DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
For

Hayman Fire Roads Management Project
Douglas and Teller County, Colorado

USDA FOREST SERVICE
PIKES PEAK RANGER DISTRICT
PIKE NATIONAL FOREST

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Hayman Fire began in the Pike National Forest on June 8, 2002 and burned approximately 138,000 acres of private, state, and National Forest System (NFS) lands in Park, Jefferson, Douglas, and Teller Counties, Colorado. About 72% of the burn occurred on NFS lands managed by the South Platte, South Park, and Pikes Peak Ranger Districts of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC).

The NFS lands affected by the Hayman Fire contain approximately 260 miles of classified (Forest system) roads and 35 miles of unclassified (non-Forest system) roads. In addition to the effects of the fire, heavy rains during the summer of 2003 and 2004 have caused extensive flash flooding and subsequent road damage and public safety risk. Because many of these roads have remain closed to motorized vehicles and have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair, a **roads analysis** was completed by the USDA Forest Service in October 2003 to assess the current and desired future condition of the road system in the burn area.

The Hayman Roads Analysis Report examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes. In January 2004, the Forest Service developed a proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report for maintaining and upgrading roads as well as closing, restricting or decommissioning roads within the Hayman burn area.

The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project that was released for public review in July 2004. The EA addresses approximately 130 miles of classified roads and 35 miles of unclassified roads within the Hayman burn area. The EA describes the proposed action and the potential environmental effects. The EA also describes the alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment.

Decision

It is my decision to implement Alternative C (proposed action in the EA) with some changes to the road management recommendations. I selected Alternative C as modified, because it addresses comments received on the EA and additional analysis by the interdisciplinary team. This decision applies only to those roads that are located on the Pikes Peak Ranger District of the Pike National Forest. This decision will affect approximately 36 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. This decision was made following thorough review of the EA and the PSICC Forest Plan, supporting materials referenced by the EA, and reviewing comments from the public (see Appendix A: Response to Comments).

The features of this decision are as follows:

The following Forest Service Roads (FSR) will be "maintained as is": **Laura Lane** (FSR 332 – 1.59 miles); **Linda Spur** (FSR 332.CA – 0.61 miles); **Connector** (FSR 332.D – 0.32 miles); **Manitou Destructor** (FSR 341.A – 1.85 miles); **Chair** (FSR 341.B – 0.21 miles); **Turkey Track Spur North** (FSR 343.A – 2.58 miles); **Turkey Track Spur South** (FSR 343.B – 0.48 miles – except for southern 0.2 mile segment which is being converted to a motorized trail); **Trout Creek Ranch** (FSR 352 – 0.39 miles); **Cemetery** (FSR 352.A – 0.26 miles); **Lost** (FSR 357.J – 1 mile); **Elvis** (FSR 357.K – 0.26 miles); **Camp** (FSR 357.L – 0.24 miles), **District Boundary** (FSR 360.A – 1.72 miles); **District Boundary Spur** (FSR 360.B – 0.90 miles); **Signal View** (FSR 362.B – 0.14 miles); **No Name** (FSR 366 – 4.98 miles); **Cow Elk** (FSR 366.AB – 0.56 miles); **Nice Buck** (FSR 366.B – 0.18 miles); **Spike Bull** (FSR 366.C – 0.42 miles); **Little Creek** (FSR 366.D – 0.72 miles); **Chestnut** (FSR 367 – 3.78 miles); and **Mistletoe** (FSR 391.A – 1.16 miles).

The following roads will be "closed year-round" to public use and will be maintained for administrative and permitted access only: **Drury** (FSR 349 – 1.36 miles) and **MEF North Road** (FSR 388 – 1.10 miles).

The following roads will be "decommissioned": **Emily Camp** (FSR 200.B – 1.08 miles); **Whitney Way** (FSR 340.C – 0.45 miles); **Mistake** (FSR 343.A1 – 0.24 miles); **Hunting** (FSR 343.A2 – 0.67 miles); **Anita** (FSR 350.C – 0.80 miles); **Dycks Drive** (FSR 357.I – 0.55 miles); **Wildhorn Campground** (access road) (FSR 361.A – 0.21 miles), **Cow** (FSR 362.C – 0.20 miles); **Calf** (FSR 362.D – 0.46 miles); **Valley** (FSR 364.B – 0.62 miles); **No Name Spur** (FSR 366.A – 2.07 miles); and **Bull Elk** (FSR 366.AA – 0.45 miles).

The following roads will be converted to motorized trails: **What** (FSR 340.B – 1.13 miles) and the southern segment of **Turkey Track Spur South** (FSR 343.B – 0.2 miles) in order maintain a connecting motorized vehicle route in the area.

All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

Reason for the Decision

In making this decision, I considered the variety of recreation experiences offered, natural resource effects, visitor safety, and other environmental and social effects. I also considered issues raised through public involvement which included comments from the general public, environmental groups, off-highway vehicle groups, state and local governments, tribes, and consultation with regulatory agencies.

Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Alternative C as modified meets the ***purpose*** of the project which is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3). The modified alternative will also meet the ***need*** for this project which is to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Many of the actions in this decision were derived from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report which provides recommendations for a road system that is safe, responsive to public and agency needs, is environmentally sound, and is affordable and efficient to manage. In my determination, the approved action will maintain an efficient flow of motorized recreation routes throughout the burn area thus providing safe and adequate public access to National Forest System lands while addressing many water quality and resource concerns (EA, Chapter 4). The numerous land management requirements including Forest Plan standards and guidelines, regulations, Best Management Practices, additional mitigation measures, and adaptive management techniques will ensure protection of soils, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat during road reconstruction, maintenance or decommission activities (EA, Appendix C).

Other Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were considered in detail (the No Action, the Proposed Action, and two alternatives to the Proposed Action). Four alternatives were also considered but eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need of this project. All the alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from further consideration are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pages 2-1 through 2-6).

Alternatives considered in detail include the following:

- Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue the present management situation. The current road closures would remain in place, with no reconstruction or

decommission of classified or unclassified roads. Water quality, soil erosion, and recreation access concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Under Alternative B, the road system would be managed according to the road maintenance levels that existed before the Hayman Fire. Recreation access concerns would be addressed but many of the water quality and soil erosion concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Alternative C as modified represents a balance of recreation access needs and natural resource concerns and meets the purpose and need of this project.

- Alternative D is similar to Alternative C except for additional road closures and decommissions. Water quality and soil erosion concerns would be addressed but many of the recreation access needs would not be sufficiently addressed.

Public Involvement

Scoping for this analysis was initiated on January 15, 2004 with a legal notice and mailing to interested parties. Two public open houses during scoping were also held in Denver and Colorado Springs on January 21 and 22, 2004 respectively, and were attended by over 700 people. Approximately 1500 persons or organizations responded with comments during the scoping process. (The public involvement effort is documented in the EA on page 1-4).

A majority of the comments received focused on roads in the Wildcat Canyon area such as Metberry, Longwater, Hackett and Corral Creek roads. These roads are not located on the Pikes Peak Ranger District.

On July 12, 2004 over 900 mailings were sent out to individuals, agencies, organizations, tribes and elected officials explaining that the EA was available for public review and comment. The full EA was also posted on the Internet and was available for distribution at the three Pike National Forest Ranger District offices. The EA was available for public review and comment from July 15, 2004 to August 16, 2004. The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the interdisciplinary environmental analysis, review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria for significant effects, and my knowledge of the expected impacts, I have determined that this action does not pose a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

CONTEXT
This project is local and would affect approximately ½ of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the 2002 Hayman fire. The NFS lands affected by the Hayman fire account

for approximately 12% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. This decision would affect approximately 36 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the Hayman area portion of the Pikes Peak Ranger District. The NFS lands managed by the Pikes Peak Ranger District that were affected by the Hayman fire account for about 2% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. Project duration is expected to be 3 to 5 years, but could take up to 10 years to complete depending on funding. Although the project has regional and some national interest, the people most affected by the project would be primarily local residents and recreationists from Woodland Park and the Colorado Springs and Denver metropolitan area.

INTENSITY

Environmental Effects

I find that Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

Rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams. The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31). Furthermore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service have concurred with our assessment in the EA that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl. Road rehabilitation and decommission activities could cause minor impacts or disturbances if sensitive wildlife species or habitats are involved. Mitigation measures for wildlife presented in the EA and Forest Plan direction will minimize any adverse impacts (EA, pgs. 2-3, 2-4).

The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species (EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all

roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4).

Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). By keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area, this will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the Pikes Peak Ranger District, such as Rainbow Falls and Gold Camp Road (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

In terms of tourism there would be no significant effects to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area (EA, pg. 4-60). This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under the selected alternative (EA, pg. 4-61). Since recreational use is not expected to change significantly, the economic contribution of recreational use in the Hayman area to the surrounding economy would be comparable to the level of activity supported before the 2002 Hayman Fire (EA, pg. 4-61).

The selected alternative would leave more level 2 roads open for motorized vehicle access compared to some of the other alternatives (EA, pg. 4-61). However, some individuals may still be forced to find substitute sites if roads are unavailable for their particular recreation use (EA, pg. 4-61). Substitute sites may offer continued activity, but would not replace the values, memories, and attachment people have accumulated in their original places (EA, pg. 4-61). As with any decision, it will be difficult to meet the demands of all interested parties, but the selected alternative offers a good balance of both recreational access needs and water quality protection concerns (EA, pg. 4-62).

The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64).

Public Health or Safety

This action does not pose a substantial question of significant effect upon public health or safety although it does have some benefits to public safety by providing a road system that reduces the number of road miles and/or properly rehabilitating those roads that are hydrologically-connected and thus prone to flash flooding and hazardous driving conditions. As mentioned in the EA, a primary purpose for this action arose from the road damage and subsequent public

safety risk caused by the Hayman fire and heavy rainfall during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (EA, pgs. 1-2, 1-3).

Unique Characteristics of the Area
There are no unique characteristics of the geographical area that will be significantly affected by the proposed actions. Historic or cultural resources will not be affected because sites will be avoided and mitigation measures (EA, see Chapter 2) will be taken to ensure that any eligible or potentially eligible heritage sites are not disturbed. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

Controversy
I recognize there is some level of public controversy associated with the management of roads. The benefits of forest roads are many. So too, are the ecological impacts of roads on our watersheds. Not all of the comments received were in full support of this project. After reviewing the project record and EA, I am confident the Interdisciplinary Team reviewed these comments and incorporated them into alternatives or addressed them in the appropriate resource section. It is my judgment, while portions of the public disagree with various components of the project, there does not exist an unusual or high degree of controversy related to this project.

Uncertainty
There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. All of the effects of the selected alternative are similar to those taken into consideration in the Forest Plan. Best Management Practices, mitigation measures, monitoring and adaptive management techniques will ensure effects are within expected parameters (EA, Appendix C).

Precedent
The selected alternative does not represent a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The assessment is site-specific and its actions incorporate those practices envisioned in the PSICC Forest Plan and are within the Standards and Guidelines included in the Forest Plan. Future similar projects would have to be evaluated under NEPA for the significance on the effects of those specific actions.

Cumulative Impact
There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project. The EA describes the anticipated cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4). The EA discloses (page 4-11) the cumulative effects of past logging, grazing, fire suppression, as well as wildfire and storm events, that have resulted in sediment delivery in the analysis area. However, I am satisfied, after reviewing the EA, that none of the cumulative effects of the roads decisions are significant. Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 4-11), “The cumulative long-term effects . . . of reducing sediment from roads and improving riparian conditions by closing, decommissioning, or improving maintenance under any of the action alternatives and other concurrent burn area restoration projects would be beneficial.”

Properties On or Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; Significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources
There are no known cultural resources that would be significantly affected by this project. If cultural resources are found during operations, work will be stopped and Forest Service archaeologists consulted.

Endangered or Threatened Species
I find the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or US Forest Service listed sensitive species or their critical habitat. The Biological Assessment (BA) supports this conclusion (the project record contains the BA). The action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Pawnee montane skipper, Mexican spotted owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, or the bald eagle. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with our assessment that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl (the project record contains the FWS concurrence letter). Therefore, I find that the action can be carried out with no significant adverse effect to federally listed species.

Legal requirements for environmental protection
Implementation of the selected alternative will not violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (pg. 1-2). This project is fully consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, pg. 1-4) and will comply with Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) (EA, page 2-3). As stated in the EA (page 2-3), "The effectiveness of BMP's and other [mitigation] measures [will] be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act".

In arriving at this conclusion, I have considered the potential effects in terms of Context and Intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations
This project was designed in conformance with the PSICC Forest Plan standards and guidelines. As such, my decision to proceed with the Proposed Action is consistent with the Forest Plan and the National Forest Management Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

Appeal Standing
Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.5, the public was invited to review and comment the EA for a 30-day period. Individuals or organizations which submitted "substantive" written or oral comments during the 30-day comment period established "standing" to appeal this final decision. The 30-day comment period began July 15, 2004 and ended August 16, 2004. 94 letters and/or emails were received during the 30-day comment period. Individuals and organizations that provided substantive comments are eligible to appeal.

Appeals Information
This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to Federal Regulations at 36 CFR 215.11. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing and filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the Appeal Deciding Officer (36 CFR 215.8) within 45 days following the date of publication of this notice. The publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15(a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13(b), only those individuals and organizations who submitted substantive comments during the 30-day comment period may file an appeal. Where to file an appeal:

USPS: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
POB 25127
Lakewood, Colorado 80225-25127

UPS, FED EX: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms
Golden, Colorado 80401
303 275-5296

Fax: 303-275-5134
E-mail: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Appeal Content Requirements:
It is an appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official's decision should be reversed. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address (36 CFR 215.1), with telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant (36 CFR 215.2) and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
5. The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either this part or part 251, subpart C (36 CFR 215.11(d));
6. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;

7. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
8. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments; and
9. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Notices of Appeal that do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 will be dismissed.

The appellant is responsible for submitting an appeal on or before the last day of the appeal filing period. Where there is a question about timeliness, the U.S. Postal Service postmark on a mailed appeal or the time and date imprint on a facsimile appeal will be used to determine timeliness.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.9(a), if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, the fifth day from the close of the appeal filing period.

Contact
For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Bill Nelson, District Ranger, Pikes Peak Ranger District, at (719) 636-1602.

Signature and Date

/s/ *Bill Nelson* September 9, 2004

Bill Nelson, District Ranger Date
Pikes Peak Ranger District
Responsible Official

DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
For

Hayman Fire Roads Management Project
Park and Teller County, Colorado

USDA FOREST SERVICE
SOUTH PARK RANGER DISTRICT
PIKE NATIONAL FOREST

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Hayman Fire began in the Pike National Forest on June 8, 2002 and burned approximately 138,000 acres of private, state, and National Forest System (NFS) lands in Park, Jefferson, Douglas, and Teller Counties, Colorado. About 72% of the burn occurred on NFS lands managed by the South Platte, South Park, and Pikes Peak Ranger Districts of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC).

The NFS lands affected by the Hayman Fire contain approximately 260 miles of classified (Forest system) roads and 35 miles of unclassified (non-Forest system) roads. In addition to the effects of the fire, heavy rains during the summer of 2003 and 2004 have caused extensive flash flooding and subsequent road damage and public safety risk. Because many of these roads have remain closed to motorized vehicles and have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair, a **roads analysis** was completed by the USDA Forest Service in October 2003 to assess the current and desired future condition of the road system in the burn area.

The Hayman Roads Analysis Report examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes. In January 2004, the Forest Service developed a proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report for maintaining and upgrading roads as well as closing, restricting or decommissioning roads within the Hayman burn area.

The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project that was released for public review in July 2004. The EA addresses approximately 130 miles of classified roads and 35 miles of unclassified roads within the Hayman burn area. The EA describes the proposed action and the potential environmental effects. The EA also describes the alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment.

Decision

It is my decision to implement Alternative C (proposed action in the EA) with some changes to the road management recommendations. I selected Alternative C as modified, because it addresses comments received on the EA and additional analysis by the interdisciplinary team. This decision applies only to those roads that are located on the South Park Ranger District of the Pike National Forest. This decision will affect approximately 15 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. This decision was made following thorough review of the EA and the PSICC Forest Plan, supporting materials referenced by the EA, and reviewing comments from the public (see Appendix A: Response to Comments).

The features of this decision are as follows:

The following Forest Service Roads (FSR) will be "maintained as is": **Platte Springs** (FSR 210 – 2.51 miles); **Pilgrim** (FSR 360.2C – 0.92 miles); **Lutheran** (FSR 360.2D – 0.96 miles); and **Taylor Spur** (FSR 367.1A – 0.59 miles).

The following roads will have "seasonal travel restrictions" during the winter season and will receive "major improvement and/or deferred maintenance work": **Stage Stop** (FSR 211.A – 0.77 miles); **Lentinus** (FSR 211.B – 0.14 miles) and **Deceptive** (FSR 211.C – 1.35 miles).

The following roads will have "seasonal travel restrictions" during the winter season: **Maggie Dip** (FSR 211.E – 0.12 miles); **Iris** (FSR 211.F – 0.34 miles); and **Quartz** (FSR 360.2E – 0.34 miles).

The following roads will be "decommissioned": **Deer Meadow** (FSR 205.A – 0.52 miles); **Fat Chance** (FSR 207 – 0.67 miles); **Shortcut** (FSR 210.2A – 0.47 miles); **Lioness** (FSR 210.2B – 0.42 miles); **Stage Stop Spur** (FSR 211.A1 – 0.26 miles); **Magilla Gorilla** (FSR 211.D – 0.72 miles); **Alley Oop** (FSR 211.D1 – 0.14 miles); **Old Matukat Road** (FSR 211.G – 0.39 miles); **Preserve Spur** (FSR 215.A – 0.06 miles); and **Chestnut Spur** (FSR 367.A – 0.61 miles).

The following roads will be converted to non-motorized trails: **Approach** (FSR 294 – 1.28 miles); and **Preserve** (FSR 215 – 1.87 miles).

All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

This decision does not apply to those roads that are located in the Wildcat Canyon portion of the South Park Ranger District. A separate Decision Notice and FONSI have been prepared for Wildcat Canyon roads on the South Park Ranger District which include FSR 220 (Hackett); FSR 220.A (Crossover); FSR 220.B (Widow Maker); and the lower (southern) section of FSR 540 (Corral Creek).

Reason for the Decision

In making this decision, I considered the variety of recreation experiences offered, natural resource effects, visitor safety, and other environmental and social effects. I also considered

issues raised through public involvement which included comments from the general public, environmental groups, off-highway vehicle groups, state and local governments, tribes, and consultation with regulatory agencies.

Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Alternative C as modified meets the ***purpose*** of the project which is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3). The modified alternative will also meet the ***need*** for this project which is to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Many of the actions in this decision were derived from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report which provides recommendations for a road system that is safe, responsive to public and agency needs, is environmentally sound, and is affordable and efficient to manage. In my determination, the approved action will maintain an efficient flow of motorized recreation routes throughout the burn area thus providing safe and adequate public access to National Forest System lands while addressing many water quality and resource concerns (EA, Chapter 4). The numerous land management requirements including Forest Plan standards and guidelines, regulations, Best Management Practices, additional mitigation measures, and adaptive management techniques will ensure protection of soils, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat during road reconstruction, maintenance or decommission activities (EA, Appendix C).

Other Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were considered in detail (the No Action, the Proposed Action, and two alternatives to the Proposed Action). Four alternatives were also considered but eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need of this project. All the alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from further consideration are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pages 2-1 through 2-6).

Alternatives considered in detail include the following:

- Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue the present management situation. The current road closures would remain in place, with no reconstruction or decommission of classified or unclassified roads. Water quality, soil erosion, and recreation access concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Under Alternative B, the road system would be managed according to the road maintenance levels that existed before the Hayman Fire. Recreation access concerns would be addressed but many of the water quality and soil erosion concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Alternative C as modified represents a balance of recreation access needs and natural resource concerns and meets the purpose and need of this project.

