

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 1

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/21/2011 Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
no the destruction is clear

Topic Question 2:
The determination that there would be no major impact to the environment is obvious to anyone who loves the trail to be inaccurate

Topic Question 3:
Nope. Paving paradise has always worked, why stop now?

Topic Question 4:
Nope, You have managed to reach the desired outcome for the "special interests".

Topic Question 5:
I would imagine everything is all on the up and up. Just like when the other 6 miles got paved.

Topic Question 7:
The trail I use regularly will be destroyed, but the masses with their garbage and their need for ease and comfort will be happy. So I will go elsewhere

I did seriously hold onto a small glimmer of hope that the trail would not be destroyed. There is nothing more to say.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 2

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 09/21/2011 | Date Received: 09/21/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

I look forward to being able to safely bicycle from one end of the lake to the other, as well as to Sol Duc, without having to use the main highway. Any plan that accomplishes that is a good plan as far as I am concerned.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 3

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/11/2023 Date Received: 09/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
NO

Topic Question 2:
NO

Topic Question 3:
ALTERNATIVES 2 THRU 4 ARE UNACCEPTABLE AND WOULD DESTROY THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF
THIS
TRAIL. WE DON'T NEED A PAVED ROAD ON BOTH SIDES OF THE LAKE!!!!

Topic Question 4:
JUST LEAVE IT ALONE

Topic Question 7:
IF YOU PAVE IT WE WON'T USE IT!

PLEASE LEAVE IT ALONE!!!!

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 4

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/23/2011 Date Received: 09/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

Topic Question 3:
No

Topic Question 4:
NO

Topic Question 5:
No

Topic Question 6:
No

Topic Question 7:
No

Please leave this beautiful trail as is... we don't need a paved road on both sides of the lake!!! We hikers so appreciate having a place close by that isn't a steep trudge or drive but still gives us that wonderful wilderness experience. There is a paved pathway along the Strait already available to bikers and such... nothing like it for us

hikers except for Railroad Spruce!

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 5

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 09/23/2011 | Date Received: 09/23/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

Why does Clallam County want Alternative 4? What are AASHTO guidelines? How are any of these alternatives to be funded? How much do Alternatives 2,3,4 cost?

Topic Question 7:

I want to be able to ride a regular road bike from Port Townsend to La Push and this will be a part of that route. It is therefore of utmost importance that the entire route be paved and that both tunnels be reopened.

If the NPS is preferring Alternative 2 in order to make this part of the trail non-AASHTO compliant and therefore ineligible for certain federal funding, I will be very disappointed. The Olympic Discovery Trail is going to be a jewel on the Olympic Peninsula, one that will attract many bicycle enthusiasts who may have never visited Olympic National Park before. A wide bike trail would allow safe passage along Lake Crescent, that does not exist presently. It would also encourage people to visit portions of the park without their automobile. People could ride their bike from the cities on the peninsula to Sol Duc Hot Springs without driving. This is encouraged. I get the feeling the NPS does not want increased visitation by bike riders and that is wrong!

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 6

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/24/2011 Date Received: 09/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

Topic Question 3:
I think this trail has to accessible to road bikes, horses, walkers, and wheelchairs.

Topic Question 7:
I use the ODT literally daily, in which to commute to work, as well as business, appts., grocery shopping, and as recreation. My dream is to someday ride from Port Townsend to La Push.

I am in favor of Alternative 4, to continue development of the ODT.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 7

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/24/2011 Date Received: 09/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

A little difficult to understand to a "civilian" but I was able to understand the main parts of each Alternative.

Topic Question 2:

I feel the information as written is complete and accurate. I did not see (maybe I missed it) anything about tourism dollar values. Alternatives 1 and 2 while viable have far lower marketing and tourism value than Alternative 3. It is possible that Alternative 3 could be marketed as a destination recreation opportunity in and of itself, separate from the Olympic Discovery Trail. The uniqueness of this section has a great "face" and will resonate with the weekend recreators. Great for tourism dollars in a bad economy.

Topic Question 3:

I prefer Alternative 3 (NPS recommended). It will provide the most and safest access to the greatest number of trail users. It will be easier to maintain and the public will enjoy it more than the other alternatives. Much better tourism generator than the other alternatives.

Topic Question 4:

No.

Topic Question 5:

Yes.

Topic Question 6:

In my opinion, yes.

Topic Question 7:

Alternative 3 would allow my wife and I an opportunity to enjoy a unique part of Olympic National Park together. Due to her limited mobility the other alternative would only afford myself that enjoyment.

