

Pikes Peak District Priority routes

Support closing 376.A Bull Park to public motorized use

We support the proposal in alternative E to convert this to an administrative road.

This road fragments a Bighorn Sheep production areas, winter concentration area and summer range. Motorized use in these areas will disturb sheep.

This road also poses risks to watersheds, a stream, globally imperiled plants and archaeological resources.

This road protrudes into and fragments an otherwise unroaded and relatively untrammelled 8500+ acre segment of habitat, consisting of primarily USFS but also BLM and other land. There is a relatively high density of routes, disturbance, fragmentation and human use just to the east of this area. Limiting motorized use on this road to administrative use only will help preserve and protect this area.

Oppose designation and construction of new motorcycle trails PA 42 and PA 43

These routes will fragment habitat and permit new OHV use west of the Rampart Range Road in this area.

We also oppose the designation and construction of the segments of trails PA 44 and PA 54 extending east of trail PA 48 as these provide the connection to PA 42 and 43 and the Rampart Range Road.

These routes were only proposed as part of Alternative D.

Oppose the designation and creation of new motorcycle trails PA 15 and PA 16

These routes will fragment additional habitat and land.

They will fragment Bighorn Sheep production areas, winter concentration areas and summer range. Motorized use in these areas will disturb sheep. There is evidence that the addition of new trails can result in declines in Bighorn Sheep at the population level.

These routes were only proposed as part of Alternative D.

Oppose the proposed creation of new route PA 115

No justification or support is provided for the proposed addition of this new road as part of alternative D.

We oppose the proposed creation and construction of 1.57 miles of a new road, which will consume additional road funding. The PSI Forest already has a huge road maintenance deficit, and the addition of this new road will only add to that.

We find it odd that this new route is proposed as a new road and not as another new motorized trail open to all motor vehicles. This is especially true as road 311.A to which PA 115 will connect to the north is proposed to be converted into a new motorized trail in most other alternatives, and the same alternative D that proposed to create PA 115 as a road also proposes to decommission the segment of road 307 that 115 would connect to on the south.

We oppose any proposed designation of PA 115 as any type of new motorized trail, as this was not suggested as an alternative and the public is not considering this route as a potential new trail.

The designation of PA 115 will create a new motorized loop route that will increase the volume of motorized use on 311.A and the end of 307. These are dead end route segments and receive less recreational motorized use because they do not provide motorized loop opportunities.

Increased motorized use on this dead end segment of road 307 will increase conflicts with quiet recreationists, who use that segment of road to complete a trail loop on the Schubarth 721 and Stanley Canyon 707 Trails.

PA 115 will unnecessarily fragment additional habitat. Screening also indicates that this route will impact wetlands, riparian areas and wildlife.

Oppose reducing maintenance on part of the Rampart Range Road 300 to make it unsuitable for passenger car access

We oppose reducing maintenance on part of the Rampart Range Road from ML-3 to ML 2 as proposed in alternatives B and D.

This road provides popular access to all types of recreation. We do not believe these recreationists should have to consider obtaining a specialized high clearance 4WD vehicle to safely and easily use this road.

Maintenance level 2 roads are more likely to allow mixed unlicensed OHV use on them, and we believe that will increase conflicts and compromise safety.