- Alternative D is similar to Alternative C except for additional road closures and decommissions. Water quality and soil erosion concerns would be addressed but many of the recreation access needs would not be sufficiently addressed.

Public Involvement

Scoping for this analysis was initiated on January 15, 2004 with a legal notice and mailing to interested parties. Two public open houses during scoping were also held in Denver and Colorado Springs on January 21 and 22, 2004 respectively, and were attended by over 700 people. Approximately 1500 persons or organizations responded with comments during the scoping process. (The public involvement effort is documented in the EA on page 1-4).

A majority of the comments received focused on roads in the Wildcat Canyon area such as Metberry, Longwater, Hackett and Corral Creek roads. As mentioned above, a separate Decision Notice and FONSI have been prepared for Wildcat Canyon roads on the South Park Ranger District which include Forest Service Road (FSR) 220 (Hackett); FSR 220.A (Crossover); FSR 220.B (Widow Maker); and the lower (southern) section of FSR 540 (Corral Creek).

On July 12, 2004 over 900 mailings were sent out to individuals, agencies, organizations, tribes and elected officials explaining that the EA was available for public review and comment. The full EA was also posted on the Internet and was available for distribution at the three Pike National Forest Ranger District offices. The EA was available for public review and comment from July 15, 2004 to August 16, 2004. The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the interdisciplinary environmental analysis, review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria for significant effects, and my knowledge of the expected impacts, I have determined that this action does not pose a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

CONTEXT
This project is local and would affect approximately ½ of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the 2002 Hayman fire. The NFS lands affected by the Hayman fire account for approximately 12% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. This decision

would affect approximately 15 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the Hayman area portion of the South Park Ranger District (does not include the Wildcat Canyon roads that are being addressed in a separate Decision Notice). The NFS lands managed by the South Park Ranger District that were affected by the Hayman fire account for almost 3% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. Project duration is expected to be 3 to 5 years, but could take up to 10 years to complete depending on funding. Although the project has regional and some national interest, the people most affected by the project would be primarily local residents and recreationists from Woodland Park and the Colorado Springs and Denver metropolitan area.

INTENSITY

Environmental Effects

I find that Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

Rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams. The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31). Furthermore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service have concurred with our assessment in the EA that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl. Road rehabilitation and decommission activities could cause minor impacts or disturbances if sensitive wildlife species or habitats are involved. Mitigation measures for wildlife presented in the EA and Forest Plan direction will minimize any adverse impacts (EA, pgs. 2-3, 2-4).

The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species

(EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4).

Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). Keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the South Park Ranger District, such as China Wall and Breakneck Pass (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

In terms of tourism there would be no significant effects to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area (EA, pg. 4-60). This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under the selected alternative (EA, pg. 4-61). Since recreational use is not expected to change significantly, the economic contribution of recreational use in the Hayman area to the surrounding economy would be comparable to the level of activity supported before the 2002 Hayman Fire (EA, pg. 4-61).

The selected alternative would leave more level 2 roads open for motorized vehicle access compared to some of the other alternatives (EA, pg. 4-61). However, some individuals may still be forced to find substitute sites if roads are unavailable for their particular recreation use (EA, pg. 4-61). Substitute sites may offer continued activity, but would not replace the values, memories, and attachment people have accumulated in their original places (EA, pg. 4-61). As with any decision, it will be difficult to meet the demands of all interested parties, but the selected alternative offers a good balance of both recreational access needs and water quality protection concerns (EA, pg. 4-62).

The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64).

Public Health or Safety

This action does not pose a substantial question of significant effect upon public health or safety although it does have some benefits to public safety by providing a road system that reduces the number of road miles and/or properly rehabilitating those roads that are hydrologically-connected and thus prone to flash flooding and hazardous driving conditions. As mentioned in

the EA, a primary purpose for this action arose from the road damage and subsequent public safety risk caused by the Hayman fire and heavy rainfall during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (EA, pgs. 1-2, 1-3).

Unique Characteristics of the Area
There are no unique characteristics of the geographical area that will be significantly affected by the proposed actions. Historic or cultural resources will not be affected because sites will be avoided and mitigation measures (EA, see Chapter 2) will be taken to ensure that any eligible or potentially eligible heritage sites are not disturbed. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

Controversy
I recognize there is some level of public controversy associated with the management of roads. The benefits of forest roads are many. So too, are the ecological impacts of roads on our watersheds. Not all of the comments received were in full support of this project. After reviewing the project record and EA, I am confident the Interdisciplinary Team reviewed these comments and incorporated them into alternatives or addressed them in the appropriate resource section. It is my judgment, while portions of the public disagree with various components of the project, there does not exist an unusual or high degree of controversy related to this project.

Uncertainty
There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. All of the effects of the selected alternative are similar to those taken into consideration in the Forest Plan. Best Management Practices, mitigation measures, monitoring and adaptive management techniques will ensure effects are within expected parameters (EA, Appendix C).

Precedent
The selected alternative does not represent a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The assessment is site-specific and its actions incorporate those practices envisioned in the PSICC Forest Plan and are within the Standards and Guidelines included in the Forest Plan. Future similar projects would have to be evaluated under NEPA for the significance on the effects of those specific actions.

Cumulative Impact
There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project. The EA describes the anticipated cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4). The EA discloses (page 4-11) the cumulative effects of past logging, grazing, fire suppression, as well as wildfire and storm events, that have resulted in sediment delivery in the analysis area. However, I am satisfied, after reviewing the EA, that none of the cumulative effects of the roads decisions are significant. Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 4-11), “The cumulative long-term effects . . . of reducing sediment from roads and improving riparian conditions by closing, decommissioning, or improving maintenance under any of the action alternatives and other concurrent burn area restoration projects would be beneficial.”

Properties On or Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; Significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources
There are no known cultural resources that would be significantly affected by this project. If cultural resources are found during operations, work will be stopped and Forest Service archaeologists consulted.

Endangered or Threatened Species
I find the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or US Forest Service listed sensitive species or their critical habitat. The Biological Assessment (BA) supports this conclusion (the project record contains the BA). The action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Pawnee montane skipper, Mexican spotted owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, or the bald eagle. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with our assessment that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl (the project record contains the FWS concurrence letter). Therefore, I find that the action can be carried out with no significant adverse effect to federally listed species.

Legal requirements for environmental protection
Implementation of the selected alternative will not violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (pg. 1-2). This project is fully consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, pg. 1-4) and will comply with Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) (EA, page 2-3). As stated in the EA (page 2-3), "The effectiveness of BMP's and other [mitigation] measures [will] be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act".

In arriving at this conclusion, I have considered the potential effects in terms of Context and Intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations
This project was designed in conformance with the PSICC Forest Plan standards and guidelines. As such, my decision to proceed with the Proposed Action is consistent with the Forest Plan and the National Forest Management Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

Appeal Standing
Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.5, the public was invited to review and comment the EA for a 30-day period. Individuals or organizations which submitted "substantive" written or oral comments during the 30-day comment period established "standing" to appeal this final decision. The 30-day comment period began July 15, 2004 and ended August 16, 2004. 94 letters and/or emails were received during the 30-day comment period. Individuals and organizations that provided substantive comments are eligible to appeal.
Appeals Information

This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to Federal Regulations at 36 CFR 215.11. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing and filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the Appeal Deciding Officer (36 CFR 215.8) within 45 days following the date of publication of this notice. The publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15(a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13(b), only those individuals and organizations who submitted substantive comments during the 30-day comment period may file an appeal. Where to file an appeal:

USPS:
Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
POB 25127
Lakewood, Colorado 80225-25127

UPS, FED EX:
Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms
Golden, Colorado 80401
303 275-5296

Fax: 303-275-5134
E-mail: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Appeal Content Requirements:
It is an appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official's decision should be reversed. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address (36 CFR 215.1), with telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant (36 CFR 215.2) and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
5. The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either this part or part 251, subpart C (36 CFR 215.11(d));
6. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;
7. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;

8. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments; and
9. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Notices of Appeal that do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 will be dismissed.

The appellant is responsible for submitting an appeal on or before the last day of the appeal filing period. Where there is a question about timeliness, the U.S. Postal Service postmark on a mailed appeal or the time and date imprint on a facsimile appeal will be used to determine timeliness.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.9(a), if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, the fifth day from the close of the appeal filing period.

Contact

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Sara Mayben, District Ranger, South Park Ranger District, at (719) 836-2031.

Signature and Date

_/s/ *Sara Mayben*_____ September 9, 2004

Sara Mayben, District Ranger — Date
South Park Ranger District
Responsible Official

DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
For

Hayman Fire Roads Management Project
Park and Teller County, Colorado

USDA FOREST SERVICE
SOUTH PARK RANGER DISTRICT (Wildcat Canyon)
PIKE NATIONAL FOREST

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Hayman Fire began in the Pike National Forest on June 8, 2002 and burned approximately 138,000 acres of private, state, and National Forest System (NFS) lands in Park, Jefferson, Douglas, and Teller Counties, Colorado. About 72% of the burn occurred on NFS lands managed by the South Platte, South Park, and Pikes Peak Ranger Districts of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC).

The NFS lands affected by the Hayman Fire contain approximately 260 miles of classified (Forest system) roads and 35 miles of unclassified (non-Forest system) roads. In addition to the effects of the fire, heavy rains during the summer of 2003 and 2004 have caused extensive flash flooding and subsequent road damage and public safety risk. Because many of these roads have remain closed to motorized vehicles and have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair, a **roads analysis** was completed by the USDA Forest Service in October 2003 to assess the current and desired future condition of the road system in the burn area.

The Hayman Roads Analysis Report examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes. In January 2004, the Forest Service developed a proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report for maintaining and upgrading roads as well as closing, restricting or decommissioning roads within the Hayman burn area.

The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project that was released for public review in July 2004. The EA addresses approximately 130 miles of classified roads and 35 miles of unclassified roads within the Hayman burn area. The EA describes the proposed action and the potential environmental effects. The EA also describes the alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment.

Decision

It is my decision to implement Alternative C (proposed action in the EA) with some changes to the road management recommendations. I selected Alternative C as modified, because it addresses comments received on the EA and additional analysis by the interdisciplinary team. This decision applies only to those roads that are located in the Wildcat Canyon area of the South Park Ranger District. This decision will affect approximately 11 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. This decision was made following thorough review of the EA and the PSICC Forest Plan, supporting materials referenced by the EA, and reviewing comments from the public (see Appendix A: Response to Comments).

The features of this decision are as follows:

The decision will allow for the opening of the following roads, if and only if a written easement, agreement or special use permit is entered into with a public road management agency with respect to each road, and such easement, agreement or permit contains an agreed maintenance standard for each road:

- Forest Service Road 220, also known as **Hackett Road** (7.16 miles);
- Forest Service Road 220.A, also known as **Crossover** (1.35 miles);
- Forest Service Road 220.B, also known as **Widow Maker** (0.53 miles);
- Lower (southern) section of FSR 540, also known as **Corral Creek Road** (2 miles).

All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

This decision does not apply to those roads that are located on the South Park Ranger District outside of the Wildcat Canyon portion of the South Park Ranger District. A separate decision notice has been prepared for those roads.

Reason for the Decision

In making this decision, I considered the variety of recreation experiences offered, natural resource effects, visitor safety, and other environmental and social effects. I also considered issues raised through public involvement which included comments from the general public, environmental groups, off-highway vehicle groups, state and local governments, tribes, and consultation with regulatory agencies.

Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Alternative C as modified meets the ***purpose*** of the project which is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3). The modified alternative will also meet the ***need*** for this project which is to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Many of the actions in this decision were derived from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report which provides recommendations for a road system that is safe, responsive to public and agency needs, is environmentally sound, and is affordable and efficient to manage. In my determination, the approved action will maintain an efficient flow of motorized recreation routes throughout the burn area thus providing safe and adequate public access to National Forest System lands while addressing many water quality and resource concerns (EA, Chapter 4). The numerous land management requirements including Forest Plan standards and guidelines, regulations, Best Management Practices, additional mitigation measures, and adaptive management techniques will ensure protection of soils, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat during road reconstruction, maintenance or decommission activities (EA, Appendix C).

Other Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were considered in detail (the No Action, the Proposed Action, and two alternatives to the Proposed Action). Four alternatives were also considered but eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need of this project. All the alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from further consideration are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pages 2-1 through 2-6).

Alternatives considered in detail include the following:

- Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue the present management situation. The current road closures would remain in place, with no reconstruction or decommission of classified or unclassified roads. Water quality, soil erosion, and recreation access concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Under Alternative B, the road system would be managed according to the road maintenance levels that existed before the Hayman Fire. Recreation access concerns would be addressed but many of the water quality and soil erosion concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Alternative C as modified represents a balance of recreation access needs and natural resource concerns and meets the purpose and need of this project.

- Alternative D is similar to Alternative C except for additional road closures and decommissions. Water quality and soil erosion concerns would be addressed but many of the recreation access needs would not be sufficiently addressed.

Public Involvement

Scoping for this analysis was initiated on January 15, 2004 with a legal notice and mailing to interested parties. Two public open houses during scoping were also held in Denver and Colorado Springs on January 21 and 22, 2004 respectively, and were attended by over 700 people. Approximately 1500 persons or organizations responded with comments during the scoping process. (The public involvement effort is documented in the EA on page 1-4).

A majority of the comments received focused on roads in the Wildcat Canyon area such as Metberry, Longwater, Hackett and Corral Creek roads. The comments regarding water quality and motorized recreation access in Wildcat Canyon were divisive and polarized enough that the Forest Service sent a letter to 42 Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) and environmental groups on March 11, 2004 requesting that they work together to develop a compromise alternative sufficient to both groups. However, for various reasons, not all groups were in agreement to seek a compromise alternative. Subsequently, the four project alternatives presented in the EA were developed by the Forest Service to cover the broad range of issues raised by the public during scoping and to present a broad range of alternatives to the Proposed Action.

On July 12, 2004 over 900 mailings were sent out to individuals, agencies, organizations, tribes and elected officials explaining that the EA was available for public review and comment. The full EA was also posted on the Internet and was available for distribution at the three Pike National Forest Ranger District offices. The EA was available for public review and comment from July 15, 2004 to August 16, 2004. The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the interdisciplinary environmental analysis, review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria for significant effects, and my knowledge of the expected impacts, I have determined that this action does not pose a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

CONTEXT

The Hayman Roads Management Project is local and would affect approximately ½ of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the 2002 Hayman fire. The NFS lands affected by the Hayman fire account for approximately 12% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. This decision is specific to the Wildcat Canyon area of the South Park Ranger District and would affect approximately 11 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the Hayman burn area. The NFS lands managed by the South Park Ranger District that were affected by the Hayman fire account for almost 3% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. Project duration is expected to be 3 to 5 years, but could take up to 10 years to complete depending on funding. Although the project has regional and some national interest, the people most affected by the project would be primarily local residents and recreationists from Woodland Park and the Colorado Springs and Denver metropolitan area.

INTENSITY

Environmental Effects

I find that Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

Rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams. The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31). Furthermore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service have concurred with our assessment in the EA that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl. Road rehabilitation and decommission activities could cause minor impacts or disturbances if sensitive wildlife species or habitats are involved. Mitigation measures for wildlife presented in the EA and Forest Plan direction will minimize any adverse impacts (EA, pgs. 2-3, 2-4).

The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species (EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4).

Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). Keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area will help reduce the potential

for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the South Park Ranger District, such as China Wall and Breakneck Pass (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

The key eligibility-related value in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River study area is fisheries (EA, pg. 4-58). (The EA also identified recreation as a value, but a commenter noted this was an error. Acknowledgement of the error is included in Appendix A, Response to Comments, page 31). As noted in the EA (pg. 4-58), the selected alternative will protect the fisheries value by the long-term reduction of sediment delivery to the river. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

In terms of tourism there would be no significant effects to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area (EA, pg. 4-60). This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under the selected alternative (EA, pg. 4-61). Since recreational use is not expected to change significantly, the economic contribution of recreational use in the Hayman area to the surrounding economy would be comparable to the level of activity supported before the 2002 Hayman Fire (EA, pg. 4-61).

The selected alternative would leave more of the challenging level 2 roads open for vehicle use compared to some of the other alternatives (EA, pg. 4-61). However, some individuals may still be forced to find substitute sites if roads are unavailable for their particular recreation use (EA, pg. 4-61). Substitute sites may offer continued activity, but would not replace the values, memories, and attachment people have accumulated in their original places (EA, pg. 4-61). As with any decision, it will be difficult to meet the demands of all interested parties, but the selected alternative offers a good balance of both recreational access needs and water quality protection concerns (EA, pg. 4-62).

The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64).

Public Health or Safety

This action does not pose a substantial question of significant effect upon public health or safety although it does have some benefits to public safety by providing a road system that reduces the number of road miles and/or properly rehabilitating those roads that are hydrologically-connected and thus prone to flash flooding and hazardous driving conditions. As mentioned in the EA, a primary purpose for this action arose from the road damage and subsequent public

safety risk caused by the Hayman fire and heavy rainfall during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (EA, pgs. 1-2, 1-3).

Unique Characteristics of the Area
There are no unique characteristics of the geographical area that will be significantly affected by the proposed actions. Historic or cultural resources will not be affected because sites will be avoided and mitigation measures (EA, see Chapter 2) will be taken to ensure that any eligible or potentially eligible heritage sites are not disturbed. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

Controversy
I recognize there is some level of public controversy associated with the management of roads. The benefits of forest roads are many. So too, are the ecological impacts of roads on our watersheds. Not all of the comments received were in full support of this project. After reviewing the project record and EA, I am confident the Interdisciplinary Team reviewed these comments and incorporated them into alternatives or addressed them in the appropriate resource section. It is my judgment, while portions of the public disagree with various components of the project, there does not exist an unusual or high degree of controversy related to this project.

Uncertainty
There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. All of the effects of the selected alternative are similar to those taken into consideration in the Forest Plan. Best Management Practices, mitigation measures, monitoring and adaptive management techniques will ensure effects are within expected parameters (EA, Appendix C).

Precedent
The selected alternative does not represent a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The assessment is site-specific and its actions incorporate those practices envisioned in the PSICC Forest Plan and are within the Standards and Guidelines included in the Forest Plan. Future similar projects would have to be evaluated under NEPA for the significance on the effects of those specific actions.

Cumulative Impact
There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project. The EA describes the anticipated cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4). The EA discloses (page 4-11) the cumulative effects of past logging, grazing, fire suppression, as well as wildfire and storm events, that have resulted in sediment delivery in the analysis area. However, I am satisfied, after reviewing the EA, that none of the cumulative effects of the roads decisions are significant. Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 4-11), “The cumulative long-term effects . . . of reducing sediment from roads and improving riparian conditions by closing, decommissioning, or improving maintenance under any of the action alternatives and other concurrent burn area restoration projects would be beneficial.”

Properties On or Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; Significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources
There are no known cultural resources that would be significantly affected by this project. If cultural resources are found during operations, work will be stopped and Forest Service archaeologists consulted.

Endangered or Threatened Species
I find the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or US Forest Service listed sensitive species or their critical habitat. The Biological Assessment (BA) supports this conclusion (the project record contains the BA). The action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Pawnee montane skipper, Mexican spotted owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, or the bald eagle. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with our assessment that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl (the project record contains the FWS concurrence letter). Therefore, I find that the action can be carried out with no significant adverse effect to federally listed species.

Legal requirements for environmental protection
Implementation of the selected alternative will not violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (pg. 1-2). This project is fully consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, pg. 1-4) and will comply with Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) (EA, page 2-3). As stated in the EA (page 2-3), "The effectiveness of BMP's and other [mitigation] measures [will] be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act".