I would like to see NPS make use of the many community organization in doing as much volunteer work on this project as possible. I realize that that would be mainly hand work but if the communities can be involved in the construction they will become "owners" if they are "owners" they will be users and maintainers. Not to mention there could be significant cost reductions.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 8

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Port Angeles,, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/24/2011 Date Received: 09/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

Let's get this project underway. If alternative #3 seems best to this administration, then go for it or else another administration will come along and decide they need to go through the planning process again. What is unclear to me is why, you went through the planning process a second time. Valuable time and money was lost by extending the planning process.

Topic Question 2:

Get the last four miles of this ten mile cycle route constructed as soon as possible. The information that seems to be incomplete is the time line that the Park seems to be working with to get the project off the drafting boards. For instance, why is there a reluctance on the part of the Park to use County funds? There is a grant big enough to complete reopening both tunnels. However, these funds disappear in 2013. Stop sitting on your hands and let's start moving.

Topic Question 3:

There are drawbacks to any plan. If the Park feels that alternative #3 is the plan to follow, then go for it or else we will end up with a planning period that may or may not result in a better product.

Topic Question 4:

If you feel that alternative #3 should set the width of the trail, then use that width. Once the trail is in, it is entirely possible that a mandate comes through to widen the paved portion from 6 feet to 8 or 10 feet. After all, the original right-of-way was cleared to approximately 16 feet. However, I can handle 6 feet just fine and the vast majority of folks using a bicycle on the trail will use good judgement. Alternative #3 is such a vast improvement over using Hwy 101 as a bicycle route, it should be implemented immediately.

Topic Question 5:

Sorry, I haven't read it, but I'm sure you have put everything you feel meets legal mandates and standards into your EA. If bicycles become a significant alternate to cars now driving past Lake Crescent, then there will be less pollution from vehicles and thus less pollution in the Lake.

The sooner the trail is constructed, the sooner pollution to the Lake will be limited.

Topic Question 6:

I'm sorry, but I don't know.

Topic Question 7:

The construction of the last 4 miles of the bicycle path will allow me and my wife to access the Spruce Railway Trail from the Lyre River trail head rather than driving all the way around Lake Crescent to the Fairholm trail head and returning just to get on a paved section of the trail.

Since my wife and I no longer ride bicycles because of balance problems, we now both ride recumbent tricycles. The present six mile long paved trail is one of the finest cycling trails in Washington and we use it several times each year. We'd like to be able to access the SRRT from the Lyre River end so that we don't have to drive our truck with the recumbents in it all the way around Lake Crescent to the Fairholm access point.

Please start working on Alternative #3 as soon as is possible so that we can use this fine new trail in our lifetime.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 9

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: Sierra Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/25/2011 Date Received: 09/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No. They are clear and well written

Topic Question 2:
Yes

Topic Question 3:
Yes

Topic Question 4:
No

Topic Question 5:
All except the County proposal

Topic Question 6:
Yes

Topic Question 7:
The County proposal would ruin the natural environment that the National Park Service is charged to protect for posterity

The Olympic National Park is not:

a theme park;
a city park;
a county park;
a state park.

It is a NATIONAL PARK!

I prefer Option 1.

I can accept Option 2 - the minimal environmental impact option.

I recognize the Political compromises in Option 3.

I deplore the blatant disregard for preservation in Option 4.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 10

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jeff L. Selby
Organization: Peninsula Trails Coalition (Vice President, Jefferson County)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Hadlock, WA 98339
Port Hadlock, WA 98339
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/25/2011 Date Received: 09/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

Yes. Why are the final rating values used to determine the preferred alternative (#3) not published? And why would the Park recommend a design that includes an 18% grade that specifically excludes handicapped users (and others) from the the most convenient access point for the Spruce RR Trail? It implies that users who cannot negotiate the trail at the Lyre River trailhead (including some walkers, cyclists, families with small children in strollers, in addition to handicapped users) would have to travel approximately 35 miles round trip to access the trail across from the Sol Duc road at the top of Fairholm hill. Why has the Park not made this clear?

Topic Question 2:

No. Again, the grading process and the resultant comparative values is not made clear. Why?
In addition, revisions to the design described in Alternative #4 was submitted by Clallam County Public Works to the Park within the allowed time period. However, these refined design changes, many of which are closer to the design of the proposed alternative (#3) and reduce impacts to the described route, have not been included for public review in the published Environmental Assessment. The additional information has simply been ignored in the EA. This exclusion is misleading on the part of the Park. On the other hand, as stated during the Sept. 21st public meeting, the Park has included alterations it had made to its design in arriving at the preferred alternative. As a result, the public does not have the complete set of information upon which to base comments. Why does this disparity exist in the published EA?

Topic Question 3:

Yes. See above. The primary reason for establishing an alternative route around Lake Crescent is safety, eliminating travel along the dangerous Highway 101 section. Given that premise, how can a 6' wide pathway be considered safe for all types of users? Consider not only bicycles passing bicycles or pedestrians (including small children).

