west side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur. A willow riparian area is located adjacent to the trail south of Redstone. Impacts would be minimized or avoided through trail design.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and Castle; proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$128,999 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

CASTLE B

1.01 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows Redstone Castle Dr. As the Drive turns to head east to the Castle, the trail alternative would stay south and would follow an existing two-track.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor buffer impact to high-quality habitat area
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road, and existing social trail/RR grade for most of its length. It parallels but avoids wetlands along the river. The alignment goes through a high-quality area, but because it would be contained to existing road and trail, new disturbance would be minimal. No tree and minimal vegetation removal would be required for trail construction.
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate impact to Redstone Blvd/Road to Cleveholm
- **Mitigation:** A combination of detailed documentation (e.g. measured drawings of significant features and photographs) and interpretive signage would likely mitigate any potential impacts to these resources.



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would share an existing, neighborhood dirt road
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic neighborhood and views of the Castle and up the pass
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$32,143 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Would require use agreements between County and road owners

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

HAWK CREEK A

0.48 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the west side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW, limited trail clearance
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and canyon; proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Highway pinch point may require structural section and roadway crossing may need to be designed
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$221,845 - Moderate, due to limited space and complex structural options
- **Maintenance:** Moderate to high, depending on barrier type between highway (to control road debris)
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW and OST property

HAWK CREEK B

0.53 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows an existing two-track before crossing Hawk Creek and connecting to Beaver Dr and then Antelope Dr back to Hwy 133.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing road where vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would share an existing, neighborhood dirt road, may pass very close to one house
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic east side of the river separated from the highway
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; may require one small bridge crossing
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$72,016 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** Would require use agreements between County and private owners

* No on-the-ground surveys occurred across private property

HAYS FALLS A

0.57 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the east side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way and crosses near the falls back to the west side of Hwy 133 .



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed, and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW, limited trail clearance
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and canyon; proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Highway pinch point may require structural section and roadway crossing will need to be designed
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$90,841 - Medium
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

BEAR CREEK A

1.40 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the west side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way with one road crossing where the highway crosses the Crystal River.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and canyon, proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Highway pinch point may require structural section and roadway crossing may need to be designed
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$259,044 - Medium
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

BEAR CREEK B

1.45 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows an existing Rock Creek County Road cut across the National Forest.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Buffer impact to potential lynx/FSS habitat
- **Mitigation:** Clearance surveys for species of concern, work with Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife and review lynx data
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing social trail/railroad grade through a diverse vegetation community where habitat for FSS Harrington's penstemon is present (but no individuals were observed during surveys). Disturbance would be limited to existing trail footprint, and little if any vegetation would be removed.
- **Cultural Resources:** Minor impact to Rock Creek Wagon Road



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would use existing Rock Creek County Road cut, fully separated from highway
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Very scenic trail through the forest with beautiful view up the pass
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low; may require a few trail bridge crossing
- **Geotechnical:** A few chutes that may need to be bridged
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$209,031 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS property

PLACITA A

0.64 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the west side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk winter range and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and Placita area and pass; proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$84,757 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

EVALUATION SUMMARY:

McCLURE PASS A

4.27 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor to potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Vegetation is disturbed and no new impacts to vegetation communities would occur.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Scenic views of river and canyon; proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Highway pinch point may require structural section and roadway crossing may need to be designed
- **Geotechnical:** Rock fall areas on the pass
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$451,601 - Moderate-High due to the distance required
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW

McCLURE PASS B

2.52 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the existing two-track old Hwy 133 switchbacks up to the pullout area near the top of the pass.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to elk migration corridor and potential lynx habitat
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment follows existing trail/wagon road grade for most of its length. It would cross Harrington's penstemon habitat. None were observed during surveys. Impacts would be minimized or avoided by trail design criteria.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would use existing old highway cut, fully separated from existing highway
- **Trail User Types:** All users
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Very scenic trail with beautiful views of the valley floor
- **Seasonal Use:** Year-round use



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



ESTIMATED COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$79,905 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Low
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** USFS

TOP OF McCLURE A

0.27 singletrack trail miles

Alternative follows the west side of the Hwy 133 right-of-way.



ENVIRONMENTAL

- **Wildlife:** Minor impact to habitat for lynx and FSS species
- **Vegetation/Wetlands:** Alignment would avoid new disturbance to vegetation in this high-quality and biologically diverse area. Design criteria would reduce or eliminate impacts to Grand Mesa penstemon and large flower globemallow. It is not likely that these would be found within the alignment.
- **Cultural Resources:** No impact



USER EXPERIENCE

- **Safety/Comfort:** Trail users would be in the highway ROW
- **Trail User Types:** Proximity to highway may limit use by equestrians
- **Scenic Quality/Ambiance:** Proximity to highway and noise would be a drawback
- **Seasonal Use:** Proximity to highway would make winter use impossible



ENGINEERING

- **Design Difficulty:** Low
- **Geotechnical:** None
- **Hydrologic Impact:** None



COSTS

- **Construction Costs:** \$28,974 - Low
- **Maintenance:** Moderate
- **Property/Easement Acquisition:** CDOT ROW and USFS