In arriving at this conclusion, I have considered the potential effects in terms of Context and Intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations
This project was designed in conformance with the PSICC Forest Plan standards and guidelines. As such, my decision to proceed with the Proposed Action is consistent with the Forest Plan and the National Forest Management Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

Appeal Standing
Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.5, the public was invited to review and comment the EA for a 30-day period. Individuals or organizations which submitted "substantive" written or oral comments during the 30-day comment period established "standing" to appeal this final decision. The 30-day comment period began July 15, 2004 and ended August 16, 2004. 94 letters and/or emails were received during the 30-day comment period. Individuals and organizations that provided substantive comments are eligible to appeal.

Appeals Information
This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to Federal Regulations at 36 CFR 215.11. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing and filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the Appeal Deciding Officer (36 CFR 215.8) within 45 days following the date of publication of this notice. The publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15(a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13(b), only those individuals and organizations who submitted substantive comments during the 30-day comment period may file an appeal. Where to file an appeal:

USPS: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
POB 25127
Lakewood, Colorado 80225-25127

UPS, FED EX: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms
Golden, Colorado 80401
303 275-5296

Fax: 303-275-5134
E-mail: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Appeal Content Requirements:
It is an appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official's decision should be reversed. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address (36 CFR 215.1), with telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant (36 CFR 215.2) and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
5. The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either this part or part 251, subpart C (36 CFR 215.11(d));
6. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;

7. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
8. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments; and
9. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Notices of Appeal that do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 will be dismissed.

The appellant is responsible for submitting an appeal on or before the last day of the appeal filing period. Where there is a question about timeliness, the U.S. Postal Service postmark on a mailed appeal or the time and date imprint on a facsimile appeal will be used to determine timeliness.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.9(a), if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, the fifth day from the close of the appeal filing period.

Contact
For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Sara Mayben, District Ranger, South Park Ranger District, at (719) 836-2031.

Signature and Date

/s/ *Sara Mayben* September 9, 2004

Sara Mayben, District Ranger Date

South Park Ranger District
Responsible Official

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Person with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audio tape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
For

Hayman Fire Roads Management Project
Douglas, Jefferson, Park and Teller County, Colorado

USDA FOREST SERVICE
SOUTH PLATTE RANGER DISTRICT
PIKE NATIONAL FOREST

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Hayman Fire began in the Pike National Forest on June 8, 2002 and burned approximately 138,000 acres of private, state, and National Forest System (NFS) lands in Park, Jefferson, Douglas, and Teller Counties, Colorado. About 72% of the burn occurred on NFS lands managed by the South Platte, South Park, and Pikes Peak Ranger Districts of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC).

The NFS lands affected by the Hayman Fire contain approximately 260 miles of classified (Forest system) roads and 35 miles of unclassified (non-Forest system) roads. In addition to the effects of the fire, heavy rains during the summer of 2003 and 2004 have caused extensive flash flooding and subsequent road damage and public safety risk. Because many of these roads have remain closed to motorized vehicles and have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair, a **roads analysis** was completed by the USDA Forest Service in October 2003 to assess the current and desired future condition of the road system in the burn area.

The Hayman Roads Analysis Report examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes. In January 2004, the Forest Service developed a proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report for maintaining and upgrading roads as well as closing, restricting or decommissioning roads within the Hayman burn area.

The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project that was released for public review in July 2004. The EA addresses approximately 130 miles of classified roads and 35 miles of unclassified roads within the Hayman burn area. The EA describes the proposed action and the potential environmental effects. The EA also describes the alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment.

Decision

It is my decision to implement Alternative C (proposed action in the EA) with some changes to the road management recommendations. I selected Alternative C as modified, because it addresses comments received on the EA and additional analysis by the interdisciplinary team. This decision applies only to those roads that are located on the South Platte Ranger District of the Pike National Forest. This decision will affect approximately 56 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. This decision was made following thorough review of the EA and the PSICC Forest Plan, supporting materials referenced by the EA, and reviewing comments from the public (see Appendix A: Response to Comments).

The features of this decision are as follows:

The following Forest Service Road (FSR) will be "maintained as is": **Nine-J** (FSR 523 – 5 miles).

The following road will be "maintained as is" and will receive "major improvement and/or deferred maintenance work": **Bell Rock SH** (FSR 522 – 1.54 miles); **Lazy Gulch** (FSR 529 – 1.05 miles); **Flying G** (FSR 541 – 1.36 miles); and **Stoney Pass** (FSR 560 – 10.63 miles).

The following roads will be "maintained as is" and will receive "minor improvement and/or deferred maintenance work": **Goose Creek Trailhead** (FSR 558 – 1.2 miles).

The following roads will be "closed year-round" to public use and will be maintained for administrative and permitted access only: **Cedar Mt. Spur** (FSR 360.A – 0.60 miles); **Flat Saloon** (FSR 534 – 5.66 miles); **Brush Creek** (FSR 535 – 1.64 miles); and **Kelsey Creek** (FSR 536 – 1.15 miles).

The following roads will be "decommissioned": **Northrup** (FSR 206 – 2 miles); **Lost Valley Cutoff** (FSR 211.I – 1.96 miles); **Helen's Rock** (FSR 211.K – 0.40 miles); **Helen's Rock Spur** (FSR 211.L – 1.44 miles); **Molly Gulch Campground (access road)** (FSR 211.M – 0.41 miles); **Bell Rock Spur** (FSR 522.A – 0.20 miles); **Turkey Creek Cutoff** (FSR 523.B – 0.92 miles); **Hunter** (FSR 523.C – 0.23 miles); **Upper Turkey Creek** (FSR 524 – 1.63 miles); **Little Turkey Creek** (FSR 525 – 3 miles); **Turkey Creek** (FSR 526 – 3.26 miles); **Twin Creek** (FSR 542 – 5.19 miles); and **Cabin Creek** (FSR 544 – 2.01 miles).

The decision on the following roads is being deferred pending further investigation: **Tepee** (FSR 560.A – 1.76 miles); **Turkey Rock** (FSR 360.B – 0.50 miles); **Big Turkey Campground (access road)** (FSR 360.C – 0.68 miles); and **Goose Creek Campground (access road)** (FSR 211.J – 0.28 miles).

All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

This decision does not apply to those roads that are located in the Wildcat Canyon portion of the South Platte Ranger District. A separate Decision Notice and FONSI have been prepared for Wildcat Canyon roads on the South Platte Ranger District which include Forest Service Road

(FSR) 205 (Metberry); FSR 221(Longwater); and the upper (northern) section of FSR 540 (Corral Creek).

Reason for the Decision

In making this decision, I considered the variety of recreation experiences offered, natural resource effects, visitor safety, and other environmental and social effects. I also considered issues raised through public involvement which included comments from the general public, environmental groups, off-highway vehicle groups, state and local governments, tribes, and consultation with regulatory agencies.

Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Alternative C as modified meets the ***purpose*** of the project which is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3). The modified alternative will also meet the ***need*** for this project which is to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Many of the actions in this decision were derived from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report which provides recommendations for a road system that is safe, responsive to public and agency needs, is environmentally sound, and is affordable and efficient to manage. In my determination, the approved action will maintain an efficient flow of motorized recreation routes throughout the burn area thus providing safe and adequate public access to National Forest System lands while addressing many water quality and resource concerns (EA, Chapter 4). The numerous land management requirements including Forest Plan standards and guidelines, regulations, Best Management Practices, additional mitigation measures, and adaptive management techniques will ensure protection of soils, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat during road reconstruction, maintenance or decommission activities (EA, Appendix C).

Other Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were considered in detail (the No Action, the Proposed Action, and two alternatives to the Proposed Action). Four alternatives were also considered but eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need of this project. All the alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from further consideration are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pages 2-1 through 2-6).

Alternatives considered in detail include the following:

- Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue the present management situation. The current road closures would remain in place, with no reconstruction or decommission of classified or unclassified roads. Water quality, soil erosion, and recreation access concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Under Alternative B, the road system would be managed according to the road maintenance levels that existed before the Hayman Fire. Recreation access concerns would be addressed but many of the water quality and soil erosion concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Alternative C as modified represents a balance of recreation access needs and natural resource concerns and meets the purpose and need of this project.

- Alternative D is similar to Alternative C except for additional road closures and decommissions. Water quality and soil erosion concerns would be addressed but many of the recreation access needs would not be sufficiently addressed.

Public Involvement

Scoping for this analysis was initiated on January 15, 2004 with a legal notice and mailing to interested parties. Two public open houses during scoping were also held in Denver and Colorado Springs on January 21 and 22, 2004 respectively, and were attended by over 700 people. Approximately 1500 persons or organizations responded with comments during the scoping process. (The public involvement effort is documented in the EA on page 1-4).

A majority of the comments received focused on roads in the Wildcat Canyon area such as Metberry, Longwater, Hackett and Corral Creek roads. As mentioned above, a separate Decision Notice and FONSI have been prepared for Wildcat Canyon roads on the South Platte Ranger District which include Forest Service Road (FSR) 205 (Metberry); FSR 221(Longwater); and the upper (northern) section of FSR 540 (Corral Creek).

On July 12, 2004 over 900 mailings were sent out to individuals, agencies, organizations, tribes and elected officials explaining that the EA was available for public review and comment. The full EA was also posted on the Internet and was available for distribution at the three Pike National Forest Ranger District offices. The EA was available for public review and comment from July 15, 2004 to August 16, 2004. The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the interdisciplinary environmental analysis, review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria for significant effects, and my knowledge of the expected impacts, I have determined that this action does not pose a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

CONTEXT

The Hayman Roads Management Project is local and would affect approximately ½ of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the 2002 Hayman fire. The NFS lands affected by the Hayman fire account for approximately 12% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. This decision is specific to the South Platte Ranger District and would affect approximately 56 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the Hayman burn area (does not include the Wildcat Canyon roads that are being addressed in a separate Decision Notice). The NFS lands managed by the South Platte Ranger District that were affected by the Hayman fire account for almost 8% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. Project duration is expected to be 3 to 5 years, but could take up to 10 years to complete depending on funding. Although the project has regional and some national interest, the people most affected by the project would be primarily local residents and recreationists from Woodland Park and the Colorado Springs and Denver metropolitan area.

INTENSITY

Environmental Effects

I find that Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

Rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams. The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31). Furthermore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service have concurred with our assessment in the EA that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl. Road rehabilitation and decommission activities could cause minor impacts or disturbances if sensitive wildlife species or habitats are involved. Mitigation measures for wildlife presented in the EA and Forest Plan direction will minimize any adverse impacts (EA, pgs. 2-3, 2-4).

The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species (EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4).

Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). Keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the South Platte Ranger District such as the Rampart Range (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

In terms of tourism there would be no significant effects to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area (EA, pg. 4-60). This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under the selected alternative (EA, pg. 4-61). Since recreational use is not expected to change significantly, the economic contribution of recreational use in the Hayman area to the surrounding economy would be comparable to the level of activity supported before the 2002 Hayman Fire (EA, pg. 4-61).

The selected alternative would leave more level 2 roads open for motorized vehicle access compared to some of the other alternatives (EA, pg. 4-61). However, some individuals may still be forced to find substitute sites if roads are unavailable for their particular recreation use (EA, pg. 4-61). Substitute sites may offer continued activity, but would not replace the values, memories, and attachment people have accumulated in their original places (EA, pg. 4-61). As with any decision, it will be difficult to meet the demands of all interested parties, but the selected alternative offers a good balance of both recreational access needs and water quality protection concerns (EA, pg. 4-62).

The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64).

Public Health or Safety
This action does not pose a substantial question of significant effect upon public health or safety although it does have some benefits to public safety by providing a road system that reduces the number of road miles and/or properly rehabilitating those roads that are hydrologically-connected and thus prone to flash flooding and hazardous driving conditions. As mentioned in the EA, a primary purpose for this action arose from the road damage and subsequent public safety risk caused by the Hayman fire and heavy rainfall during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (EA, pgs. 1-2, 1-3).

Unique Characteristics of the Area
There are no unique characteristics of the geographical area that will be significantly affected by the proposed actions. Historic or cultural resources will not be affected because sites will be avoided and mitigation measures (EA, see Chapter 2) will be taken to ensure that any eligible or potentially eligible heritage sites are not disturbed. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

Controversy
I recognize there is some level of public controversy associated with the management of roads. The benefits of forest roads are many. So too, are the ecological impacts of roads on our watersheds. Not all of the comments received were in full support of this project. After reviewing the project record and EA, I am confident the Interdisciplinary Team reviewed these comments and incorporated them into alternatives or addressed them in the appropriate resource section. It is my judgment, while portions of the public disagree with various components of the project, there does not exist an unusual or high degree of controversy related to this project.

Uncertainty
There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. All of the effects of the selected alternative are similar to those taken into consideration in the Forest Plan. Best Management Practices, mitigation measures, monitoring and adaptive management techniques will ensure effects are within expected parameters (EA, Appendix C).

Precedent
The selected alternative does not represent a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The assessment is site-specific and its actions incorporate those practices envisioned in the PSICC Forest Plan and are within the Standards and Guidelines included in the Forest Plan. Future similar projects would have to be evaluated under NEPA for the significance on the effects of those specific actions.

Cumulative Impact
There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project. The EA describes the anticipated cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4). The EA discloses (page 4-11) the cumulative effects of past logging, grazing, fire suppression, as well as wildfire and storm events, that have resulted in sediment delivery in the analysis area. However, I am satisfied, after reviewing the EA, that

none of the cumulative effects of the roads decisions are significant. Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 4-11), "The cumulative long-term effects . . . of reducing sediment from roads and improving riparian conditions by closing, decommissioning, or improving maintenance under any of the action alternatives and other concurrent burn area restoration projects would be beneficial."

Properties On or Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; Significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources
There are no known cultural resources that would be significantly affected by this project. If cultural resources are found during operations, work will be stopped and Forest Service archaeologists consulted.

Endangered or Threatened Species
I find the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or US Forest Service listed sensitive species or their critical habitat. The Biological Assessment (BA) supports this conclusion (the project record contains the BA). The action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Pawnee montane skipper, Mexican spotted owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, or the bald eagle. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with our assessment that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl (the project record contains the FWS concurrence letter). Therefore, I find that the action can be carried out with no significant adverse effect to federally listed species.

Legal requirements for environmental protection
Implementation of the selected alternative will not violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (pg. 1-2). This project is fully consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, pg. 1-4) and will comply with Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) (EA, page 2-3). As stated in the EA (page 2-3), "The effectiveness of BMP's and other [mitigation] measures [will] be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act".

In arriving at this conclusion, I have considered the potential effects in terms of Context and Intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations
This project was designed in conformance with the PSICC Forest Plan standards and guidelines. As such, my decision to proceed with the Proposed Action is consistent with the Forest Plan and the National Forest Management Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

Appeal Standing
Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.5, the public was invited to review and comment the EA for a 30-day period. Individuals or organizations which submitted "substantive" written or oral comments

during the 30-day comment period established "standing" to appeal this final decision. The 30-day comment period began July 15, 2004 and ended August 16, 2004. 94 letters and/or emails were received during the 30-day comment period. Individuals and organizations that provided substantive comments are eligible to appeal.

Appeals Information
This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to Federal Regulations at 36 CFR 215.11. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing and filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the Appeal Deciding Officer (36 CFR 215.8) within 45 days following the date of publication of this notice. The publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15(a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13(b), only those individuals and organizations who submitted substantive comments during the 30-day comment period may file an appeal. Where to file an appeal:

USPS: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
POB 25127
Lakewood, Colorado 80225-25127

UPS, FED EX: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms
Golden, Colorado 80401
303 275-5296

Fax: 303-275-5134
E-mail: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Appeal Content Requirements:
It is an appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official's decision should be reversed. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address (36 CFR 215.1), with telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant (36 CFR 215.2) and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;

5. The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either this part or part 251, subpart C (36 CFR 215.11(d));
6. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;
7. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
8. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments; and
9. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Notices of Appeal that do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 will be dismissed.

The appellant is responsible for submitting an appeal on or before the last day of the appeal filing period. Where there is a question about timeliness, the U.S. Postal Service postmark on a mailed appeal or the time and date imprint on a facsimile appeal will be used to determine timeliness.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.9(a), if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, the fifth day from the close of the appeal filing period.

Contact

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Randy Hickenbottom, District Ranger, South Platte Ranger District, at (303) 275-5610.

Signature and Date

/s/ *Randy Hickenbottom* September 9, 2004

Randy Hickenbottom, District Ranger Date
South Platte Ranger District
Responsible Official

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Person with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audio tape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

DECISION NOTICE
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
For

Hayman Fire Roads Management Project
Douglas, Jefferson, Park and Teller County, Colorado

USDA FOREST SERVICE
SOUTH PLATTE RANGER DISTRICT (Wildcat Canyon)
PIKE NATIONAL FOREST

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Background

The Hayman Fire began in the Pike National Forest on June 8, 2002 and burned approximately 138,000 acres of private, state, and National Forest System (NFS) lands in Park, Jefferson, Douglas, and Teller Counties, Colorado. About 72% of the burn occurred on NFS lands managed by the South Platte, South Park, and Pikes Peak Ranger Districts of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC).

The NFS lands affected by the Hayman Fire contain approximately 260 miles of classified (Forest system) roads and 35 miles of unclassified (non-Forest system) roads. In addition to the effects of the fire, heavy rains during the summer of 2003 and 2004 have caused extensive flash flooding and subsequent road damage and public safety risk. Because many of these roads have remain closed to motorized vehicles and have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair, a **roads analysis** was completed by the USDA Forest Service in October 2003 to assess the current and desired future condition of the road system in the burn area.

The Hayman Roads Analysis Report examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes. In January 2004, the Forest Service developed a proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report for maintaining and upgrading roads as well as closing, restricting or decommissioning roads within the Hayman burn area.

The Forest Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project that was released for public review in July 2004. The EA addresses approximately 130 miles of classified roads and 35 miles of unclassified roads within the Hayman burn area. The EA describes the proposed action and the potential environmental effects. The EA also describes the alternatives to the proposed action and the effects those alternatives may have on the environment.

Decision

It is my decision to implement Alternative C (proposed action in the EA) with some changes to the road management recommendations. I selected Alternative C as modified, because it addresses comments received on the EA and additional analysis by the interdisciplinary team. This decision applies only to those roads that are located in the Wildcat Canyon area of the South Platte Ranger District. This decision will affect approximately 12 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. This decision was made following thorough review of the EA and the PSICC Forest Plan, supporting materials referenced by the EA, and reviewing comments from the public (see Appendix A: Response to Comments).

The features of this decision are as follows:

The decision will allow for the opening of the following roads, if and only if a written easement, agreement or special use permit is entered into with a public road management agency with respect to each road, and such easement, agreement or permit contains an agreed maintenance standard for each road:

- Forest Service Road 205, also known as **Metberry Road** (4.63 miles);
- Forest Service Road 221, also known as **Longwater Road** (4.63 miles);
- Upper (northern) section of FSR 540, also known as **Corral Creek Road** (2.9 miles).

All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

This decision does not apply to those roads that are located on the South Platte Ranger District outside of the Wildcat Canyon portion of the South Platte Ranger District. A separate Decision Notice and FONSI have been prepared for those roads.

Reason for the Decision

In making this decision, I considered the variety of recreation experiences offered, natural resource effects, visitor safety, and other environmental and social effects. I also considered issues raised through public involvement which included comments from the general public, environmental groups, off-highway vehicle groups, state and local governments, tribes, and consultation with regulatory agencies.

Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Alternative C as modified meets the ***purpose*** of the project which is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those

causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3). The modified alternative will also meet the ***need*** for this project which is to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3).