Consider the cases of cyclists passing wheelchairs, wheelchairs passing wheelchairs, equestrians passing wheelchairs, small children on bicycles or in strollers passing wheelchairs or horses or fast-moving cyclists. Also consider the case of any one of three users of different types passing the other two simultaneously. This will occur during busy usage times. Six feet is a dangerous width for a multi-user path. All private and public pedestrian and cycling agencies -- local, state, national -- agree.

This is the wrong choice from virtually any perspective. As long as a safer route is being considered, let's make it the safest it can be, not something less. How can the "preferred" alternative possibly represent a safe public corridor? By whom, other than the Park, is it "preferred"?

Topic Question 4:

Absolutely! Adopt the features of Alternative #4 into the preferred alternative. The grades make far more sense and provide more access. The width makes more sense and provides more safety and allows less sediment impingement on the lake.

The timeline for completion of this project is also a very significant issue impacting the Purpose and Need for the project. If the proposed alternative is adopted, the timeline for construction is 3 - 6 years, as stated at the September 21st public meeting in Port Angeles. In addition, other Park projects would be impacted, since revenue for the project would have to accumulate over time from park entry fees.

However if Alternative #4 is adopted, construction is currently fully funded so that it could be started and completed much earlier. This would allow a better, safer resource to attract visitors sooner, generating revenue sooner, and allowing for users to enjoy this great resource years earlier than the Park plan.

Topic Question 5:

No. Specifically, they fail to meet local, state, and federal standards for any safe multi-user trail travel.

Topic Question 6:

No. The trail can be designed and constructed in such a way as to minimize to a much greater extent the impact on large trees and steep sideslopes.

Topic Question 7:

If the proposed design (#3) is adopted, I would avoid the use of this section of the trail. I would instead access the trail from the west end of Fairholm Hill, avoiding the congestion and danger of the Lyre River trail entrance. However, if the County plan (#4) is adopted, I would make more use of the Park and the SRRT much more often. With a safe route established there, I would be much more inclined to drive the 65 miles from my residence area to use and enjoy the Lake Crescent area.

As a member of the Foothills Trail Coalition (Pierce County), the Jefferson Trails Coalition (Jefferson County), the national Rails to Trails Conservancy, and as Vice President (Jefferson County) of the Peninsula Trails Coalition, I most strongly disagree with the Olympic National Park's choice of Alternative design #3 for the SRRT trail project. The Clallam County proposal (Alternative #4) provides the minimum acceptable design for safety, convenience, and a positive user experience.

Having grown up in Port Angeles, I've had the opportunity to explore many areas of the Olympic National Park over many years. I've hiked hundreds of its miles of trails, beaches, and mountains. I've fished, swam, and skied many years on its rivers and lakes. I've skied its mountains over many of the past sixty years. And I have become very familiar with its many trails, beaches, and peaks. Lake Crescent in particular has been a very popular and favorite recreational area. But I have never cycled or walked the Highway 101 corridor, specifically for safety reasons. I believe it is the most dangerous road in the Park. And I believe few would dispute that. I recall many reports of the deadly accidents along the lake during my years growing up in Port Angeles.

The Spruce RR Trail is an absolutely critical section of the Olympic Discovery Trail. In my opinion, creating a safe corridor around Lake Crescent is its primary purpose. For pedestrians and cyclists who want an isolated, natural experience away from the dangerous and noisy highway 101 route around the south side of the lake, this is the route that will provide it. If the correct design is adopted, the route also provides equestrian and handicapped users' access past the lake, neither of which exist now. In fact, of the almost 600 miles of trails within the Park, there are only 6 miles of ADA accessible trails now in existence. This route would increase that total by roughly 200%.

The Peninsula Trails Coalition strongly supports the design of Alternative #4. The Park's preferred alternative #3 is simply unacceptable from a safety and access standpoint. It does not meet any established standard for handicapped or physically challenged users and is not supported by multiple agencies (DOT, FHC, the Bicycle Alliance, the Rails to Trails Conservancy, etc.) including the funding sources for the project. It should be obvious to the Park designers that a 6' wide surface is not a safe passing width with the other expected traffic (families w. small children and strollers, horses, walkers & hikers, wheelchairs, cyclists, bicycle wagons, etc.). The large majority of people (85%), from previous public comment held by the County in Port Angeles, prefer the 8' wide surface design. In addition, the Park plan includes a section with an 18% grade within the very first mile from the eastern trailhead at the end of the East Beach Rd. (closest to the largest population center on the Peninsula), making it totally inaccessible to handicapped users (as well as some cyclists & pedestrians).

