

Blue Sky Trailhead Discussion

OLAB, May 27, 2010

Assumptions:

- 1) The Blue Sky Trailhead will primarily serve visitors accessing the Blue Sky Trail. There will likely be some day use park visitors that use it to park and access the reservoir, and potentially bikers that park and ride to HTMOS to avoid the fee, but these are assumed to be negligible.
- 2) Projected revenue has many assumptions including varying levels of visitation throughout the year, amount of enforcement and patrol needed. The numbers are our best guess at this time until area actually opens to the public.

	Pro's	Con's
Option 1 <i>Fee, Day Use Area</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self service pay vault • Ranger enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area would potentially generate at least \$7,450 per year based on revenue collected at Soderberg trail head in 2009 • Consistent with OLAB (8/04) & BOCC (9/04) recommendations re: open space areas adjacent to fee areas • Consistent with current fee management at Soderberg & Ramsay-Shockey OS's • Visitors having to pay fee could limit capacity of # people on a very busy trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public must pay a fee, potential loss of Department support • Need to install self-serve permit vault and appropriate signage at an estimated \$3,500 one time cost (would need to be allocated) • Not consistent with the way HTMOS fees are collected, high use could dictate need for gatehouse • Does not alleviate the problem of fee avoiders parking illegally to avoid a fee (safety, increased enforcement, etc) • Higher operations' costs for increased ranger patrol
Option 2 <i>Fee, Day Use Area</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self service pay vault • Gatehouse with attendant on weekends • Ranger enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area would potentially generate more than \$7,450 per year based on revenue collected at Soderberg trail head in 2009 • Consistent with OLAB (8/04) & BOCC (9/04) recommendations re: open space areas adjacent to fee areas • Consistent with current fee management at HTMOS and reservoir access points • Visitors having to pay fee could limit capacity of # people on a very busy trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public must pay a fee, potential loss of Department support • Need to install self-service vault and appropriate signage at an estimated \$3,500 one time cost (would need to be allocated) • Need to install gatehouse at an estimated \$10,000 one time cost (would need to be allocated) • Current design does not include space for a gatehouse • Does not alleviate the problem of fee avoiders parking illegally to avoid a fee (safety, increased enforcement, etc) • Higher operations' costs for increased ranger patrol and to pay gatehouse attendant on peak season weekends
Option 3 <i>No Fee, Day Use Area</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less Ranger enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes public good will for the Dept of Natural Resources • Since most users are expected to use the BST, it is more consistent with the no fee policy at the Devil's Backbone OS and Coyote Ridge NA (to which the trail connects). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not consistent with OLAB (8/04) & BOCC (9/04) recommendations re: open space areas adjacent to fee areas (HTMOS, Soderberg and Ramsay-Shockey OS) • No revenue generated except special events, etc. • Once it's free it would be hard to change the no fee policy unless done throughout all open spaces w/extensive public process