Many of the actions in this decision were derived from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report which provides recommendations for a road system that is safe, responsive to public and agency needs, is environmentally sound, and is affordable and efficient to manage. In my determination, the approved action will maintain an efficient flow of motorized recreation routes throughout the burn area thus providing safe and adequate public access to National Forest System lands while addressing many water quality and resource concerns (EA, Chapter 4). The numerous land management requirements including Forest Plan standards and guidelines, regulations, Best Management Practices, additional mitigation measures, and adaptive management techniques will ensure protection of soils, watershed conditions, and wildlife habitat during road reconstruction, maintenance or decommission activities (EA, Appendix C).

Other Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were considered in detail (the No Action, the Proposed Action, and two alternatives to the Proposed Action). Four alternatives were also considered but eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need of this project. All the alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from further consideration are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pages 2-1 through 2-6).

Alternatives considered in detail include the following:

- Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue the present management situation. The current road closures would remain in place, with no reconstruction or decommission of classified or unclassified roads. Water quality, soil erosion, and recreation access concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Under Alternative B, the road system would be managed according to the road maintenance levels that existed before the Hayman Fire. Recreation access concerns would be addressed but many of the water quality and soil erosion concerns would not be sufficiently addressed.

- Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Alternative C as modified represents a balance of recreation access needs and natural resource concerns and meets the purpose and need of this project.

- Alternative D is similar to Alternative C except for additional road closures and decommissions. Water quality and soil erosion concerns would be addressed but many of the recreation access needs would not be sufficiently addressed.

Public Involvement

Scoping for this analysis was initiated on January 15, 2004 with a legal notice and mailing to interested parties. Two public open houses during scoping were also held in Denver and Colorado Springs on January 21 and 22, 2004 respectively, and were attended by over 700 people. Approximately 1500 persons or organizations responded with comments during the scoping process. (The public involvement effort is documented in the EA on page 1-4).

A majority of the comments received focused on roads in the Wildcat Canyon area such as Metberry, Longwater, Hackett and Corral Creek roads. The comments regarding water quality and motorized recreation access in Wildcat Canyon were divisive and polarized enough that the Forest Service sent a letter to 42 Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) and environmental groups on March 11, 2004 requesting that they work together to develop a compromise alternative sufficient to both groups. However, for various reasons, not all groups were in agreement to seek a compromise alternative. Subsequently, the four project alternatives presented in the EA were developed by the Forest Service to cover the broad range of issues raised by the public during scoping and to present a broad range of alternatives to the Proposed Action.

On July 12, 2004 over 900 mailings were sent out to individuals, agencies, organizations, tribes and elected officials explaining that the EA was available for public review and comment. The full EA was also posted on the Internet and was available for distribution at the three Pike National Forest Ranger District offices. The EA was available for public review and comment from July 15, 2004 to August 16, 2004. The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the interdisciplinary environmental analysis, review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria for significant effects, and my knowledge of the expected impacts, I have determined that this action does not pose a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

CONTEXT

The Hayman Roads Management Project is local and would affect approximately ½ of the 260-mile classified road system in the area affected by the 2002 Hayman fire. The NFS lands affected by the Hayman fire account for approximately 12% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. This decision is specific to the Wildcat Canyon area of the South Platte Ranger District and would affect approximately 12 miles of the 260-mile classified road system in the Hayman burn area. The NFS lands managed by the South Platte Ranger District that were affected by the Hayman fire account for almost 8% of the total 1.1 million acres of the Pike National Forest. Project duration is expected to be 3 to 5 years, but could take up to 10 years to complete depending on funding. Although the project has regional and some national interest, the people most affected by the project would be primarily local residents and recreationists from Woodland Park and the Colorado Springs and Denver metropolitan area.

INTENSITY

Environmental Effects

I find that Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources as documented by the EA. Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

Rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams. The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10).

The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31). Furthermore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service have concurred with our assessment in the EA that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl. Road rehabilitation and decommission activities could cause minor impacts or disturbances if sensitive wildlife species or habitats are involved. Mitigation measures for wildlife presented in the EA and Forest Plan direction will minimize any adverse impacts (EA, pgs. 2-3, 2-4).

The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species (EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4).

Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). Keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area will help reduce the potential

for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the South Platte Ranger District such as the Rampart Range (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

The key eligibility-related value in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River study area is fisheries (EA, pg. 4-58). (The EA also identified recreation as a value, but a commenter noted this was an error. Acknowledgement of the error is included in Appendix A, Response to Comments, page 31). As noted in the EA (pg. 4-58), the selected alternative will protect the fisheries value by the long-term reduction of sediment delivery to the river. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

In terms of tourism there would be no significant effects to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area (EA, pg. 4-60). This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under the selected alternative (EA, pg. 4-61). Since recreational use is not expected to change significantly, the economic contribution of recreational use in the Hayman area to the surrounding economy would be comparable to the level of activity supported before the 2002 Hayman Fire (EA, pg. 4-61).

The selected alternative would leave more of the challenging level 2 roads open for vehicle use compared to some of the other alternatives (EA, pg. 4-61). However, some individuals may still be forced to find substitute sites if roads are unavailable for their particular recreation use (EA, pg. 4-61). Substitute sites may offer continued activity, but would not replace the values, memories, and attachment people have accumulated in their original places (EA, pg. 4-61). As with any decision, it will be difficult to meet the demands of all interested parties, but the selected alternative offers a good balance of both recreational access needs and water quality protection concerns (EA, pg. 4-62).

The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64).

Public Health or Safety

This action does not pose a substantial question of significant effect upon public health or safety although it does have some benefits to public safety by providing a road system that reduces the number of road miles and/or properly rehabilitating those roads that are hydrologically-connected and thus prone to flash flooding and hazardous driving conditions. As mentioned in the EA, a primary purpose for this action arose from the road damage and subsequent public

safety risk caused by the Hayman fire and heavy rainfall during the summers of 2003 and 2004 (EA, pgs. 1-2, 1-3).

Unique Characteristics of the Area
There are no unique characteristics of the geographical area that will be significantly affected by the proposed actions. Historic or cultural resources will not be affected because sites will be avoided and mitigation measures (EA, see Chapter 2) will be taken to ensure that any eligible or potentially eligible heritage sites are not disturbed. The selected alternative will not adversely affect the finding of eligibility and will maintain the classifications identified in the South Platte Wild and Scenic River Study (EA, pg. 4-59).

Controversy
I recognize there is some level of public controversy associated with the management of roads. The benefits of forest roads are many. So too, are the ecological impacts of roads on our watersheds. Not all of the comments received were in full support of this project. After reviewing the project record and EA, I am confident the Interdisciplinary Team reviewed these comments and incorporated them into alternatives or addressed them in the appropriate resource section. It is my judgment, while portions of the public disagree with various components of the project, there does not exist an unusual or high degree of controversy related to this project.

Uncertainty
There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. All of the effects of the selected alternative are similar to those taken into consideration in the Forest Plan. Best Management Practices, mitigation measures, monitoring and adaptive management techniques will ensure effects are within expected parameters (EA, Appendix C).

Precedent
The selected alternative does not represent a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The assessment is site-specific and its actions incorporate those practices envisioned in the PSICC Forest Plan and are within the Standards and Guidelines included in the Forest Plan. Future similar projects would have to be evaluated under NEPA for the significance on the effects of those specific actions.

Cumulative Impact
There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project. The EA describes the anticipated cumulative effects (EA, Chapter 4). The EA discloses (page 4-11) the cumulative effects of past logging, grazing, fire suppression, as well as wildfire and storm events, that have resulted in sediment delivery in the analysis area. However, I am satisfied, after reviewing the EA, that none of the cumulative effects of the roads decisions are significant. Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 4-11), “The cumulative long-term effects . . . of reducing sediment from roads and improving riparian conditions by closing, decommissioning, or improving maintenance under any of the action alternatives and other concurrent burn area restoration projects would be beneficial.”

Properties On or Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; Significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources
There are no known cultural resources that would be significantly affected by this project. If cultural resources are found during operations, work will be stopped and Forest Service archaeologists consulted.

Endangered or Threatened Species
I find the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or US Forest Service listed sensitive species or their critical habitat. The Biological Assessment (BA) supports this conclusion (the project record contains the BA). The action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Pawnee montane skipper, Mexican spotted owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, or the bald eagle. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with our assessment that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Pawnee montane skipper, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and bald eagle and would not affect the Mexican spotted owl (the project record contains the FWS concurrence letter). Therefore, I find that the action can be carried out with no significant adverse effect to federally listed species.

Legal requirements for environmental protection
Implementation of the selected alternative will not violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the EA (pg. 1-2). This project is fully consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, pg. 1-4) and will comply with Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) (EA, page 2-3). As stated in the EA (page 2-3), "The effectiveness of BMP's and other [mitigation] measures [will] be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act".

In arriving at this conclusion, I have considered the potential effects in terms of Context and Intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations
This project was designed in conformance with the PSICC Forest Plan standards and guidelines. As such, my decision to proceed with the Proposed Action is consistent with the Forest Plan and the National Forest Management Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

Appeal Standing
Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.5, the public was invited to review and comment the EA for a 30-day period. Individuals or organizations which submitted "substantive" written or oral comments during the 30-day comment period established "standing" to appeal this final decision. The 30-day comment period began July 15, 2004 and ended August 16, 2004. 94 letters and/or emails were received during the 30-day comment period. Individuals and organizations that provided substantive comments are eligible to appeal.

Appeals Information
This decision is subject to administrative review pursuant to Federal Regulations at 36 CFR 215.11. Appeals (including attachments) must be in writing and filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the Appeal Deciding Officer (36 CFR 215.8) within 45 days following the date of publication of this notice. The publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal (36 CFR 215.15(a)). Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.13(b), only those individuals and organizations who submitted substantive comments during the 30-day comment period may file an appeal. Where to file an appeal:

USPS: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
POB 25127
Lakewood, Colorado 80225-25127

UPS, FED EX: Appeals Deciding Officer
USDA, Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Region
740 Simms
Golden, Colorado 80401
303 275-5296

Fax: 303-275-5134
E-mail: appeals-rocky-mountain-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Appeal Content Requirements:
It is an appellant's responsibility to provide sufficient activity-specific evidence and rationale, focusing on the decision, to show why the Responsible Official's decision should be reversed. At a minimum, an appeal must include the following (36 CFR 215.14):

1. Appellant's name and address (36 CFR 215.1), with telephone number, if available;
2. Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the appeal);
3. When multiple names are listed on an appeal, identification of the lead appellant (36 CFR 215.2) and verification of the identity of the lead appellant upon request;
4. The name of the project or activity for which the decision was made, the name and title of the Responsible Official, and the date of the decision;
5. The regulation under which the appeal is being filed, when there is an option to appeal under either this part or part 251, subpart C (36 CFR 215.11(d));
6. Any specific change(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks and rationale for those changes;

7. Any portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees, and explanation for the disagreement;
8. Why the appellant believes the Responsible Official's decision failed to consider the substantive comments; and
9. How the appellant believes the decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy.

Notices of Appeal that do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 215.14 will be dismissed.

The appellant is responsible for submitting an appeal on or before the last day of the appeal filing period. Where there is a question about timeliness, the U.S. Postal Service postmark on a mailed appeal or the time and date imprint on a facsimile appeal will be used to determine timeliness.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 215.9(a), if no appeal is filed, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, the fifth day from the close of the appeal filing period.

Contact

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Randy Hickenbottom, District Ranger, South Platte Ranger District, at (303) 275-5610.

Signature and Date

/s/ *Randy Hickenbottom* September 9, 2004

Randy Hickenbottom, District Ranger — Date
South Platte Ranger District
Responsible Official

APPENDIX A

Response to Comments

INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service received 94 public comment letters on the Environmental Assessment (EA). These comments have been documented, analyzed for content, and responses have been prepared. This section presents all of the substantive comments received on the EA and the agency's response to those comments. Comments that simply favor or oppose specific alternatives or those that only agree or disagree with Agency policy were not considered substantive comments.

Comments were grouped by key topics and subjects and comment excerpts in **boldface** are used to briefly describe the main points that are made in the comment letters. The comments are not presented here in their entirety; they are available for public review in the Project Record. Comment numbers in parenthesis following the boldface comment excerpts refer to the numbering system used in the content analysis process and can be found in the following Appendix B and the Project Record.

SPECIFIC ROAD CONCERNS

SUBJECT: KEEP THE FOLLOWING ROADS OPEN

Comment:

Forest Service Road (FSR) 205, 205B and 215 are used as access routes to my mining claim, the FAT CHANCE. (8) (89)

FSR 205, 205A and 207 lead to Quartz Hill, a very popular mineral collecting site. (8) (89)

Please keep FSR 360, Cedar Mountain Rd Open (16)

I would like to see the following roads kept open: FSR 205 (Metberry), FSR 220A (Crossover), FSR 349 (Drury), FSR 524 (Upper Turkey Creek), FSR 525 (Little Turkey Creek), FSR 526 (Turkey Creek). (22) (23) (24) (25) (29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (35) (36) (37) (39) (42) (43) (45) (46) (47) (48) (50) (51) (57) (58) (59) (60) (62) (65) (67) (72) (74) (85) (92) (94)

The most common comment heard at the January 22, 2004 Open House was "Keep Metberry Open" …yet there appears to have been no realistic attempt to do so. (28)

Response:

FSR 205 and 205B mentioned in this comment is in the Lake George area of the South Park Ranger District and was not addressed in this EA. [Note: the FSR 205 mentioned here is not the same FSR 205 known as "Metberry Road" on the South Platte Ranger District which is being addressed in this EA.] FSR 215 will be converted to a nonmotorized trail under the modified Alternative C and would be open under Alternative B. The EA, pg. 1-2 states that

"roads providing access to private inholdings, special use sites, and/or mining claims were identified through the RAP process and are not being considered in this EA". Recent plan of operations does not mention FSR 215 as an access to this mining claim.

FSR 205 mentioned in this comment is in the Lake George area of the South Park Ranger District and was not addressed in this EA. FSR 205A and 207 would remain open under Alternative B, but will be decommissioned in Alternative C (see EA, Appendix B).

Cedar Mountain Road, also known as Forest Service Road 360, is not one of the roads being considered in this EA because portions of this road are under a county maintenance agreement with Teller County and numerous private land parcels and mining claims are accessed by Cedar Mountain Road. As of July 4, 2004, Cedar Mountain Road was partially open to motorized vehicles.

The Forest Service Roads mentioned above in the last two comments were all considered for opening under Alternative B, the pre-fire condition. This alternative was considered in detail in the Environmental Analysis. The District Ranger considered the needs of the public in his/her decision based on public comments and the Hayman Roads Analysis Report completed for this project and weighed these needs within the environmental concerns identified in the EA. Please refer to the Decision Notice(s) to see which roads will be kept open.

SUBJECT: KEEP THE FOLLOWING ROADS CLOSED

Comment:

I again recommend that Cedar Mountain Road at the four corners junction be closed to all. (18)

Close FSR 206, 524, 526, 211 to encourage ecosystem recovery (20)

Leaving FSR 540, 221 and 220 open is simply unacceptable - the damage from use outweighs the public's desires for these routes. (26)

Recommend closing FSR 540 (Corral Creek) at its junction with Matukat Road (FSR 211) or other suitable location well before it turns south to head for the River and converting the road into a non-motorized trail – this would allow fishing and hiking access. (26)

We support their decommissioning and do not support converting any of these routes to motorized trails: FSR 534, 535, 536, 211.I, 211.K, 211.L, 542, 211.A, 211.A1, 211.D, 211.D1, 211.G, 523.B, 524, 526 (54)

Want permanent closure of Metberry, Northrup, Corral Creek (FSR 540) along the river, Widow Maker and Shortcut trail. To protect Gunbarrel roadless area, the decommissioning of FSR 534, 535, and 536 are key. Permanent closure of FSR 221 and spurs as well as FSR 220, and Corral Creek ford should be considered. (63)

To provide game herd cover, reduce soil erosion and runoff of soils into streams and into the South Platte we feel it is essential to close FSR 205, 206, 210.2B, 220.B, 220.A, 210.2A. (71)

We support the closure/decommission of the Wildcat Canyon routes: FSR 205, 206, 220.A, 220.B 210.2A, 210.2B, 540 above Corral Creek, and the South Platte and Tarryall Creek fords to reduce erosion and protect water quality. (77) (78) (79) (81) (83)

I support the decommissioning of the following road segments to preserve and protect roadless areas: FSR 211 spurs, FSR 544, 534, 535, 536,535.B, 524 and 526. (77) (78) (83)

Please close FSR 540, 221 and Hackett (FSR 220) to protect Denver water supply and protect aquatic life in Wildcat Canyon. (77) (78) (79) (81) (83)

Response:

Cedar Mountain Road, also known as Forest Service Road 360, is not one of the roads being considered in this EA because portions of this road are under a county maintenance agreement with Teller County and numerous private land parcels and mining claims are accessed by Cedar Mountain Road. As of July 4, 2004, Cedar Mountain Road was partially open to motorized vehicles.

The FSR 211 road, also known as Matukat Road, is not being considered in this EA because a portion of this road is also under county maintenance agreement, numerous private land parcels are accessed by this road and this road is a main arterial road providing needed public access to many parts of the forest including the Lost Creek Wilderness.

With the exception of Cedar Mountain Road and Matukat Road, the Forest Service Roads mentioned in the above comments were all considered for closure and/or decommission under Alternative D. This alternative was considered in detail in the Environmental Analysis. The District Ranger considered the needs of the public in his/her decision based on public comments and the Hayman Roads Analysis Report completed for this project and weighed these needs within the environmental concerns identified in the EA. Please refer to the Decision Notice(s) to see which roads will be kept open.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)

SUBJECT: PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

Comment:

Given the Forest Service roads in Teller, Park, and Douglas counties proposed by the Forest Service to be closed or decommissioned, we [Teller County] certainly can not find by any stretch of the imagination [any roads that need to be closed or decommissioned]. (27)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 1-2), "Because many roads in the Hayman burn area have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair and are causing resource and public safety concerns, a **roads analysis** was carried out to assess the current condition of the road system in the burn area. . . . In accordance with the NFS Final Road Management Policy and Rule published in the Federal Register on January 12, 2001, the science-based roads

analysis process is designed to help forest officials better address needs, issues, and opportunities associated with road and access management."

As stated in the EA (page 1-2), "The Hayman Roads Analysis Report (also referred to as "RAP") was conducted by a Forest Service interdisciplinary team from April to September 2003 and published in October 2003 (USDA Forest Service, 2003a). . . . The RAP provides recommendations for a road system that is safe to the public, responsive to public needs, environmentally sound, affordable, and efficient to manage. . . . The Hayman RAP examined each road and the associated risks to soil and water, wildlife habitat, noxious weed infestation, cultural and heritage sites, as well as the value of the road for recreation, social, and economic purposes."

As stated in the EA (page 2-2), "Alternative C is the proposed action based on recommendations from the Hayman Roads Analysis Report (RAP)." Recommendations from the RAP include the closure and decommission of classified and unclassified FS roads which is necessary to meet the purpose and need of this project (see EA, page 1-3),

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Comment:

The EA fails to respond to a scoping issue: "the potential closure and decommission of roads in the Hayman burn area may decrease motorized recreation access to popular areas and may decrease recreational opportunities." The FS did not formulate an alternative that reasonably responded to this issue that would increase opportunities for OHV use. (50)

Alternative B goes further in fulfilling the purpose and need as well as addresses the issues brought forward during the Scoping process than all other Alternatives. (50)

Alternative C and D are not responsive to public needs in that they do not adequately provide for the documented increase in the popularity of OHV use. Alternative C must be modified to provide for increased OHV recreation opportunities to meet current and anticipated demand. (28) (29) (50)

Response:

The EA (pg. 1-4) describes the public involvement process, and along with documents in the Project Record, show that relevant information was provided to the public and decision-makers early in and throughout the process. Scoping letters were mailed in January 2004 requesting public input and two open house meeting were also held in January 2004. Approximately 1500 comment letters and emails were received. All comments were considered in the development of issues and the alternatives.