The park seems to value preservation over accessibility. Historically, the Park was set aside for the purpose of public recreation and enjoyment. It also seems clear that the Park does not view the SRRT section of the Olympic Discovery Trail as a regional trail, attractive to visitors and trail enthusiasts from all parts of the nation, but rather as a Park trail. This is not a Park trail -- it is the Olympic Discovery Trail! Its intent and purpose is completely different from the typical wilderness park trail experience -- it merely happens to pass through the Park on its 126 mile route from Port Townsend to La Push. And there is in reality no other practical and viable alternative to providing a safe travel route to either through-travelers or day-visitors who wish to conveniently experience the Olympic Peninsula in a completely special, natural and unique way.

I respectfully request that the Park please seriously reconsider the aspects of the preferred alternative to include many of the design features of Alternative #4. It will establish a safe and equally attractive resource on the Olympic Peninsula for visitors to enjoy and appreciate for many years to come. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
Jeff L. Selby

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 11

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/25/2011 Date Received: 09/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 2:
Width of trikes

Topic Question 3:
Please see my comments below

Topic Question 4:
Sometimes slightly greater adverse impacts would result in a much superior final trail. See my comments below.

Topic Question 7:
We will continue to use the park, but would enjoy it much more with the changes I have suggested. See below.

I use the Spruce Railway Trail often,, and I am an avid trail supporter both in and outside of the park.

I like many parts of your plan #3; your opening of the tunnels, your paving plan, your trail access from the picnic area on Camp David Rd., your method of including the parking lot on Sol Duc Rd.

However some areas of the plan need modification. The 10-12 year time line for completion is unacceptable. Clallam county needs this trail link to be closed ASAP to get bikers off Hwy 101 before another tragedy occurs, and also to compete with the rest of the nation for the bicycling tourist's dollar.

The whole trail must be made ADA accessible. Therefore section D must be widened and its grade made reasonable for wheel chairs as well as bikes and trikes, with no more than 7% inclination. To simply pave over the existing trail will not do.

The trail really needs to have 8 feet of paving width to make it safe for all users. We ride trikes which are 33" wide including mirrors. We need more space than a regular bike does, as do wheel chairs. I hate to think of a wheel chair overturning if it is forced off the pavement, or likewise a trailer carrying a child.

Horses should not be barred from the trail, either, as they are in some other areas of the ODT. They just need more space. The Back Country Horsemen spend many hours doing trail maintenance and they certainly deserve consideration.

Perhaps instead of trying to squeeze everything into only 10 feet total width, you could expand the total width to 12 feet thereby accommodating all users.

If trees must be cut, so be it. Trees regrow, but it is important to make this trail adequate and safe for not only the present generation of users, but for future generations also. This is our chance to do the job right once and for all, so let's get it right!

Thank you for considering my thoughts on this.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 12

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 09/26/2011 | Date Received: 09/26/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

I would choose Alternative 1 and leave the trail as it is. Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 13

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/24/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Superintendent,
I'm interested on what you decide to develop on your Spruce Railroad Trail.
I hope you will decide on Alternative # 4.
I've followed the work being done on the Olympic Discovery Trail, over the years, and feel that it has been a big
asset to our community. It will be an even bigger one, once it is finished.
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 14

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/27/2011 Date Received: 09/27/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No.

Topic Question 2:
Yes.

Topic Question 3:
No.

Topic Question 4:
No.

Topic Question 5:
Yes.

Topic Question 6:
Yes.

Topic Question 7:
It would not affect my usage, except for broadening the possibilities.

My wife and I like the Alternative 3: NPS Preferred and Alternative 4: The Clallam County Proposal.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 15

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: BRIAN S. MOOREHEAD
Organization: WSDOT
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
OLYMPIA, WA 98504
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 2:
i BELEIVE THE PARK IS NOT EQUALLY EVALUATING OPTIONS AND IS SKEWING THE PREFFERED ALTERNATIVE

Topic Question 3:
ANY OPTION THAT IS NOT FULLY ADA ACCESSABLE IS LEGALLY WRONG.

Topic Question 4:
USE THE CLALLAM CO. PREFFERED ALTERNATIVE.

Topic Question 5:
I DO NOT BELIEVE SO. MUST MEET ADA STANDARDS

Topic Question 6:
I BELIEVE THE PARK IS SKEWING THE EVALUATIONS TO THEIR OWN DESIRES AND NOT EVALUATING OR CONSIDERING BEST DESIGN PRACTICES (ADA REQUIREMENTS)

Topic Question 7:
I AM A STROKE SURVIVOR, KEEP THE TRAIL ADA ACCESSABLE.

