Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/22/2020 4:56:21 AM
First name: Dave
Last name: McIntire
Organization:
Title:
Comments: December 21, 2020

USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Regional Office
ATTN: Reviewing Officer
P.O. Box 18980
Golden, CO 80402

RE: Pike and San Isabel National Forests Motorized Travel Management (MVUM) Analysis

To Whom it may Concern:

I am writing to object to certain aspects of the Record of Decision as a follow-up to my comments on this topic I submitted on 11/1/2019.

First, in my comments I identified that I supported the additional parking spots as you identified in Alternative D. I find what looks to be only 2 new places in your ROD. This is a major shortcoming.

In my comments I stated: "I do think there is a need for additional places for people to park their vehicles, for whatever activity they wish to pursue, and thus I think the various spots listed in Alternative D should be added to Alternative C. Converting short, dead-end, spur roads to parking spots or camp spots if desired, would be a good thing."

With the public's increased use of outdoor recreation opportunities there is a dramatically increased need in this regard currently, and as population continues to increase, the need will become even greater in the future. Your decision failure was you failed to properly provide for a sustainable system due to provision of an inadequate number of places for people to park and dispersed camp, which will result in excessive use to the environment due to an overconcentration of users in few areas due to this lack of availability. This overconcentration will harm the environment, which will spawn closures, and more concentration, and more closures... its a vicious circle!

I hereby request that you reconsider the dead-end spur roads and rather than simply closing the vast majority of them, designate them as open for parking and as available for dispersed camping.

Second, I identified that I supported the opening of, what are commonly known as, The Gulches.

In my comments I stated: "In both the South Park RD and South Platte RD are roads commonly known as The Gulches. I applaud the Alt C proposed opening of the stretch of 220 on the Park County side so that a loop can be made with 736 and I also applaud the proposed opening of the portion of 205 that is in Douglas County, however all the roads should all be open at least down to the river and not terminate arbitrarily at the Park County line. Its very fun and scenic down there by the river for not only dirt bikes, but also for the 4x4 community. Obviously 736 should remain singletrack only as proposed."

I see that you have partly agreed with me in that the loop with part of 220 and 736 will be allowed and I applaud that because this is a high quality section, but the other roads should also be legally opened, at least down to the river. Better yet, would be a solution, likely involving a bridge, over the S. Platte River so that the historically used roads/trails on the other side of the river could be legally open too.

Your decision failure was that the recreational benefit of these roads/trails was incorrect...the value was arbitrarily indicated to be low due to lack of use when in fact, the value of these are among the highest of everything in the PSI, and that applies to pretty much all motorized user groups.

I hereby request that these roads be re-opened, at least down to the S. Platte River (i.e. don't close them at the Park County line), and that includes the western ends of 220 and 221. Also, ideally, your ROD would provide for the possible reopening of the roads on the west side of the S. Platte River at some point in the future if a method of dry travel across the S. Platte were arranged.

Third, I identified support for various new singletracks south of the Captain Jacks Trail. Unfortunately, none of these trails are shown in the ROD as open.

Specifically, I stated: "The singletrack in these areas are very valuable and should be kept open as per the treatment in Alt C. The proximity to the front range adds to their importance, especially with the continual population increase, which obviously applies across the entire PSI. To this end, the proposed new motorized singletrack (PA 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 28 ) and other trails and roads from Alt D would be very welcome to help disperse users across a wider area of terrain."

Via omitting these new trails, you are failing to provide trail mileage that will further disperse users in a trail system that is near one of the major metro areas in the state of Colorado. Via this failure, you will be limiting the ability for users to disperse which is ever more dangerous and which also results in avoidable damage to the environment. Single track trails have very little impact on the environment, but are the most attractive trails to dirt bikers, hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians because these types of users like to get away from larger 4 wheeled vehicles, and thus the more single track miles, the better. Maintenance costs on singletrack would be much less than on roads but could serve many user groups.

Thus, I hereby request that you reconsider these singletracks as viable options to help increase the public's safety, especially because singletracks rate very highly when it comes to recreation value among its user groups.

Fourth, I spoke to my support for adding various new trails in both the Rainbow Falls areas and southern Rampart Range area. Unfortunately, I only see one or two of these trails as being added in the ROD.

Specifically, I stated: "I will comment here about the Alt D proposed road addition (PA 18) in the Pikes Peak RD that would link 346 to 300.F. This could be a very welcome addition to 346 (Hotel Gulch) as a second way of getting between Rampart Range Road and the NE edge of the 717 trail system." and "Again, this area (like a huge portion of the PSI) is close to the front range and thus needs to provide as many opportunities for recreation as possible in order to disperse users and help enhance safety. Toward this end, I would welcome the addition of the motorcycle singletrack proposed in Alt D (PA 42-48) and the other new roads and trails as well. Proposed new trail PA 25 is beyond welcome, it is needed as a link across CO 67 in order to facilitate getting from this area, to the 717 area."

I do see that PA 25 was added, and I think that was wise as it adds safety in that it will be a good way for OHVs to cross 67. However, the absence of the others I think is a shortcoming, again, for the similar reasons I've mentioned above, of providing additional safety (spreading out users) and lessened environmental impacts (use less concentrated).

Thank you for considering my comments.

NOTE - I sent these comments tonight via email to the address in the ROD, and it was kicked back as invalid. Address was: r02admin-review@usda.gov