Alternatives B and D were developed to provide a reasonable alternative to the Proposed Action (Alternative C). Alternative B would reopen the Forest Service roads in the Wildcat Canyon area which is responsive to the public comments received from the motorized community. Likewise, Alternative D would close and decommission many of the Forest Service roads in the Wildcat Canyon area which is responsive to the public comments received from the environmental community (see EA, Appendix B for detailed Alternatives).

Increasing OHV opportunities in the project area above the pre-fire condition does not meet the purpose and need of this project. As stated in the EA (pg. 1-3) the purpose of the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation. There is a need to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat.

As described in the Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), the decision maker had to weigh their decisions based on several factors including public need but also projected budgets, safety, and environmental resource conditions.

Comment:

Would it be possible to add Metberry Gulch to Option C or must the options be adopted or rejected exactly as written? (28)

Alternative C would be ok if roads 220a, 220b, 540 and Metberry Gulch were to stay open as they make wonderful connections and allow long loops which greatly increase the recreational experience. (55)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 1-4), the District Ranger may decide to select the no action alternative, to defer action, or to select an action alternative. If an action alternative is selected, the District Ranger will decide on which roads to keep open or increase the maintenance level, and which roads to close, decommission or convert to another use such as motorized or nonmotorized trail. The District Ranger may decide to select an alternative and then modify it by adding, deleting or otherwise changing certain components of the alternative. So to answer the first comment, yes it would be possible to add Metberry Gulch to Alternative C, and no, the alternatives do not have to be adopted or rejected exactly as written. Please refer to the Decision Notice(s) to see which roads will be kept open.

Comment:

More miles of multiple-use trails must be made available. (29) (91)

I would also like to see some trails designated as motorized use only, similar in concept to those trails which are designed as hikers, bicycles, equestrian only. (91)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 1-2), this project addresses roads which are defined as a "vehicle travel-way greater than 50 inches wide". The management of Forest Service trails is outside the scope of this project. However, as stated in the EA (page 1-4), if an action alternative is selected, the District Ranger will decide on which roads to keep open or increase the maintenance level, and which roads to close, decommission or convert to another use such as a motorized or nonmotorized trail. Please refer to the Decision Notice(s) to see which roads will be kept open and converted to motorized or nonmotorized trails.

Comment:

The EA states that if alternative D was approved (pg. 4-54) a Forest Plan amendment would probably be necessary because of the reduction in motorized recreation opportunity in management areas 2A and 2B. We disagree because even with all the closures proposed under alternative D, there would still be many other routes open to motorized travel in those areas within the project area assigned to management prescriptions 2A and 2B. (26)

Response:

Under Alternatives A and D a large area of Management Areas (MA) 2A and 2B would become nonmotorized. As stated in the EA (page 4-56), the MA 2A and 2B categories emphasize semiprimitive motorized, roaded, and roaded natural recreation opportunities respectively. The comment above is referring to the Wildcat Canyon/South Platte River corridor area, where the four main roads leading to the South Platte River (i.e., Corral Creek, Hackett, Longwater, and Metberry) would be closed (under Alternative. A) and closed and/or decommissioned (under Alternative D).

The comment above is correct that there would still be many other motorized opportunities in the rest of MA 2A and 2B in the burn area, but not in the Wildcat Canyon/South Platte River corridor which is traditionally known for motorized access and challenging Jeep/OHV opportunities. Therefore, if Alternative D was selected, a Forest Plan Amendment would probably be necessary to emphasize the new nonmotorized recreation use in these areas.

Comment:

Close and return to natural state all logging and illegal roads in the area, and close any FS administrative roads or old roads from past cuttings. (83)

Response:

Under all alternatives, unclassified roads would either be closed or decommissioned. Under Alternative C, all unclassified (non-system) roads in the Hayman burn area will be decommissioned.

SUBJECT: OUTSIDE SCOPE OF PROJECT

Comment:

Please restore the dispersed camping in the drainage immediately north and across the road from the former Trail Creek Campground. (29)

Please re-open the Big Turkey campground in the near future. (29) (52) (59) (60) (72) (74) (85) (92) (94)

I also want to comment on Rampart Range Trail area. We need more trails not less. (33)

RESPONSE:

Dispersed camping along Trail Creek Road is outside the scope of this project; Trail Creek Road is not being addressed in this EA. Big Turkey Campground is also outside the scope of this project but was mentioned in the Cumulative Effects analysis in the EA on page 4-57. The Rampart Range Trail area is also outside the scope of this project but was also mentioned in the Cumulative Effects analysis in the EA on page 4-58. Please contact the South Platte

Ranger District for more information on the Big Turkey Campground and the Rampart Range Trail area planning process.

SUBJECT: COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Comment:

Allowing Forest roads 540 (Corral Creek), 221 (Longwater), and 220 (Hackett) to stay open for pubic recreation would place the FS out of compliance with the Clean Water Act, the Forest Service's Planning Regulations, various regulations, and relevant parts of the PSICC Forest Plan…and would fail to even meet the purpose and need of the project. (26) (54)

Many of the roads proposed to re-open would be difficult, even with regular maintenance, due to their location. Failure to close and obliterate these roads would likely place the FS outside of compliance with various laws and regulations, including the FS Planning Regulations. (26)

If roads are proposed for repair or conversion to motorized trails rather than obliteration, the agency must demonstrate that these routes can be maintained to minimize resource damage and not violate the Clean Water Act's anti-degradation rule for watersheds on the State of Colorado's 303(d) list. (26)

RESPONSE:

As stated in the Decision Notice (page 2), "Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3)."

As stated in the FONSI (page 5), "Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources. Overall, the project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

Furthermore, as stated in the FONSI (page 5), the EA discloses that "rehabilitation activities associated with reconstructing, relocating and decommissioning classified and unclassified roads, particularly in and near riparian areas and stream channels, would cause temporary short-term increases in stream sediment loading. Carrying out Best Management Practices and road engineering guidelines (EA, Appendix C) and the specific mitigations listed in Chapter 2 of the EA (pg. 2-3) will help minimize the amount of sediment entering streams.

The small increase in sediment would diminish downstream (EA, pg. 4-9). Various studies have found that most river-dwelling fish can tolerate minor increases in sediment and turbidity for short periods (Lloyd, 1985, 1987; Newcombe and MacDonald, 1991) (EA, pg. 4-9). Thus, the proposed road rehabilitation activities would be an insignificant adverse impact and have very minimal effect on downstream aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

The effectiveness of BMP's and other measures would be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act. Monitoring would measure the success of BMP's and help improve future mitigation methods. Monitoring would also identify unforeseen problems that require remedial measures. This monitoring would involve field measurements and inspections.

Comment:

The FS must adhere to the requirements of other federal statutes such as the Multiple-use Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA). Decisions based upon this EA will inevitably result in reduced OHV opportunity or less intensive use of National Forest lands. The Forest Service must seek to maximize present opportunity for motorized recreation in this area and plan for future increases to meet growing demand. (30)

Response:

The MUSYA provides for the management of "all the various renewable resources of the National Forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land...without impairment of the productivity of the land." The MUSYA does not require the Forest Service to provide a system of roads and trails sufficient to meet the increasing demands of forest users, but it does require the Forest Service to consider these demands in such a way that resources of related services (such as roads) are provided in coordination with other resources.

The effects on recreation access in the burn area and the need to protect water quality were among the driving issues for this EA and were considered by the District Ranger in this final decision. Effects of this decision to motorized recreation and the environment are fully disclosed in the EA and the Decision Notice/Finding of No Significant Impact and were found to be not significant. Providing additional opportunities for motorized recreation above and beyond the existing road system was not recognized within the purpose and need for action, was not included in the decision framework and is outside the scope of this project. Therefore, providing additional opportunities for motorized recreation would not fall within a range of alternatives considered "reasonable".

Where large or significant changes are proposed, the National Forest Management Act requires that the FS amend the forest plan and follow all of the procedures required for the revision of such a plan, including the preparation of an EIS. (30)

Response:

This is correct. If an amendment to the Forest Plan is needed, the Forest will follow Forest Service Handbook direction to amend the Plan. The definition for significance is different for amending the Plan and for NEPA. FSH 1992.52 lists the changes that are considered significant and FSH 1909.12, 5.32 list factors to be used when determining whether a proposed change to a forest plan is significant or not significant, based on NFMA planning requirements.

Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 allow agencies to "minimize conflicts among various users". The Executive Orders did not state "minimize conflicts with other users." (50)

Response:

The purpose and need for this project (EA, page 1-3) is focused around protection of resources and providing a safe and affordable transportation system for agency and public use – this is not an effort to resolve existing conflicts between any user groups.

The Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse is being considered for the removal from the Endangered Species list. This section does not reflect that the actions are requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). (90)

Response:

The EA indicates that prior to any decommissioning of a road in critical or potential habitat for the Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse, US Fish and Wildlife Service will be contacted and consulted as needed. Currently, the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse is still listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act and, by regulation, the Forest Service must address the potential influences of the alternatives on this species and seek to conserve it (50 CFR Part 402). Delisting processes must also be published in the Federal Register for public comment and review, and may take a considerable amount of time to finalize. If there are changes to the ESA requirements for these species, appropriate actions will be taken in the future. All of the alternatives indicate that the Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the mouse or its critical habitat. Concurrence on this determination has been received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

SUBJECT: COMPLIANCE WITH REVISED STATUTE 2477 (RS2477)

Comment:

Nowhere in the Environmental Assessment is there discussion of rights of the public regarding "RS-2477 roads": the right to enter upon and construct rights-of-way across federal lands unreserved for public uses. (27)

Since the Forest Service was aware of these RS-2477 assertions in Teller County before the EA was completed, it may not be possible for it to make the assertion (page 1-2) that the EA has been prepared in accordance with all Federal and State Laws. The closure of the 205 road and any decommissioning of the 220.A road is not, in our opinion [Teller County], a legal option for the Forest Service. (27)

Only Alternative B - Pre-Fire Condition is acceptable to Teller County -- or, in our opinion even legal -- since it is the only alternative that keeps all pre-fire RS-2477 roads open. Teller County understands that both Douglas and Park Counties concur in this. (27)

Teller County Commissioners recently declared RS-2477 on most of the roads in the Hayman area making them public access. (88)

Response:

A road traversing National Forest System lands may only be established as a public road under Revised Statute 2477 in two ways: (1) through a court proceeding or (2) through an

administrative process of a federal agency. A county cannot establish jurisdiction over such a road simply by making an assertion to the Forest Service or otherwise. At this time, there is no established administrative process for counties to file a request for a validity determination with the Forest Service on an R.S. 2477 assertion, except in situations where the county can demonstrate a compelling need. (See letter from Chief of the Forest Service to the Regional Forester and OGC Regional Attorneys, dated September 25, 1997; letter from the Associate Deputy Chief for NFS to Regional Foresters, dated December 15, 1997; and Forest Service Manual 2734.5.) Teller County has not asserted any compelling need in its statement.

SUBJECT: PROJECT MITIGATIONS AND MONITORING

Comment:

Proposed mitigation measures for noxious weed control should be strengthened to require pre-treatment (26)

It will be important to regularly monitor repairs, closures and decommissions for effectiveness and for the presence of noxious weeds. (26)

Response:

The mitigation measures listed for Noxious Weeds on page 2-4 of the EA contains adequate pre-treatment measures for noxious weed control. These include the following:

- Incorporate weed prevention into road maintenance and decommission projects.
- Inventory roads for noxious weeds and maintain records of weed species and their locations so planning for road maintenance can include mitigation measures.
- Avoid working in weed infested areas if possible. Postpone work until weeds have been eliminated from the site.

The Forest Service agrees with the comment above that it will be important to regularly monitor repairs, closures and decommissions for effectiveness and for the presence of noxious weeds. As stated in the EA (page 4-43), "Monitoring of the closed roads and obliterated roads would need to occur to reduce the hazard of the long term viability of noxious weed seed." Furthermore, as stated in the FONSI (page 5), "The closure and decommission of roads would assist in slowing the spread of noxious weeds (EA, pg. 4-43). Lack of access by vehicles would reduce the transport of seeds into the area, limit the amount of continued disturbance by vehicles, and allow for growth of native species (EA, pg. 4-43). However, increased risks of noxious weed infestation are associated with all roads work including road rehabilitation and decommission work (EA, pg. 4-42). Mitigation measures for noxious weeds presented in the EA will minimize any adverse impacts (pg. 2-4)."

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment:

The project will require the preparation of an EIS before any on-ground steps may be taken, which must explain the relevance of the Roads Analysis Report (RAP) to the NEPA process.

You should explain the difference between the EA and the RAP, and why the RAP was not covered by NEPA. How were the public comments to the RAP used? (30)

Response:

The Forest Service has considered doing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as required under the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). CEQ created the Environmental Assessment (EA) to provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS or a finding of no significant impact (FONSI). The District Ranger is the responsible official for making the decision on this project. A Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Notice and appropriate rationale are required if an EIS is not necessary.

The Forest Service prepared an EA for this project because the initial scoping and analysis did not raise any significant issues with the proposed action. Scoping for this EA was designed to ensure a full range of public issues, opportunities, and concerns were identified and considered during development of the proposed action and EA (see EA, page 1-4). The Forest Service does not believe that preparing an EIS only because a public group has requested it is in keeping with NEPA policy. Agencies are required to the fullest extent possible "to make the NEPA process more useful to decision makers and the public, to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data, and to emphasize real environmental issues and alternatives" (40 CFR § 1500.2(b)).

The EA is also consistent with the PSICC Forest Plan (EA, page 1-4). As stated in the EA (EA, page 1-4), this project tiered off the PSICC Forest Plan (USDA Forest Service 1984).

When proposed road management activities (road construction, reconstruction, and decommissioning) would result in changes in access, such as changes in current use, traffic patterns, and road standards, or where there may be adverse effects on soil and water resources, ecological processes, or biological communities, those decisions must be informed by roads analysis (FSM 7712.1). Conducted by an interdisciplinary team, the science-based roads analysis process provides the Responsible Official with critical information needed to identify and manage a minimum road system. Units are to use an authorized science-based roads analysis process, such as that described in the report Roads Analysis: Informing Decisions about Managing the National Forest Transportation System (USDA Forest Service, 1999, Misc., Report FS-643). While the report contains factual information concerning the transportation system, road management decisions are not a direct product of roads analysis. Rather, road management decisions utilize the information found by roads analysis and are disclosed in an appropriate NEPA document (FSM 1950 and FSH 1909.15).

Comments received during the preparation of the Hayman RAP were considered in that project and in this Environmental Assessment (EA, pg 1-2).

SUBJECT: DATA/SCIENCE ANALYSIS

Comment:

NEPA requires the agency to take a "hard look" at the potential environmental consequences of its proposal. Hayman EA fails to meet this standard because it is replete

with guesswork and summary conclusion, and contains a dearth of the quantified data and analysis necessary to justify any decision. (30)

Concerns over sensitive or endangered/threatened wildlife should in no way effect the FS's choice of alternative. To the extent that concerns over "habitat fragmentation" based upon roads and road density are at all relevant to the selection of alternative, the FS must set forth the scientific theory and hard data upon which such determinations are made. Requesting quantitative not qualitative analysis. (30)

Any perceived "damage" must be objectively quantified and measured against possible mitigation and management efforts. (50)

Response:

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects are clearly stated in the EA and the supporting analysis. The EA contains both quantitative and qualitative details, particularly with the respect to the key issues (EA, page 1-4). The emphasis on these issues and deemphasis on non-key issues is consistent with NEPA regulations.

By law, the Forest Service must address and seek to conserve threatened and endangered species when they could potentially be influenced by a federal action (50 CFR Part 402). By policy, the Forest Service must also address Regional Sensitive Species and assure that federal actions do not lead to a trend towards listing under the Endangered Species Act (Forest Service Manual 2670.3). These species were addressed in the Biological Assessment and Biological Evaluation for this project using the best quantified information available. As stated in the DN/FONSI, "The closure and decommission of roads under this action will also lower open road densities and reduce human disturbance factors which would have a long-term beneficial impact on wildlife including elk, mule deer, beaver, and resident and migratory landbirds including the Wilson's Warbler (EA, pgs. 4-18 to 4-31)." The selected alternative will help achieve the Project's purpose and need (EA, page 1-3) which will help achieve the PSICC Forest Plan goal to "increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement" (EA, page 1-3).

The specialist's analysis reports were too large to include in their entirety within the EA. Therefore, the EA summarizes and incorporates by reference some of the data, assumptions, and other detailed information contained in the Project Record, in accordance with NEPA regulations. The EA contains numerous scientific references to provide supporting evidence, used along with the professional judgment of the interdisciplinary planning team members. The EA contains quantified data where relevant and uses the best information available. NEPA documents are not intended to be the same as research studies or similar reports. The scope and content of the EA was developed consistently with NEPA regulations, and the Forest Service NEPA Handbook. NEPA regulations require EAs to be concise.

Comment:

The statement made in the EA (page 1-2), "…have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair…" is vague as to which roads this statement applies. (88)

Response:

To clarify, the entire statement referred to above in the EA (page 1-2) is "Because many roads in the Hayman burn area have required and continue to require extensive maintenance and repair and are causing resource and public safety concerns, a **roads analysis** was carried out to assess the current condition of the road system in the burn area." This sentence is providing general background information as to why a road analysis was carried out in the area affected by the Hayman Fire. Page 1-2 of the EA provides additional detailed information on the Hayman Roads Analysis Report. Specific information on the risks and values associated with the 620 miles of road evaluated in the Hayman roads analysis can be found in the Hayman Roads Analysis Report Appendices. For the approximately 130 miles of roads included within this EA, recommended road restoration work is highlighted in the EA Appendix E.

SUBJECT: CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS

Comment:

Concerned about the cumulative loss of motorized recreation opportunities on public lands (50)

Response:

The EA includes cumulative effects analysis developed in accordance with NEPA regulations. Cumulative effects are defined under CEQ Regulations, 40 CFR 1508.7. Cumulative Impact: "Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment that results from the incremental increase of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes them." Chapter 4 includes a detailed cumulative effects analysis for each resource area. The cumulative impacts to recreational opportunities are disclosed in the EA, page 4-56 through 4-58. As stated in the FONSI (page 7), "There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned in the area affected by this project".

SOIL AND WATER

SUBJECT: ROADS HAVE NO INFLUENCE ON SOIL EROSION/WATER QUALITY

Comment:

The magnitude of impacts from road erosion and environmental degradation due to 0.25% of the burn area is simply overstated. Impacts and degradation from burned hill slopes and other developed and undeveloped areas will far exceed the impacts from the 343 acres of the roads. (17) (55)

Response:

The EA (page 3-1 to 3-6, 4-7, and 4-8) discloses and differentiates the erosion coming from burned hill slopes and the influence of roads and erosion. The impacts and degradation from burned hill slopes are considered as cumulative effects, however erosion from the roads are the

emphasis of the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project. Erosion from burned areas, hillslopes, etc. will likely recover to approximately background levels after an estimated 3-10 years while roads will continue to produce sediment, although the amount will vary with road use, climatic conditions, and other factors (Libhova, 2004). As stated in the project purpose and need (EA, page 1-3): The purpose of the Hayman Fire Roads Management Project is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission (obliterate) unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation. There is a need to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat.

Comment:

Teller County disagrees with the assertion that roads are the cause of environmental degradation. (27)

Roads inspected by Teller County fail to show that the roads were causing erosion or habitat and water degradation, rather the negative impact was to resources and to roads themselves from upslope fire damage. (27) (86)

Response:

On pages 4-1 to 4-4, and 4-7 to 4-8, the EA describes the impacts of roads to riparian areas, water quality, fisheries and aquatic systems. Page 4-7 of the EA describes in detail that "Research evidence of increased erosion and sediment delivery to streams resulting from roads is strong (USDA Forest Service, 2000b; MacDonald and Stednick, 2003)." Furthermore, the EA discloses that "the effect of roads on streams depends upon the extent to which the road network is connected to the stream network. Interception of subsurface flow increases runoff rate and potentially the amount of sediment that is delivered to streams (EA, page 4-7 to 4-8)." Furniss (2000) describes that "Wherever a hydrologic connection exists [between a road and surrounding environment], accelerated water runoff, sediments and road-associated chemicals, such as oil or gasoline spills, generated on the road surface and cutslope, have a direct route to the natural channel network and surface waters (EA, page 4-2).