USE CLALLAM COUNTIES PREFFERED ALTERNATIVE.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 16

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/03/2011 | Date Received: 10/03/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

I support the Clallam County proposal for the Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion. It will facilitate the greatest use of the trail. Not only will it be safer for all users it will attract more users. Attracting more users (bike groups from out of state) will bring more dollars into our communities, county and state.

Thank you,
Jerry

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 17

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Florence Blay
Organization: Back Country Horsemen (WA. & AZ.)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
Yes!

The Park needs to consider Clallam County's suggestions to make this a viable access for ALL user groups in terms of safety and accessibility as well as funds to assist.

Topic Question 3:

1. Trail width should be 12+ feet for ALL user use safety. (8' paved with 4' unpaved). This is standard for AASHTO Bicycle Guide and would also allow funding from other sources than NPS.
2. 1200' of trail segment west of Lyre River Trailhead needs grade revision to allow for handicapped accessibility & safety of ALL user groups.
3. As the original roadbed width of 16' is documented from historic notes of Spruce Railroad Engineers, 12' is appropriate for rehabilitation of an approximation of the historical roadbed.

Topic Question 4:

The ODT is an ambitious and wonderful addition for recreation for all user groups. Please do not sacrifice any user (i.e. equestrian) group. Back Country Horsemen have aided in trail maint. for years and provide substantial assistance for trail systems.

Topic Question 5:
No.

Topic Question 6:

NO.

Topic Question 7:

The first proposals would prohibit safe use of the ODT trail for EVERY user. The room to pass would be insufficient for safety. Further, they would make addn'l funding impossible.

As an equestrian, I feel quite unhappy about the discrimination against equestrian use in the parks system. Our assistance in BCH seems appreciated, but equestrians' use is the first use to be eliminated when any problems arise.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 18

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
Trail thru the Park should be accessible for people disabilities.

Topic Question 3:
Clallam County plan is the best. They have the most experience in building trails that serve all people. The width of trail plus reducing the grade by the Lyre will be able to serve horses, hikers, wheelchairs, road bike and mt bikers.

Topic Question 7:
18 % grade will discourage people that don't bike much and your normal average person. Would not be available for persons in wheeler chair or disabled persons. Park SHOULD be available to all levels of bicyclist and the disabled.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 19

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

Topic Question 3:
In my opinion the paved trail will be too narrow.

Topic Question 4:
Wider paved trail and less steep grade at the east end of Spruce Railroad Trail.

Topic Question 6:
yes

We are writing in regard to the Spruce Railroad Plan. We applaud the hard work by all the parties involved in making this plan.

There are two items we feel that the National Park Service should reconsider. One is the width of the paved trail. Six feet, in our opinion is too narrow for a trail that will be shared by hiking groups of various sizes and bicyclists of differing abilities. We feel that eight feet of paved trail is the minimum acceptable and ten feet would be ideal. The second point is the 18% grade of the trail coming out of the parking lot seems too steep to us. Could not a few more switchbacks be added to the trail to lessen this slope? From our experience on the Spruce Railroad Trail this is the most used portion. Making the grade less would make the trail more useable by those people with disabilities that are unable to go for a longer hike or bicycle ride.

The future is exciting for the Spruce Railroad Trail and we am looking forward to using the trail in its improved configuration in the future.

[REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 20

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Sandy Shadforth
Organization: Peninsula Trails Coalition
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

Topic Question 3:
A 6 foot proposed Paved Trail from the ONP is too narrow. A lot of people, including me, prefer the 8 foot to 10 foot Paved Trail along with the equestrian 3 to 4 foot gravel on one side.

Topic Question 4:
See above.

Topic Question 5:
None

Topic Question 6:
None

Topic Question 7:
A lot of areas on the SRRT is very muddy and there is quite a few land and rock slides on the north side of the Trail. The present Trail is very dangerous for hikers and bicyclers.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 21

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Darrell B. Hansen
Organization: B.C.H. & Peninsula Trail Coalition
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
Yes

I beleve that plan 4 would meet the needs better for a multible use trail , and it will be a high use trail if it is done right. The Olympic Discovery Trail is a shared use trail as so you need room for different users to pass safely and ALSO TO GET state grant money . You may have to meet AASHTO guidelines.

Darrell Hansen

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 22

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David Graves
Organization: National Parks Conservation Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Seattle, WA 98101
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

October 21, 2011

Superintendent ? SRRT EA
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion and Improvement Environmental Assessment Comments

Dear Superintendent Gustin,

On behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) and the nearly 350,000 members we represent nationwide, I respectfully submit the following comments on Olympic National Park's Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion and Improvement Environmental Assessment (EA).

NPCA supports implementation of parts of Alternatives 2 and 3. A combination of the prescriptions of these two alternatives fully meets the objectives of the project and provides a non-motorized, multipurpose trail as identified in the General Management Plan (GMP) and Lake Crescent Management Plan (LCMP).