As stated in the FONSI for this project (page 5), "Overall, this project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

Comment:

Had immediate FS post-fire mitigation taken place to protect these roads, and pre-fire maintenance been allowed to continue, the negative impacts observed today would be significantly less. (27)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 3-6), Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation (BAER) treatments have been completed on 36,000 acres as of May, 2004. BAER treatments were initiated by the Forest Service on 31,300 acres after the fire was contained on July 7, 2002. BAER

treatments in the Hayman area included: 1) Hydromulching and seeding from roads and the air; 2) Ground cover with straw mulch and seeding; and 3) Ground scarification (hand or mechanical) with seeding. These projects were implemented on high-risk areas (high burn intensity, steep slopes, and erodible soils) to reduce the likelihood of damage to life and property. The cost of the BAER treatments from 2002 to 2004 was approximately $15 million dollars (Kanaan, pers. comm., 2004).

Road maintenance after the Hayman fire was prioritized by roads that were required to be opened because they are necessary for the functioning of the basic transportation network in the area and provide primary access to private inholdings and/or permitted special-use sites (EA, page 1-2). As stated in the EA (page 3-15), "Since the fire, emergency BAER maintenance and mitigation work concentrated primarily on protecting the major level 3 roads (i.e., Forest Roads 211, 560, etc.), and also level 2 roads that are open for public use. Road surfaces were repaired, culverts were cleaned, roads were armored with jersey barriers and riprap, and drainage areas along and across roads were also repaired, cleaned and enhanced as needed. In many cases, roads had to be repaired and culverts cleaned multiple times due to the amount of sediment carried into culverts and across roads during each rain event."

A decision to repair roads being addressed in this EA that are located in drainage or valley bottoms that were closed after the fire because of safety or resource concerns might have resulted in larger sediment contributions to the South Platte River if additional road fill was brought in.

Comment:

We disagree that it is necessary to close and decommission roads to restore environmental damage. Where roads have been closed, erosion, water degradation and habitat loss has been exacerbated. If upslope restoration is to occur, roads must be open. (27) (88) (90)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 1-3), the proposed action would include decommissioning or obliterating roads, not simply closing the roads. As defined in the EA glossary (Appendix A, page A-7), "Road decommissioning is the stabilization and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state." Road decommissioning will reduce the erosion coming off of the roads by reestablishing former drainage patterns, stabilizing slopes, and restoring vegetation. As stated in the FONSI for this project (page 5), "The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

Upslope restoration does not require roads. Approximately 21,500 acres were aerially treated with seed and straw mulch in 2002 and 2003. All-terrain vehicles (ATV quad runners) and ground crews have also been used successfully off of roads to scarify soils, spread mulch and seed. BAER efforts are detailed beginning on page 3-5 of the EA.

Comment:

Closing roads and trails as motorized recreation is not a reasonable alternative unless there is imminent danger to the environment. This danger has not been demonstrated. (31) (55)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 1-3) the purpose of the project is to restore needed roads to a safe, environmentally sound condition, and decommission unneeded roads and those causing excessive erosion, water degradation and/or habitat degradation. There is a need to provide a safe transportation network in the burn area that is responsive to public needs, realistic to projected budgets, and sensitive to wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife habitat.

The EA (pg. 1-4) describes the public involvement process, and along with documents in the Project Record, show that relevant information was provided to the public and decision-makers early in and throughout the process. Scoping letters were mailed in January 2004 requesting public input and two open house meeting were also held in January 2004. Approximately 1500 comment letters and emails were received. All comments were considered in the development of issues and the alternatives.

Flash flooding, hazard trees, erosion, and other natural resource damage as a result of the fire have created unsafe situations for people recreating in the area, and environmental resource concerns. While these may not be of "imminent danger", the Forest Service desires to be proactive and reduce both safety and environmental hazards before significant damage occurs.

Comment:

Reducing the amount of roads available for recreational use will cause overcrowding and increased wear and tear on the roads. (52) (56) (58) (59) (60) (66) (68) (69) (72) (73) (85) (87) (92) (94)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-46), all classified roads would be brought up to Forest Service (FS) standards before they are opened for public use. It is fully disclosed in the EA (pages 4-46, 4-48, 4-53, and 4-55) that the reduction of the amount of roads available for recreational use may cause overcrowding and increased wear and tear to the roads. However, also on page 4-47, the EA states that "Because the roads would be brought up to FS standards, they should be able to handle the extra volume of traffic and increased public safety concerns."

Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 2-3 and 4-47), strict adherence to those mitigations listed in Chapter 2, Best Management Practices and road engineering guidelines is essential. A list of BMP's and road engineering guidelines are located in the EA, Appendix C.

Comment:

River crossings by motorized users have never been a threat to fish or drinking water and don't kick up excessive sediment. (55)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-7), "Loss of riparian vegetation and sediment pollution from roads has been shown to reduce stream production potential for aquatic organisms. Road-stream crossings and improperly placed culverts can reduce or eliminate fish passage. Research evidence of increased erosion and sediment delivery to streams resulting from roads is strong (USDA Forest Service, 2000b; MacDonald and Stednick, 2003)." Furthermore, the EA discloses that "In many disturbed areas, vehicles have driven on, around and through the

stream banks removing stabilizing vegetation and causing bank erosion that contributes to higher sediment loads downstream (EA, page 4-3)."

As stated in the FONSI (page 5), "The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

SUBJECT: ROADS HAVE INFLUENCE ON SOIL EROSION/WATER QUALITY

Comment:

We oppose converting any roads to motorized trails as this would perpetuate erosion and excessive resource damage. (26) (38) (54) (63) (77) (78) (79) (81) (83)

Response:

The conversion of some roads to motorized trails will help meet the purpose and need of this project by providing a safe transportation network.

Furthermore, as stated in the EA (page 2-3 and 4-47), strict adherence to those mitigations listed in Chapter 2, Best Management Practices and road engineering guidelines is essential. A list of BMP's and road engineering guidelines are located in the EA, Appendix C.

The effectiveness of BMP's and other measures would be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act. Monitoring would measure the success of BMP's and help improve future mitigation methods. Monitoring would also identify unforeseen problems that require remedial measures. This monitoring would involve field measurements and inspections.

Comment:

Therefore, it is of paramount importance that any roads contributing more than very minor amounts of sediment or capable of doing so either be repaired or obliterated. (26)

Maintenance of Forest Road 558 should include proper placement of culverts at the stream crossing or in wet areas and ensuring that runoff from the roadbed does not wash sediment into Goose Creek. (26)

Roads most damaged by fire and subsequent rain should not be closed but be obliterated. (83)

The year round closure of Corral Creek (540) should include major restoration work on the lower end where the route descends to the river. (26)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-46), all classified roads would be brought up to Forest Service (FS) standards before they are opened for public use.

Furthermore, Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection as indicated in the Forest Service Handbook (FSH 2509.25-2001-1) would be applied to all proposed activities (EA, page 2-3). A list of BMP's and road engineering guidelines are located in the EA, Appendix C.

The effectiveness of BMP's and other measures would be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act. Monitoring would measure the success of BMP's and help improve future mitigation methods. Monitoring would also identify unforeseen problems that require remedial measures. This monitoring would involve field measurements and inspections.

Comment:

At a bare minimum, all river fords must be closed, and the section of 221 within about one-half mile of the river must be obliterated. This road is so steep that it simply cannot be located or engineered so that erosion and water quality concerns are adequately addressed. (26)

Leaving roads open which allow unhardened fording of the South Platte River and Tarryall Creek perpetuates erosion, stream sedimentation, and the degradation of fisheries and water quality. (26)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-46), all classified roads would be brought up to Forest Service (FS) standards before they are opened for public use.

Furthermore, Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water quality protection would be applied to all proposed activities (EA, page 2-3 and 4-47). A list of BMP's and road engineering guidelines are located in the EA, Appendix C. In Appendix C, page C-6, it is stated to "Avoid unimproved stream crossings. When a culvert or bridge is not feasible, locate drive-throughs on a stable, rock portion of the stream channel."

It is recognized in the EA that steep roads require special attention. As stated in the EA (page 4-52), "Many of the roads . . . will require extensive repair and rehabilitation to get them back to a safe level. Any road repair or relocation work that is required outside of the existing road location, or "road prism", may require additional NEPA analysis. Depending on the extent of road rehabilitation work required current road closures would remain in place until resources and funding are obtained and the road is fixed."

The effectiveness of BMP's and other measures would be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and Clean Water Act. Monitoring would measure the success of BMP's and help improve future mitigation methods. Monitoring would also identify unforeseen problems that require remedial measures. This monitoring would involve field measurements and inspections.

<u>SUBJECT: SOIL EROSION AND WATER QUALITY MODELING AND MEASUREMENTS</u>

Comment:

Soil erosion rates vary within the EA. Recommend that this section be revised to clarify the estimated soil erosion rate for the Hayman Burn Area. (17)

To most people, the numbers of tonnage of debris in the EA are as incomprehensible as the budget numbers for the federal government. (88)

Response:

The soil erosion rates that are used in the EA are based on several research reports, modeling and collected data (EA, page 3-1 to 3-4). The amount of sediment coming off of the Hayman Burn Area post-fire is in the range of 35-86 tons/acre. The range of 35-50 tons/acre over a 5 year period is based on Moody and Martin's (2001) report based on post-fire monitoring of the Buffalo Creek Fire – an area on the Pike National Forest with similar soil types, vegetation and topography. The erosion rate of 70 tons/acre over a 5 year period for high severity burn areas is the modeled Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) output based on erosion data from the Big Turkey and Buffalo Creek fires (EA, page 3-4). The high estimate of 86 tons/acre (EA, page 3-1) comes from the Upper South Platte Watershed Protection and Restoration Project: Annual Report 2002: A Year of Fire and Recovery.

As stated in the EA (page 3-4), "The average erosion rate for the Hayman Fire is 43 tons per acre/year based on a weighted average of the erosion rate by severity class and acreage in each group." Furthermore, the point being made with the soil erosion rates is that "the hydrology and stream flow of the area has drastically changed since the Hayman Fire. As was experienced in the summer of 2003 [and 2004], the burn area is prone to frequent flash floods and these will continue to occur until the area has sufficiently recovered (EA, page 3-5).

The unit of measure utilized in the EA to quantify the sediment erosion rate is "tons per acre". Tons and acres are common methods of measurement used in everyday communication such as newspapers, magazines, television and other methods of communication. One ton is equivalent to 2000 pounds. One acre is equivalent to 43,560 square feet and is slightly smaller in size than a football field.

Comment:

Recommend adding the rainfall depth (i.e. total inches of rainfall) used to model the 25 year, 1 hour storm event as a common measure that most people can understand and relate to. (17)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 3-5), "The BAER team used the WILDCAT flow prediction model (Hawkins and Greenberg, 1990) to predict changes in peak flow events from the Hayman area. The modeled design storm was a 25-year, 1-hour storm and represents the maximum storm that BAER treatments could withstand." The rainfall depth used in the WILDCAT modeling is approximately 1inch/hour.

According to the model, 13% of the affected watersheds would have flows exceeding 500 cubic-feet per second/square mile (csm) and 4% exceeding 600csm (EA, page 3-5). The average pre-fire predicted runoff was 75csm and post-fire was 290 csm. After the BAER treatments were completed, the WILDCAT model was run again for each of the sub-

watersheds (7th order watershed) that had some portion treated. The average runoff rate was reduced from 290 to 175 csm.

Cubic foot per second per square mile (csm) is the average number of cubic feet of water flowing per second from each square mile of area drained, assuming that the runoff is distributed uniformly in time and area.

One cubic foot/second (cfs) is equal to 7.48 gallons per second.

Comment:

Which streams are on the M&E list due to sediment and which ones are on the list for temperature? What is causing the temperatures to be high? Is there a relationship with the roads? (90)

Response:

The following tributaries to the South Platte River are on Colorado's 2004 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) List.

Tarryall Creek, Listed for: Sediment
Indian Creek, Listed for: Sediment
Goose Creek, Listed for: Sediment
Trout Creek, Listed for: Temperature
Pine Creek, Listed for: Sediment
Goose Creek, from Lost Valley Ranch to Cheesman Reservoir, Listed for: Sediment and Temperature
Bruno Gulch and tributaries on USFS Land, Listed for: Metals
Sugar Creek, Listed for: Sediment
Trail Creek, Listed for: Temperature
Wigwam Creek, from Flying G Ranch to South Platte River, Listed for: Sediment
Russell Gulch, Listed for: Sediment
S. Fork Lost Creek, Listed for: Sediment

Stream temperature is currently being monitored by the Forest Service. This data will be evaluated by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and the Forest Service to determine if the temperatures are elevated above natural conditions and try to identify the source. If the temperatures are deemed to be above the state water quality standards, the stream may be added to the 303d list (required by federal Clean Water Act) and require a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) analysis to be completed in order to improve water quality.

The EA (page 4-3) states that "Indirect effects of roads include increased sediment and bank instability which can cause sediment deposition further downstream, thus changing the channel morphology and watershed response to flood waters. When too much sediment is added to a stream system, channels that have moderate width/depth ratios and moderate sinuosity (the curvature of a stream channel) become wider and shallower. As a result, they tend to have very little habitat for aquatic life, and often exceed temperature standards for sustainable aquatic productivity."

Comment:

As stated in the EA, "Roads located directly in stream channel bottoms play a role in the delivery of these sediments." Is it known how much a role the roads play? (90)

Response:

The role that roads play on the delivery of sediment depends upon the extent to which the road network is connected to the stream network (EA, page 4-7 to 4-8). As stated in the EA (page 4-1), approximately 59.5 miles of the roads addressed in this EA have a risk rating of **high** for aquatics which means they have the potential for causing major or severe adverse effects on fisheries and aquatic habitat due to their location within or in close proximity to a stream channel. These roads, because of their location, provide a main access point for the delivery of sediment since they are the path of least resistance. As severely burned areas recover with vegetation over time, sediment production rates will decrease (EA, page 4-8). Unpaved roads, on the other hand, will continue to produce sediment, although the amount will vary with road use, climatic conditions, and other factors (Libhova, 2004).

On pages 4-1 to 4-4, and 4-7 to 4-8, the EA describes the impacts of roads to riparian areas, water quality, fisheries and aquatic systems. Page 4-7 of the EA describes in detail that "Research evidence of increased erosion and sediment delivery to streams resulting from roads is strong (USDA Forest Service, 2000b; MacDonald and Stednick, 2003)." Furniss (2000) describes that "Wherever a hydrologic connection exists, accelerated water runoff, sediments and road-associated chemicals, such as oil or gasoline spills, generated on the road surface and cutslope, have a direct route to the natural channel network and surface waters (EA, page 4-2)."

Comment:

Rehabilitation efforts were conducted to provide short term mitigation of the fire's effects. Is there a measure of effectiveness of these efforts and can they be duplicated in the remaining burn areas. (90)

Response:

The effectiveness of BAER treatments in the burn are being monitored. The monitoring and measure of these treatments is outside the scope of this project. Please contact the PSICC Supervisor's Office in Pueblo for specific information about BAER treatments in the Hayman burn area.

Comment:

The EA points out that other areas in the three districts are seeing overuse and abuse because of the overcrowding. Little or no information is supplied about the extra sediment coming from these areas (88)

Response:

The measure of sediment from these other areas is outside the scope of this project.

RECREATION

SUBJECT: DISPERSED CAMPING

Comment:

Please, do what you can to allow for the continuation of "Dispersed Camping". (16)

Under Alternative C, all the camping is proposed to be eliminated. (90)

Response:

Dispersed camping or camping outside a developed recreation area may continue in those areas proposed for road closure or decommission; however, access may be by hiking, biking or horseback. Dispersed camping is currently available throughout the Hayman Burn Area on all roads currently open and would be available on those roads selected to be reopened under Alternative C. Because of safety concerns due to hazard trees and potential flash flooding in the burn area, dispersed camping and parking in the Hayman area must currently take place in areas posted on the ground with a "P" sign for "Parking". This special travel restriction order (Order No. 03-04) was signed into effect by the PSICC Forest Supervisor on July 18, 2003 and will remain in effect until July 18, 2006 or until rescinded, whichever occurs first.

SUBJECT: RECREATIONAL CROWDING

Comment:

You must take into account the serious crowding of the 717 trails that currently exist. Any other alternative will only worsen this condition. (22) (47)

The crowding, I believe, is due in large part to the closures of the trails west of Wildhorn Ranch Road, trails 735, 731, 734, 733, 732 to name a few. (22) (47)

Reducing the amount of roads available for recreational use will cause overcrowding and increased wear and tear on the roads. (29) (30) (35) (48) (50) (52) (56) (58) (59) (60) (66) (68) (69) (72) (73) (85) (87) (92) (93) (94)

The overuse of other OHV areas like Rampart Range, China Wall and Gold Camp Road will not change and may worsen if the roads in Hayman are not reopened. (86) (88)

Response:

Crowding and visitor density was an issue indicator used to evaluate the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the alternatives on the recreation resource (see EA, pg. 4-48, 4-49, 4-51, 4-53, 4-55). As stated on page 6 of the DN/FONSI, "Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). By keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area, this will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt at other parts of the Pikes National Forest such as Rainbow Falls and China Wall (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term and not significant until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again."

SUBJECT: RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Comment:

Alternative B will increase opportunities for specialized (non-stock) 4x4's. (44) (59) (61) (66) (67) (87) (92) (94)

Response:

The effects on recreation access in the burn area and the need to protect water quality were among the driving issues for this EA and were considered by the District Ranger in this final decision. The effects of this decision to motorized recreation and the environment are fully disclosed in the EA and the Decision Notice/Finding of No Significant Impact and were found to be not significant. Providing additional opportunities for specialized (non-stock) 4x4's was not recognized within the purpose and need for action, was not included in the decision framework and is outside the scope of this project. Therefore, providing additional opportunities for specialized (non-stock) 4x4's would not fall within a range of alternatives considered "reasonable".

SUBJECT: RECREATIONAL CONFLICT

Comment:

Alternative C and D will increase social conflict and close roads that are valuable to OHV enthusiasts. (23) (24) (32) (36) (37) (45) (46) (50) (60) (61) (62)

Response:

The effects on recreation access in the burn area and the need to protect water quality were among the driving issues for this EA and were considered by the District Ranger in this final decision. The effects of this decision to motorized recreation and the environment are fully disclosed in the EA and the Decision Notice/Finding of No Significant Impact and were found to be not significant. Both the recreation and social sections disclose that each alternative will close some roads to some or all OHV uses. The Recreation section (EA, Chapter 4) recognizes that road closures may contribute to additional perceived crowding and displacement between user groups. None of the alternatives is expected to increase conflict among recreation users.

As stated in the FONSI (page 6), "Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). By keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area, this will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt on other parts of the Pike National Forest such as Rainbow Falls and China Wall (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again."

SUBJECT: LAW ENFORCEMENT

Comment:

Leaving Road 220 (Hackett) open as proposed in alternative C would make it more difficult to close roads 220.A (Crossover), which crosses both the Tarryall and S. Platte Rivers, and 220.B (Widow Maker), which crosses the South Platte, allowing adverse impacts to continue. (26)

The additional closures in Alternative D would make more effective the closures contained in the Proposed Alternative, thereby reducing the enforcement problem. (54) (63)

Signing and fencing are ineffective in closing roads. (26)

Response:

As discussed in the EA (page 4-47), ongoing monitoring would be necessary to determine the safety and efficiency of the road system. Furthermore, the EA discloses (Appendix C, page C-8) that "Monitoring will be necessary under all alternatives, especially the action alternatives, to determine the effectiveness of the road maintenance and decommission mitigation measures and road closures." Signing and fencing to close roads is a definite challenge but is not ineffective. Experience on the Pike National Forest has shown that about 95% of all users respect signs and fences. Signing and fencing are the most economical and efficient means to close roads without overspending your limited dollars and staff time. Furthermore, closing and decommissioning roads will include more than signs and fences such as gates, other barricades, slash and brush.