The Planning, Environment & Public Comment (PEPC) website asked us to consider the following questions in our comments:

1) Are any actions described in the Alternatives unclear?

No. The EA described in detail the project actions proposed and locations of these actions.

2) Is the information complete and accurate? Do you have additional information that should be considered?

The information is, for the most part, complete and accurate. Additional information describing in greater detail the differences in costs and construction requirements between Alternatives 2 and 3 would have been beneficial. It is not clear if the greater costs and construction requirements of Alternative 3 are due in larger part to the further length of the trail or the wider tread.

3) Are there any particular reasons why a particular alternative or action would or would not work?

Alternative 4 would not work due to the extensive impact it would have on the natural resources of the park, particularly vegetation and soil resources. It is also much too expensive.

4) Is there an alternative or action that we did not consider that would better meet the Purpose and Need for taking action while resulting in fewer adverse impacts?

An alternative that uses part of Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would better meet the purpose and need while resulting in fewer adverse impacts. This action is described below.

5) Are the actions considered in this environmental analysis consistent with applicable legal mandates?

Yes. Of most concern are the mandates required by the National Environmental Policy Act, all of which seem to have been met.

6) Is the analysis of environmental impacts accurate and complete?

Yes.

7) How would the particular proposal discussed in the EA affect you and your use of the park?

NPCA believes that a trail which allows multiple uses is beneficial to the park. This may result in more visits and greater enjoyment of the park by a larger number of people. Meanwhile, while this reduces the wilderness characteristic of this particular trail, it does not impact other trails or areas in which the wilderness experience may still be found.

In particular, NPCA has these suggestions:

? A trail constructed the length and location of Alternative 3, as well as the reopening of the historic tunnels, but with the tread width described in Alternative 2, provides the least impacts to park resources, while fully meeting the purpose and need of the project. The reduced and narrower tread of Alternative 2 would still allow hikers, bicyclists, equestrians, and disabled access on the trail, while reducing the impacts and costs to the park. Meanwhile, NPCA also supports Alternative 3's objective of reopening the tunnel as it allows the park to increase interpretation of cultural resources of the park, such as telling the story of the historic railroad.

? The EA states that the park is investigating widening roads near the trail to "provide four foot wide paved shoulder" for bicyclists along the road. Meanwhile, the project calls for 6 feet of paved trail with a 4 foot gravel shoulder. NPCA believes that if 4 feet is enough on a paved road, 3 feet of paved trail should suffice on a trail in a

national park, as described in Alternative 2. Trails in national parks are areas where many people are seeking more of a wilderness experience and should need less paved access.

? The narrower tread called for in Alternative 2 also allows for less amendment of the 2008 GMP. Currently, the maximum tread width allowed in the GMP is 60 inches. Alternative 3 calls for a tread width of 120 inches, twice the current allowance. Alternative 2 still requires an amendment, but to only 84 inches.

? NPCA believes constructing the trail to the prescription of Alternative 3 is inappropriate because the extent of disturbance to natural resources that would be required to construct this trail should be deemed unacceptable during the development of the final environmental assessment. Alternative 2 would result in the least construction related impacts to natural resources. Alternative 3 would result in greater disturbance to natural resources because the trail corridor would be much wider than what is proposed under Alternative 2.

Finally, the impacts and costs of Alternative 3 are much higher than Alternative 2. The increased impacts and costs are due in part to the 0.7 miles of additional length of trail proposed in Alternative 3, but much of it also due to the increased width of the trail. Furthermore, although not specified in the EA, the increased costs of maintenance related to building wider trail would be much higher. These increased impacts and costs specified in the EA include:

? 21,524 more cubic yards of excavated land in Alternative 3 than Alternative 2

? 1,507 more cubic yards of asphalt placed in Alternative 3 than Alternative 2

? 4.5 more total paved acres of surface area in Alternative 3 than Alternative 2

? 4,745 more cubic yards of rip rap placed in Alternative 3 than Alternative 2

? 140 more trees removed with dbh between 11" and 30" in Alternative 3 than Alternative 2

? 7.1 times more expensive, or approximately \$3.87 million more in costs for Alternative 3 than Alternative 2.

In conclusion, NPCA does support the expansion and improvement of the Spruce Railroad Trail. We support the length of trail proposed in Alternative 3 as well as the reopening of the historic tunnels. However, we believe the tread width of both the paved and gravel sections of the trail are more appropriate as described in Alternative 2. This combination of alternative prescriptions will best protect park resources while expanding opportunities for multiple user groups.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

David G. Graves
Northwest Program Manager

National Parks Conservation Association
Northwest Regional Office
1200 5th Ave, Suite 1925
Seattle, WA 98101
PH: 206-903-1444, x205
Cell: 206-462-0821

FX: 206-903-1448
dgraves@npca.org
www.npca.org

Protecting Our National Parks for Future Generations

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 23

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Marti Campbell
Organization: Olympic Discovery Trail Coalition
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Yes

Topic Question 3:
The proposed width of the trail is not consistent with the width of the Olympic Discovery trail. There is not enough passing room for a bicycle to pass walkers or other cyclist both oncoming or overtaking.

Topic Question 4:
Leaving enough width to the trail to allow for the passing of the trail users esp bicyclists.

Topic Question 5:
I am not versed in the legal mandates. I do not know.

Topic Question 6:
Yes

Topic Question 7:
I would find it unsafe and uncomfortable to pass a walker or another bicycle rider with the proposed width of the trail. I am a bicycle tourer and carry panniers on both sides of my bike rack. Some bicycle tourers also pull a trailer. There is not enough width to accommodate these trail users.

I am very pleased that this trail will be built in my bike time. This will get me and 100's of other bicycle riders off of that narrow dangerous section on 101 on the S side of Lake Crescent.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 24

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No


Topic Question 2:
Yes

Topic Question 3:
When reviewing the preferred alternative I am concerned that a 6 foot wide trail is too narrow. My comfort bikes have 2-1/2 foot handlebars (including mirror). This means that when two bikes pass each other there is very little clearance without riding near the edge. Considering vegetation and gravel riding this close to the edge is dangerous. In addition this doesn't leave much clearance for walkers that are sure to use the paved section. Finally, my senior parents visit us. I think it would be ideal for them to be able to see this portion of the trail via their wheelchairs. But I think the grade you are proposing would be too steep for them.

I believe that increasing the width of the trail and reducing the proposed grade would really open up this area to many more people. Someday my wife and I have dreamed about riding our bikes from Sequim to the Pacific Ocean. We have rode on a portion of highway 101 but find that alternative too dangerous. We love Olympic National Park. It is indeed one of the jewels of the National Park system. We just want to make it more accessible to more people. Thank you for your consideration!

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 25

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bret Wirta
Organization: Wirta Hospitality Worldwide  Official Rep.
Organization Type: B - Business
Address: bretw@wirtahospitalityworldwide.com
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: bretw@wirtahospitalityworldwide.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes: email text entered into PEPC by Teri Tucker

Correspondence Text

Dear Teri,

Please record this as my response to your invitation for public comment. I reject alternatives #1 and alternative #2. Though I am usually in favor of National Park Service concepts of Park stewardship, I also reject the NPS supported alternative #3. I support alternative #4, the Clallam County alternative. I support Alternative #4 because of my company's desire to for a world class bike path from Port Townsend to the Pacific Ocean. Alternative #4 is ADA and highway standards compliant and is supported by the Peninsula Trail Coalition. A cross-peninsula bike path that is accessible to all walkers, bicyclists and these with physical disabilities will increase tourism to the entire Olympic Peninsula and to Olympic National Park as well. The NPS favored alternatives are just too narrow and too steep.

I urge the National Park Service to reconstruct the Spruce Railroad Trail using the plans from Alternative #4.

Sincerely,

Bret Wirta
CEO-Wirta Hospitality Worldwide

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 26

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/28/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes: Letter comment entered into PEPC by Teri Tucker

Correspondence Text

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4, the 8' paved trail with equine path. While I appreciate ONP's attempt to accommodate wheelchairs and bikes with a 6' paved path I do not believe it adequately provides enough space to safely share the trail. If part of the purpose of improving the Spruce RRT is to allow travelers an alternative to Highway 101, those bicyclers with panniers will need some additional room. Eight feet of paved trail would more adequately address the issue of wider bikes.

Thanks for your consideration,
[REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 27

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/08/2011 Date Received: 10/08/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

I am not sure how Alternative #3 can be justified in terms of making it non-wheelchair accessible (an 18% grade) if federal funds are attached. Isn't this a violation of federal law?

Topic Question 2:

I don't see enough information presented about alternative #3 and justification of the Park's perspective beyond tree taking and excavation concerns. Why does alternative #3 (the ONP proposal) include such a delay in construction? Why does alternative #3 appear to be purposeful in rejecting the federal funding sources?

Topic Question 3:

My family includes a wheelchair user. We often have visitors here who want to enjoy the sights with us. The trail concept as proposed in alternative #4 would allow all family members and friends to enjoy the natural beauty of our area together. It is all-inclusive. If I want to pack a picnic and go bike riding on the trail with my husband, we will be able to do so without the assistance of other folks to haul him up steep grades or over difficult terrain. If my husband spontaneously chooses to go on the trail alone or in the company of his service dog, he will be able to do so without calling on friends or hiring someone else to accompany and assist him on the trail.