SUBJECT: RECREATION DISPLACEMENT

Comment:

Stating that individuals may decide to do a different activity (like ATV riding instead of jeeping) is like stating that some individuals will die and decrease the usage. (90)

The EA draws the same conclusion that time and money are determining factors for forest visitors going to similar area. Since no similar area exists within same drive times, a considerable loss will accompany Alternatives A, C and D. (88)

Response:

The potential loss of OHV opportunities is recognized in both the Recreation (EA, page 4-52) and Social Economics section (EA, page 4-61).

As stated in the FONSI (page 6), "Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). By keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized

use in the Hayman area, this will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt on other parts of the Pike National Forest such as Rainbow Falls and China Wall (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again.

SUBJECT: RECREATION CLARIFICATIONS

Comment:

The description of motorized use on Forest Roads includes reference to "mountain bikers" and "horseback riders". Although these forest users in fact use the roads, they should probably not be classified as "motorized" users. (17)

In the EA, mention is made to "extreme OHV riding" there is no extreme riding in Wildcat Canyon. Using that term here overstates the recreational opportunity in the area. (88)

Response:

The statement made in the EA on pages 3-17, 3-20 and 3-23 is "However, some people utilize these roads for pleasure driving and/or sightseeing purposes including four-wheel drive motorized users, mountain bikers, and horseback riders." To clarify, the statement was made to illustrate that even nonmotorized users utilize the road system for recreation.

The statement made in the EA on pages 3-17 and 3-20 refers to "extreme OHV riding" opportunities in the Wildcat Canyon area. To clarify, the term "extreme" was used to describe OHV opportunities in Wildcat Canyon that are more challenging and beyond the norm.

TRANSPORTATION

SUBJECT: ROAD IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Comment:

The EA states that the cost per mile for maintenance of Level 2 roads is $409 per mile but that the maintenance cost of a level 1 road (closed) more than $463 per mile. Therefore, it makes sense financially to maintain these level 1 roads as level 2 roads rather than decommission or close them. (59) (72)

The FS must explain, if the cost per mile for level 2 maintenance of a road is $409, how the maintenance cost of a level 1 road is $463 per mile. (25) (30) (60)

The EA points out that a Level 1 road (a closed road) will cost $463 per mile to maintain and a Level 2 road only costs $409 per mile to maintain. Using these #'s opening roads will cost less and more can be done to stop erosion with the saved funds. (88)

The per mile cost of maintenance on the level 2 roads (4x4) in Alternative B are considerably less than the other alternatives. (25) (44) (58) (61) (65) (67) (72) (88) (92) (94)

The cost to keep existing [roads] open has also proven to be less than restoring a [road] to its natural state by over $50 per mile. (56)

Response:

As stated in the EA, Appendix F, "Cost per mile figures are estimates based on available PSICC data and are only intended to be used for comparison purposes." Furthermore, as summarized in the EA (page 3-15), the annual maintenance cost figures are based on data that is averaged across the entire PSICC. To clarify, these are not exact cost per mile figures but averages and estimates to be used for comparison purposes only.

It must be noted that Level 1 roads are closed to public motorized use but are still open for administrative purposes and permitted uses and therefore still require maintenance. They still remain as roads across the landscape and require maintenance, especially drainage features, which keep the road in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines. Furthermore, Level 1 roads, when closed, must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, signs or other closure devices which are also a factor in road maintenance costs (see Road Maintenance Level definitions in the EA, Appendix A).

The EA discloses (page 4-46) that the cost to implement Alternative B is much lower than Alternatives C and D. However, as stated in the EA (page 4-46), "Even though the one-time implementation cost is lower than C and D, the long-term cost effectiveness of this alternative is offset by the large maintenance costs, especially the deferred maintenance costs which would continue to increase since many of the roads proposed to be opened under this alternative are susceptible to flooding and erosion due to their poor location."

As stated in the Decision Notice, "Alternative C as modified does the job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3)."

In addition to looking at the per mile cost of road management, it is also important to look at the impact of each alternative in terms of costs and the benefits over time. An economic efficiency analysis looks at the values national forest users have for the resource, as well as the direct costs the Forest Service incurs in implementation and management over time. An economic efficiency analysis in the form of a present net value (PNV) calculation was completed to display these long-term differences between alternatives. PNV is defined as the value of discounted benefits (or revenues) minus discounted costs. Generally, a PNV analysis will include all benefits and costs – it the case of the Hayman, only those costs and benefits with easily identified figures were considered.

The following table highlights the economic PNV for each alterative. All dollars were in constant terms with no allowance for inflation. A four percent discount rate was used over the planning horizon of 30 years. The reduction of the PNV in any alternative as compared to the most economically efficient solution is the economic trade-off, or opportunity costs of achieving that alternative. The costs and benefits included in an PNV analysis are often the center of disagreement for interested people, so this analysis should not be considered as a complete answer, but only one tool decision makers use to gain information about resources, alternatives, and trade-off between alternatives.

	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
	In millions of dollars			
Present Value Benefits	164.6	164.6	164.6	164.6
Present Value Costs	-2.8	-4.1	-4.4	-3.9
Present Net Value	161.8	160.5	160.1	160.6

*Source: NVUM 2003, QuickSilver 2004, EA Appendix F for costs by alternative.

The costs included in the analysis are those outlined in Appendix F of the EA. Only recreation use was included as a benefit or value. The figure used is consistent across all alternatives as there is not enough use information available on which to base potential changes by alternative. The use within the Hayman area was estimated based on the total visits estimated to the Forest, and applied the Hayman area as a percentage. The use figured used was 383,793 visits. The dollar value estimated for each trip is an average of use values for Region 2 for activities including; horseback riding, motorized use, viewing scenery, picnicking, hiking, biking, wilderness use, fishing and hunting. All activities require some form of access, so the average value of $23.44/visit was applied to the annual visits estimate. These same figures were applied each year for all 30 years of the project.

While Alternative B has lower up front costs than Alternatives C or D, when considering the deferred maintenance and annual maintenance costs over the next 30 years, Alternative C is still slightly higher due to the increases in road level management, while Alternative D is less costly due to a decrease in the transportation system total miles. When considering all the costs and recreation benefits together, all alternatives show a positive Present Net Value (PNV), so the total value of recreational benefits outweigh the costs of implementing each alternative. Alternative A has the highest PNV with continued use levels and limited road rehabilitation costs, and lower annual costs with the fewest miles of roads. Alternative D has the next highest PNV with continued benefits and reconstruction and annual maintenance on less costly (less steep) road system.

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION BUDGET

Comment:

The projected cost of the proposed action is $1,729,000, with an additional annual maintenance cost of $141,241. This is a large amount of money not likely to be covered by a normal budget unless there is a special appropriation or allocation of funds, as there was for the Hayman Restoration effort. (26)

We are skeptical that the FS can afford to maintain most of its motorized routes. (59) (63)

It would be preferable to use limited funds to close expensive "problem" roads in order to use maintenance funds most effectively, and thereby actually promote the maintaining of the largest recreational road network which limited money can buy. (54)

The highest priority should be to obliterate (decommission) unclassified roads which are at high risk for damage to the aquatic ecosystems of the project area. A close second priority should be decommissioning as many classified roads as possible in the area that are rated high for risk to aquatics. (26)

Roads should not be reopened unless a comparable number of miles are decommissioned. (26)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-46 and 4-52), roads to be opened under any of the alternatives will not be opened until proper maintenance and rehabilitation have been completed. Under normal budgets, this will take several years for those roads to be opened. Priority will likely be given for those roads with resource concerns as well as those roads accessing popular use areas.

The Forest Service has little control over the total budget provided by Congress, or the levels of funding provided within each program area. While the budget for road maintenance has been limited in recent history, each ranger district and forest will apply their funds as efficiently as possible to repair and maintain the road system.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC

SUBJECT: POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Comment:

Implementation of recommended closure and/or decommissioning of any road in the northwest portion of Teller County and the southeast and east-central portion of Park County will have a significant [economic] impact on Teller County due to the popularity of the entire recreation area surrounding Wildcat Canyon. Users of these roads accessing the South Platte and Tarryall Rivers in the Wildcat Canyon recreation area can not simply be redirected elsewhere in Teller County: there's no place here to send them. (27)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-61), "… there would be little change to spending patterns by visitors and little change in overall tourism activity in the local area. This is not to say that the use in the Hayman area is not important to the local economy, but that current users of the area would not likely change their use of the overall area under any of the alternatives. For those [roads] that would be closed or decommissioned, nonmotorized use [may] increase, and there are other motorized opportunities [within the Hayman burn area, the Pike National Forest and throughout the state] for people to substitute for any closures or decommissions in the selected alternative (see Recreation section)."

As stated in the FONSI (page 6), "Alternative C as modified addresses many of the public access concerns from motorized recreation users. Many of the recreation opportunities available in the Hayman area before the fire would be made available following the required road rehabilitation work (EA, pg. 4-52). As a result, there would be less displacement of visitors to motorized areas outside of the Hayman area since many popular Forest roads would be reopened (EA, pg. 4-53). By keeping more classified Forest roads open to motorized use in the Hayman area, this will help reduce the potential for crowding, low visitor satisfaction, and resource impacts being felt on other parts of the Pike National Forest such as Rainbow Falls and China Wall (EA, pg. 4-53). The closure and decommission of favorite roads under this action will no doubt cause dissatisfaction among some recreationists and may cause displacement and perceived crowding but these effects are expected to be short-term until the road system selected under this alternative is opened up again."

Economics is only one tool decision makers use to select between alternatives, there are other benefits that are not easily quantifiable but will still be considered. The decision notice explains the tradeoffs, considerations, balancing of resources, and rationale that the decision maker used to select an alternative. As stated in the Decision Notice (page 3), "Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3)."

SUBJECT: POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS

Comment:

Alternative B provides low social effects to 4x4 recreation, whereas Alternatives C and D increase these social effects. (29) (59) (72) (92)

The Values, Attitudes and Beliefs on pg.3-30 of the EA, should have been printed in bold on each page. Is the alienation of residents and the stewards of the forest worth 49 miles of road? Is the FS willing to close roads to satisfy the environmental elite that do not help in this area, knowing they may lose the largest volunteer support the area has ever had? (88)

Response:

Management of the National Forest System lands balances all uses, interests and values, both local and those outside the area and outside the state are concerned. People value intact ecosystems, environmental protection, forest health, as well as access, commercial uses, and recreational opportunities – the planning process is an opportunity to consider and balance these values in our management of a national resource.

As stated in the Decision Notice (page 3), "Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project. The modified alternative will help achieve Forest Plan goals to provide a broad spectrum of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities; increase

diversity for wildlife and habitat improvement; maintain or improve water quality to meet Federal and State standards; protect riparian areas and wetlands from degradation; and manage the transportation system for increased cost-effectiveness, efficiency and utility (EA, Chapter 1, page 1-3)."

VOLUNTEERS

SUBJECT: ROADS AND VOLUNTEER ASSISTANCE

Comment:

The Forest Service has historically incurred very little maintenance cost in the Wildcat Canyon area since it has been well-maintained by volunteers for years. Volunteers continue to be willing to assist the Forest Service in such maintenance, and Teller County is certainly willing to commit the limited use of its heavy equipment for the reconstruction or relocation of roads that directly impact our economy. (27) (88) (93)

Nowhere in the EA are the tremendous volunteer hours, supplies and heavy equipment that are donated taken into consideration. Factor these items in and the cost to Alternative B would drop. Additionally, the water quality would improve faster than the projected five to seven years as stated in the EA. (88)

Closing any of these roads will alienate the volunteers and jeopardize continued volunteer help, not only in Wildcat, but everywhere in the forest. (88)

Alternative B states that there will be short term increases of sediment. No consideration was given to the decrease of both related and unrelated sediment reduction with volunteer help. (88)

Response:

The EA recognizes on page 3-17 and 3-20 that "many local OHV clubs were involved in the maintenance and upkeep of these roads through grant agreements with the Colorado State Parks OHV Fund and partnerships with the US Forest Service. Over the past 8-10 years, a considerable amount of volunteer hours and over $100,000 in grant monies has been dedicated to hardening and rehabilitating four-wheel drive roads in the area, especially Longwater, Corral Creek and Hackett."

Furthermore, the EA (page 4-45) states, "The use of volunteer groups to help with decommissioning, rehabilitation, reconstructing and maintaining roads under any of these alternatives is a good possibility in light of comments received during the scoping process. Any future collaboration, partnerships or contributions from volunteer groups could offset some costs and could accelerate the timing on opening roads proposed by each alternative. There are several successful partnerships on the Pike NF with road and trail user groups, but it would be difficult to include non-binding agreements in this analysis. Under any alternative, partnerships will always be considered as a valuable method for completing road maintenance work, educating user groups, and involvement opportunities."

As mentioned in the EA (page 4-59), volunteer hours and materials were not included in this analysis as it is difficult to complete an analysis with non-binding agreements. But under all alternatives, volunteer work could potentially reduce the costs for whichever alternative is selected, as well as decreasing the time needed to complete roadwork required before routes can be reopened. As stated in the EA (Appendix F), "However, utilizing volunteers and receiving grants could reduce the cost for any individual road in these alternatives."

ROADLESS AREAS/RESEARCH NATURAL AREAS/WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY

SUBJECT: ROADLESS AREAS AND RESEARCH NATURAL AREAS (RNA)

Comment:

The heavy recreation use in many parts of the project area as well as the surrounding area makes maintaining and enhancing the integrity of roadless areas necessary for wildlife habitat and for non-motorized recreation. (26)

We support the decommissioning of the following road segments to preserve and protect Sheeprock, Gun Barrel and Thunder Butte Roadless Areas: FSR 211 spurs, FSR 544, 534, 535, 536, 524 and 526. (70) (77) (78) (79) (81) (83)

Alternative C would adversely affect the ecological values of the proposed Little Creek RNA and we support the Alternative D proposal to decommission/convert to other uses the following roads: No Name (366), No Name Spur (366.A), Bull Elk (366.AA), Cow Elk (366.AB) and Little Creek (366.D). (26) (54) (79) (81)

Response:

As stated in the EA (page 4-56), "The PSICC Forest Plan prescribes much of the Hayman area as suitable for motorized recreation. Approximately 64% of the Hayman area is under the 2A and 2B management direction and about 92% of the Hayman area is within the ROS settings of Roaded-Natural (RN) and Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM)." The opportunity to expand roadless areas (IRA's), research natural areas (RNA's) and replace the "Scenic" classification of the Wildcat Canyon area with a "Wild" classification was an alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study (EA, page 2-5) because it does not meet the purpose and need of this project.

Many of the roads mentioned in the second comment above are already proposed for year-round closure or decommission under modified Alternative C, thus resulting in the closure or decommission of classified and unclassified roads in the following inventoried roadless areas: 5, 255, 345, 346, 347,

The roads mentioned in the third comment above are proposed for decommission under Alternative D. This alternative was considered in detail in the Environmental Analysis. Under the modified Alternative C, FSR 366.A (No Name Spur) and 366.AA (Bull Elk) will be decommissioned thereby reducing almost 2.5 miles of road in the area from pre-fire levels.

The District Ranger considered the needs of the public in his/her decision based on public comments and the Hayman Roads Analysis Report completed for this project and weighed these needs within the environmental concerns identified in the EA. As stated in the Decision Notice (page 3), "Alternative C as modified does the best job of balancing concerns for recreation access and for watershed and soil health while meeting the purpose and need of this project."

Furthermore, as stated in the FONSI (page 5), "Alternative C as modified can be carried out without any significant effects on social, economic, cultural, and natural resources. Overall, the project will have a long-term beneficial impact on the environment (See EA chapter 4). The rehabilitation and/or decommission of roads, especially those with a moderate or high risk rating for aquatics (EA, pgs. 4-1, 4-9, 4-10), will help reduce erosion and stream sediment loading and will result in a long-term beneficial impact to water quality (EA, pgs. 4-3, 4-6), riparian areas (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10), downstream fisheries (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10) and aquatic habitat (EA, pgs. 4-9, 4-10)."

SUBJECT: WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY

Comment:

Note that recreation, while an outstandingly remarkable value for other river segments, is not a value for this segment [Wildcat Canyon] as stated at EA pp. 4-58 and 4-59. Therefore, eligibility of the river would not be adversely affected by any level of road closures and decommissioning. (26)

Page 4-59 of the EA states: "Above Cheesman Reservoir, the key recreation value related to eligibility and classification of the South Platte River is motorized access in the Wildcat Canyon area. The recreation value is thus best served by those alternatives providing the widest range of recreation opportunities combined with a high level of user satisfaction." This is a blatant error. (26)

"In the event of conflicting elements between [the Hayman Roads Project and the ROD for the Wild and Scenic River Study of the South Platte River and North Fork of the South Platte River], the decision elements that are the most protective of river values will prevail" (ROD at 6). Clearly, closing and decommissioning roads would be the most protective of the fisheries and wildlife values, and would not adversely affect the other values. (26)

Response:

The EA erroneously listed recreation as an outstandingly remarkable value in Segment C, which is above Cheesman Reservoir and includes Wildcat Canyon. Accordingly, the first paragraph under Recreation on page 4-59 should be disregarded. However, this does not affect the overall conclusion that eligibility and classification appear to be protected under all of the alternatives.

The discussion on page 4-59 under Fisheries recognizes that Alternative D would be the most protective of the fisheries and wildlife values, but that eligibility and classification would not be jeopardized under any of the alternatives.

As stated in the EA (page 4-10), "The overall long-term consequences are improved aquatic habitat and reduced total stream sediment under the Proposed Action and therefore increased aquatic organism production and improved fisheries quality." Furthermore, as summarized in the Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat section of the EA (page 4-12), "Among alternatives, C and D permanently close and decommission the most roads and thus have the greatest beneficial cumulative effects."

Comment:

Page 3-24 although it is FS policy, what is the difference between being accepted under a classification of the Scenic and Wild Rivers Act and maintaining the classification? Why bother to solicit input from the community if the simple act of becoming eligible for consideration establishes the area as needed to "protect eligibility and maintain classification?" (90)

Response:

The difference is subtle but important. The acts of determining eligibility and classification directly follow from a technical finding conducted by agency specialists, whereas subsequently maintaining classification is a matter of agency policy. Even though carrying out this policy means that one aspect of the outcome (adherence to policy) can be known in advance, the agency still can be required to consult with the public regarding the alternatives being considered and the impacts that are expected. Such is the case here.

WILDLIFE

SUBJECT: ROADS AND BIG GAME WILDLIFE SPECIES

Comment:

The accessibility of the area to motorized travel has been one of the reasons for a decline in big game herds and hunter success. Specifically, we ask that you decommission and block off the Corral Creek, Hackett, and Longwater Roads. (71)

Response:

The big game species addressed in this analysis (mule deer and elk) are discussed on pages 11-17 of Chapter 4 in the EA and pages 10-20 of the Wildlife Report. As noted in these documents, big game populations are managed and tracked by the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) based on large herd range areas defined as Data Analysis Units (DAUs). The DAUs are comprised of smaller individual Game Management Units (GMUs) from which annual harvest levels are set. Only a small portion of three deer DAUs and 3 elk DAUs overlap the Hayman Fire Area, and only four of the 17 inclusive GMUs were influenced by the burn. Big game populations are currently above the state management objective for all three elk DAUs while deer populations vary up or down between the DAUs. The Corral Creek, Hackett, and Longwater Roads are all located in GMU 511 of deer DAU D-50 and elk DAU E-23. Deer populations in DAU D-50 are at or perhaps slightly above state management objectives while elk populations in DAU E-23 exceed objectives by approximately 32%. Therefore, based on CDOW population data there has been no measurable decline in big game numbers in this particular DAU. However, the EA recognizes the influence that open

roads and ATV trails might have on big game habitat use and vulnerability during the hunting season(s) in the post-fire condition, and proposes to close or decommission approximately half of the mileage associated with the individual roads mentioned. An analysis of the differences between the alternatives in relationship to big game species is provided on the pages mentioned above.

Comment:
Alternative D will provide the best protection of both water quality and soil resources, and will allow for a recovery in the vegetation and development of quality big game herds. (71)

Response:
It is recognized that Alternative D provides a high degree of protection for water quality, soils, and big game resources since it is associated with the highest amount of road closures and/or decommissioning. However, the analyses associated with this EA suggest that the Proposed Action (Alternative C) also displays a high degree of protection for these resources while also better addressing other issues and concerns that relate to a safe and environmentally sound transportation system that responds to the need for public access.

Comment:
To provide game herd cover, reduce soil erosion and runoff of soils into streams and into the South Platte we feel it is essential to close FSR 205, 206, 210.2B, 220.B, 220.A, 210.2A. (71)

Response:
The EA addresses each of these individual roads differently based on the analysis of the project alternatives and the recommendations from the Roads Analysis Project (RAP). Four of the six roads mentioned are currently closed in Alternative A (No Action), and all of these individual roads are proposed to be closed and/or decommissioned in Alternatives C and D. However, none of these roads would remain closed in Alternative B since the intent of this alternative is to restore the road system to the pre-fire condition to maximize public access. The EA recognizes that, if selected, many of the roads in Alternative B will require extensive repair and rehabilitation to restore and maintain them in a safe and environmentally sound condition. The EA recognizes that there are trade-offs among each of these alternatives concerning soil erosion and sedimentation potentials to streams and potential influences on how big game species may use post-fire cover and forage areas. However, any selected alternative must meet applicable laws and regulations, Forest Service policy, and Forest Plan Standards for the resources mentioned.

FIRE AND FUELS

SUBJECT: FIRE RESPONSE TIME

Comment:
Alternatives C and D will create fire dangers by closing roads, which will be needed for fire access and fuels reduction access in the future. (29) (88)

Alternative B will provide faster response times to any fire incident due to more road access. (30) (44) (58) (59) (60) (61) (94)

Alternative B could potentially speed up fire suppression response time as fire personnel would not have to deal with locked gates. (56) (72) (73) (85) (87) (92) (94)

Response:

As stated in the FONSI (page 6), "The selected alternative would not adversely affect fire suppression response times due to fewer roads being available for ground fire suppression access. Many of the roads selected for closure and decommission under this alternative are high-clearance, level 2 roads that were not accessible by Forest Service fire engines due to the steep terrain and narrow road width. As stated in the EA, aerial resources such as helicopters and /or airplanes would have to be utilized more resulting in higher suppression costs but increased ground crew safety (EA, pg. 4-64)."

APPENDIX B

List of Commenters

APPENDIX B - LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS WHO RESPONDED WITH COMMENTS TO THE HAYMAN ROADS MANAGEMENT EA

COMMENTER NUMBER	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	ORGANIZATION
1	David	Hage	
2	Don	Thompson	
3	Don	Rodgers	
4	Don	Rodgers	
5	Kent	Sundgren	
6	Peter	Waas	
7	Taryn	Reynolds	
8	Ralph	Parkes	
9	Jeff	Reinmuth	
10	Bill	Morgan	
11	Gino	Mattorano	
12	Rocky	Smith	Colorado Wild
13	Andrew	Metzger	
14	Kendall	Carlton	Colorado Land Cruisers
15	JJ	Barr	
16	Ronnie	Bincer	
17	William	Alspach	
18	Marie	Skov	
19	David	Hachenberger	
20	Lee	Patton	
21	Robert	Hutson	
22	Gary	Miller	
23	Tim	Winder	
24	Erik	Nelson	
25	Dawn	Drussel	
26	Rocky	Smith	Colorado Wild
27	Curt	Logsdon	Teller County
28	Jim	Williams	OSHWEGO Jeepers
29	Richard	Trow	
30	D. Andrew	Wight	COHVCO
31	Carl & Connie	Bauer	
32	Jim	Augliera	
33	Jim	Fleming	
34	Mike	Kleineider	
35	John	Vreeland	
36	Jerry	Pfannenstiel	
37	Terrel & Beverly	Agy	
38	Jill	Hill	
39	Mike	Berkey	
40	Bill	Hall	
41	Anne	Akers-Lewis	
42	Adam	Mehlberg	Trailridge Runners 4WD Club
43	Robert	Krus	
44	Robert	Norton	New Mexico 4-Wheelers
45	Dale	Tanaka	
46	David and Rachel	Wurst	
47	Joel	Tyler	
48	Rodrick	Mead	

COMMENTER NUMBER	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	ORGANIZATION
49	David	Porter	
50	Brian	Hawthorne	Blue Ribbon Coalition
51	Mike	Rhyne	
52	Scott	Gray	Ute Pass Iron Goats
53	Eric	Drummond	Ute Pass Iron Goats
54	James	Lockhart	Pikes Peak Sierra Club Group
55	Jim	Maucker	
56	Ige	Gustavson	
57	Shelby and Judy	Moore	
58	Cristi	Bauer	
59	Carla	Boucher	United Four Wheel Drive Associations
60	Neale	Geis	Colorado Four Wheelers Inc.
61	Dave	Saxon	Ute Pass Iron Goats
62	Adam	Mehlberg	
63	Deb & Dave	Callahan & Jones	
64	Betty	Botts	Trailridge Runners 4WD
65	Ray	Comeau	Trailridge Runners 4WD
66	Neal	Rogacki	
67	Dennis	Ogg	
68	Richard & Karla	Harmon	
69	Rich and Cathy	Horiuchi	
70	Anna	Weiland	
71	Michael	Bond	Bond Investment Group
72	Gene	King	CO Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs
73	Joan	Beck	Bullhead 4 Wheelers, Inc.
74	Nancy	Shields	
75	Barry	Shields	
76	Peter	Bond	
77	Margaret	Johnson	
78	Thomas	Johnson	`
79	Michael	Mueller	Sierra Club South Platte Group
80	David	Wicks	
81	Dave	Van Manen	
82	Dave	Van Manen	
83	David	Lien	
84	Martha	Maddux	
85	JD	Myers	
86	Lisa	Fitzgerald	Colorado Rockhoppers
87	Michael	Everhart	
88	Jerry	Panek	Predator 4-WD, LLC
89	David & Ralph	Therrin & Parkes	
90	Julie	Panek	Titan Liners, Predator 4-WD, LLC
91		Sundgren Family	
92	Gene	King	COHVCO
93	Paul	Grobe	The Hillbillies 4X4 Club
94	Larry	John	

APPENDIX C

Roads Decision Spreadsheets

Alternative C (Modified) - Proposed Action. All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.						
Pikes Peak Ranger District - Hayman Roads Management Project						
Road Number	**Classified Road Name**	***Maintenance Level**	****Ranger District**	**Number of Road Miles**	*****Management Recommendation**	*****Work Required**
200.B	EMILY CAMP	2	PP	1.08	F	
332	LAURA LANE	2	PP	1.59	A	
332.CA	LINDA SPUR	2	PP	0.61	A	
332.D	CONNECTOR	2	PP	0.32	A	
340.B	WHAT	2	PP	1.13	F-motorized trail	
340.C	WHITNEY WAY	2	PP	0.45	F	
341.A	MAINITOU DESTRUCTOR	2	PP	1.85	A	
341.B	CHAIR	2	PP	0.21	A	
343.A	TURKEY TRACK SPUR N.	2	PP	2.58	A	
343.A1	MISTAKE	2	PP	0.24	F	
343.A2	HUNTING	2	PP	0.67	F	
343.B	TURKEY TRACK SPUR S.	2	PP	0.48	A (.28 mi.) / F (.2 mi.)	
349	DRURY	2	PP	1.36	E	
350.C	ANITA	2	PP	0.80	F	
352	TROUT CREEK RANCH	3	PP	0.39	A	
352.A	CEMETERY	2	PP	0.26	A	
357.I	DYCKS DRIVE	2	PP	0.55	F	
357.J	LOST	2	PP	0.99	A	
357.K	ELVIS	2	PP	0.26	A	
357.L	CAMP	2	PP	0.24	A	
360.A	DISTRICT BOUNDARY	2	PP	1.72	A	
360.B	DISTRICT BOUNDARY SPUR	2	PP	0.90	A	
361.A	WILDHORN CG	3	PP	0.21	F	
362.B	SIGNAL VIEW	2	PP	0.14	A	
362.C	COW	2	PP	0.20	F	
362.D	CALF	2	PP	0.46	F	
364.B	VALLEY	2	PP	0.62	F	
366	NO NAME	2	PP	4.98	A	
366.A	NO NAME SPUR	2	PP	2.07	F	
366.AA	BULL ELK	2	PP	0.45	F	
366.AB	COW ELK	2	PP	0.56	A	
366.B	NICE BUCK	2	PP	0.18	A	
366.C	SPIKE BULL	2	PP	0.42	A	
366.D	LITTLE CREEK	2	PP	0.72	A	
367	CHESTNUT	2	PP	1.53	A	

Road Number	Classified Road Name	*Maintenance Level	**Ranger District	Number of Road Miles	***Management Recommendation	***Work Required
367	CHESTNUT	3	PP	2.25	A	
388	MEF NORTH ROAD	2	PP	1.10	E	
391.A	MISTLETOE	2	PP	1.16	A	
Total Classifed Road Miles				35.72		
UR	Unclassified Roads		PP	11.28	F	
Total Unclassified Road Miles				11.28		

***Road Maintenance Level**

Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, double lane, paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance.

Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane, and aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be dust abated.

Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities. Typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and native or aggregate surfacing.

Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passengar car traffic is discouraged. Traffic is minor administrative, permitted or disperesed recreation.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed. Some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. Closures must exceed one year.

****Ranger District**

PP = Pikes Peak Ranger District

*****Road Management Recommendations**

Management Strategies:

A. Maintain as is
B. Increase Maintenance Level
C. Decrease Maintenance Level
D. Implement Seasonal Travel Restrictions
E. Close Year Round
F. Decommission or Convert to Other Use

Work Required:

1. Maintain on Regular "annual" maintenance cycle
2. Maintain on "as needed" basis
3. Requires major improvement or deferred maintenance project work
4. Requires minor improvement or deferred maintenance project work

Alternative C (Modified) - Proposed Action. All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.						
South Park Ranger District - Hayman Roads Management Project						
Road Number	**Classified Road Name**	***Maintenance Level**	****Ranger District**	**Number of Road Miles**	*****Management Recommendation**	*****Work Required**
205.A	DEER MEADOW	2	SO PK	0.52	F	
207	FAT CHANCE	2	SO PK	0.67	F	
210	PLATTE SPRINGS	2	SO PK	2.51	A	
210.2A	SHORTCUT	2	SO PK	0.47	F	
210.2B	LIONESS	2	SO PK	0.42	F	
211.A	STAGE STOP	2	SO PK	0.77	D	3
211.A1	STAGE STOP SPUR	2	SO PK	0.26	F	
211.B	LENTINUS	2	SO PK	0.14	D	3
211.C	DECEPTIVE	2	SO PK	1.35	D	3
211.D	MAGILLA GORILLA	2	SO PK	0.72	F	
211.D1	ALLEY OOP	2	SO PK	0.14	F	
211.E	MAGGIE DIP	2	SO PK	0.12	D	
211.F	IRIS	2	SO PK	0.34	D	
211.G	OLD MATUKAT ROAD	2	SO PK	0.39	F	
215	PRESERVE	2	SO PK	1.87	F - nonmotorized trail	
215.A	PRESERVE SPUR	2	SO PK	0.06	F	
294	APPROACH	2	SO PK	1.28	F - nonmotorized trail	
360.2C	PILGRIM	2	SO PK	0.92	A	
360.2D	LUTHERAN	2	SO PK	0.96	A	
360.2E	QUARTZ	2	SO PK	0.34	D	
367.1A	TAYLOR SPUR	3	SO PK	0.59	A	
367.A	CHESTNUT SPUR	2	SO PK	0.61	F	
Total Classifed Road Miles				15.45		
UR	Unclassified Roads		SO PK	8.53	F	
Total Unclassified Road Miles				8.53		
***Road Maintenance Level**						
Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, double lane, paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance.						
Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane, and aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be dust abated.						
Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities. Typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and native or aggregate surfacing.						
Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passengar car traffic is discouraged. Traffic is minor						

administrative, permitted or disperesed recreation.					
Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed. Some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. Closures must exceed one year.					
****Ranger District**					
SO PK = South Park Ranger District					
*****Road Management Recommendations**					
Management Strategies:					
A. Maintain as is					
B. Increase Maintenance Level					
C. Decrease Maintenance Level					
D. Implement Seasonal Travel Restrictions					
E. Close Year Round					
F. Decommission or Convert to Other Use					
Work Required:					
1. Maintain on Regular "annual" maintenance cycle					
2. Maintain on "as needed" basis					
3. Requires major improvement or deferred maintenance project work					
4. Requires minor improvement or deferred maintenance project work					

Alternative C (Modified) - Proposed Action. All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

South Park Ranger District (Wildcat Canyon) - Hayman Roads Management Project

Road Number	Classified Road Name	*Maintenance Level	**Ranger District	Number of Road Miles	***Management Recommendation	***Work Required
220	HACKETT	2	SO PK	7.16	A*	
220.A	CROSSOVER	2	SO PK	1.35	A*	
220.B	WIDOW MAKER	2	SO PK	0.53	A*	
540	CORRAL CREEK - lower section	2	SO PK	1.99	A*	
Total Classifed Road Miles				11.04		
UR	Unclassified Roads		SO PK	8.53	F	
Total Unclassified Road Miles				8.53		

***Road Maintenance Level**

Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, double lane, paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance.

Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane, and aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be dust abated.

Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities. Typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and native or aggregate surfacing.

Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passengar car traffic is discouraged. Traffic is minor administrative, permitted or disperesed recreation.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed. Some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. Closures must exceed one year.

****Ranger District**

SO PK = South Park Ranger District

*****Road Management Recommendations**

Management Strategies:

A*. Maintain as is, if and only if a written easement, agreement or special use permit is entered into with a public road management agency with respect to each road, and such easement, agreement or permit contains an agreed maintenance standard for each road.

B. Increase Maintenance Level

C. Decrease Maintenance Level

D. Implement Seasonal Travel Restrictions

E. Close Year Round

F. Decommission or Convert to Other Use

Work Required:

1. Maintain on Regular "annual" maintenance cycle				
2. Maintain on "as needed" basis				
3. Requires major improvement or deferred maintenance project work				
4. Requires minor improvement or deferred maintenance project work				

Alternative C (Modified) - Proposed Action. All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.						
South Platte Ranger District - Hayman Roads Management Project						
Road Number	**Classified Road Name**	***Maintenance Level**	****Ranger District**	**Number of Road Miles**	*****Management Recommendation**	*****Work Required**
206	NORTHRUP	2	SO PLT	2.01	F	
211.I	LOST VALLEY CUTOFF	2	SO PLT	1.96	F	
211.J	GOOSE CREEK CG	3	SO PLT	0.28	deferred decision	
211.K	HELEN'S ROCK	2	SO PLT	0.40	F	
211.L	HELEN'S ROCK SPUR	2	SO PLT	1.44	F	
211.M	MOLLY GULCH CG	2	SO PLT	0.41	F	
360.A	CEDAR MT. SPUR	2	SO PLT	0.60	E	
360.B	TURKEY ROCK	2	SO PLT	0.50	deferred decision	
360.C	BIG TURKEY CG	2	SO PLT	0.68	deferred decision	
522	BELL ROCK SH	2	SO PLT	1.54	A	3
522.A	BELL ROCK SPUR	2	SO PLT	0.20	F	
523	NINE-J	3	SO PLT	4.97	A	
523.B	TURKEY CREEK CUTOFF	2	SO PLT	0.92	F	
523.C	HUNTER	2	SO PLT	0.21	F	
524	UPPER TURKEY CREEK	2	SO PLT	1.63	F	
525	LITTLE TURKEY CREEK	2	SO PLT	3.01	F	
526	TURKEY CREEK	2	SO PLT	3.26	F	
529	LAZY GULCH	2	SO PLT	1.05	A	3
534	FLAT SALOON	2	SO PLT	5.66	E	
535	BRUSH CREEK	2	SO PLT	1.64	E	
536	KELSEY CREEK	2	SO PLT	1.15	E	
541	FLYING G	3	SO PLT	1.36	A	3
542	TWIN CREEK	2	SO PLT	5.19	F	
544	CABIN CREEK	2	SO PLT	2.01	F	
558	GOOSE CR TRAILHEAD	3	SO PLT	1.20	A	4
560	STONEY PASS	3	SO PLT	10.63	A	3
560.A	TEPEE	2	SO PLT	1.76	deferred decision	
Total Classifed Road Miles				55.66		
UR	Unclassified Roads		SO PLT	16.65	F	
Total Unclassified Road Miles				16.65		
***Road Maintenance Level**						
Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, double lane, paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance.						

Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane, and aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be dust abated.

Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities. Typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and native or aggregate surfacing.

Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passengar car traffic is discouraged. Traffic is minor administrative, permitted or disperesed recreation.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed. Some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. Closures must exceed one year.

**Ranger District

SO PLT - South Platte Ranger District

***Road Management Recommendations

Management Strategies:

A. Maintain as is

B. Increase Maintenance Level

C. Decrease Maintenance Level

D. Implement Seasonal Travel Restrictions

E. Close Year Round

F. Decommission or Convert to Other Use

Work Required:

1. Maintain on Regular "annual" maintenance cycle
2. Maintain on "as needed" basis
3. Requires major improvement or deferred maintenance project work
4. Requires minor improvement or deferred maintenance project work

Alternative C (Modified) - Proposed Action. All unclassified roads will be decommissioned.

South Platte Ranger District (Wildcat Canyon) - Hayman Roads Management Project

Road Number	Classified Road Name	*Maintenance Level	**Ranger District	Number of Road Miles	***Management Recommendation	***Work Required
205	METBERRY 4WD	2	SO PLT	4.63	A*	
221	LONGWATER	2	SO PLT	4.63	A*	
540	CORRAL CREEK - upper section	2	SO PLT	2.90	A*	
	Total Classifed Road Miles			12.16		
UR	Unclassified Roads		SO PLT	16.65	F	
	Total Unclassified Road Miles			16.65		

***Road Maintenance Level**

Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, double lane, paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance.

Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane, and aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be dust abated.

Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities. Typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and native or aggregate surfacing.

Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passengar car traffic is discouraged. Traffic is minor administrative, permitted or disperesed recreation.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed. Some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. Closures must exceed one year.

****Ranger District**

SO PLT - South Platte Ranger District

*****Road Management Recommendations**

Management Strategies:

A*. Maintain as is, if and only if a written easement, agreement or special use permit is entered into with a public road management agency with respect to each road, and such easement, agreement or permit contains an agreed maintenance standard for each road.

B. Increase Maintenance Level

C. Decrease Maintenance Level

D. Implement Seasonal Travel Restrictions

E. Close Year Round

F. Decommission or Convert to Other Use

Work Required:

1. Maintain on Regular "annual" maintenance cycle

2. Maintain on "as needed" basis					
3. Requires major improvement or deferred maintenance project work					
4. Requires minor improvement or deferred maintenance project work					