Alternative #3 currently argues that an 18% grade should be maintained. This would require specially planned excursions and a limit of our level of independence since our family would be required to plan for physical assistance in order to utilize this trail. My husband would never be able to use this trail independently. Alternative #3 appears to represent a short sighted and limited perspective. It appears to represent an attitude intent on the exclusion of a significant portion of our population. Why not create a trail which will represent a respected National and International standard of accessibility our State can be proud of in terms of innovation, planning, and vision? This type of innovative and all-inclusive planning would also represent a necessary and much welcome benefit to our economy in terms of the increased tourism draw.

Topic Question 7:

See comment #3 response above!

If the County proposal is approved, would the concept of wheelchair accessible camp sites along this trail be possible?

My husband and I have hiked several Park trails and most trails require physical assistance along with, at least two weeks of planning. The trails have not been well maintained in the park areas. We have hiked the Sol Duc Waterfall Trail and several Hoh Rain Forest Trails with assistance. These trails have not been maintained and even when the Park claims they are accessible (Hoh Rain Forest) they are not! I seriously doubt that the Park's plan of a 7 year construction timeline would be successful as they currently cannot maintain the existing trails.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 28

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: [REDACTED]
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Townsend, WA 98368-6228
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/08/2011 Date Received: 10/08/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

As an Olympic Park user and appreciator, it's taken me quite a few years to realize how limited the access is for disabled visitors. I'm a "protect the wilderness" person and I'm glad that there are a few, very few trails accessible. Getting the Spruce Railroad Trail completed sounds like a win-win situation for all, especially since some of it is already done, thanks to the County and to several grants.

ONP has a great opportunity to extend its mileage of accessible trails and also continue a wonderful trail - without delaying it for 7 years. Funding is available for the County alternative, which I support.

I suggest the following changes needed in your Preferred Alternative:

1. Follow the proposed County alignment through the elevation high point of the trail in segment D-ADA (east end of Lake Crescent) to achieve a handicapped accessible grade in the critical 1200 feet of this trail segment west of the Lyre River Trailhead.
2. Pave the trail to the federally recognized minimum width standard for shared use paths of 8 feet of paved width (AASHTO Bicycle Guide) to allow safe passing distances for multiple user types and to allow the trail to be fundable from sources other than the NPS.

3. Provide for an overall width of 12 plus feet to provide a safe trail for all user groups and to rehabilitate the historic railroad grade to a reasonable approximation of its former width (roadbed width of 16 feet) as documented from the historic 1918 notes of the Spruce Railroad engineers

Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 29

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/09/2011 Date Received: 10/09/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 7:

I would be much more likely to bicycle through that portion of the park with a wider trail. The current bypass trail and its connection segments are not very bicycle-friendly.

I would encourage the NPS to consider the wider, ADA-compliant trail alternative as opposed to the narrower trail proposal.

A narrower trail would be inherently dangerous, especially with bicycles attempting to share the trail with pedestrians and/or equestrians. Six feet doesn't allow much leeway when it comes to bicycling.

There is nothing particularly historical about a gravel bed for a hastily-constructed railroad that never did see extensive service. It's just gravel. It's just a railroad grade. And the people who originally built the railroad didn't care much about preserving trees or terrain in the first place.

Besides, there is nothing pristine about the Lake Crescent area. There are in-holdings all along the north shore and numerous developments that predate the park. A heavily-traveled U.S. highway lines the south shore for the full length of the lake.

In addition, a wider trail has already been built north of Camp David Jr. Road, within the park boundaries. The precedent has already been set.

I would vote for the wider trail. The benefits gained far outweigh any potential cultural/historical losses. No, it wouldn't be a "park" trail, but the wider version would be a tremendous benefit and a tremendous asset to the North Olympic Peninsula.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 30

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: [REDACTED]
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/09/2011 | Date Received: 10/09/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Keep the trail as is except fill the boggy spots so they don't continue to be slues when wet and repeatedly stomped through (use historic rocks if possible) or build little foot bridges over them, build steps up to the RR tunnels so folks can peek in, and call it good.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 31

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: League of American Bicyclists
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Washington, DC 20006
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/11/2011 | Date Received: 10/11/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 3:

The League of American Bicyclists promotes bicycling for fun, fitness and transportation and works through advocacy and education for a bicycle-friendly America. We do this by representing the interests of the nation's 57 million cyclists. With a current membership of 300,000 affiliated cyclists, including 25,000 individuals and 700 affiliated organizations, the League works to bring better bicycling to communities across the United States.

As the nation's voice for cyclists we would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion and Improvement Environmental Assessment (SRRT EA) specifically, in regards to the proposed 6 foot minimum width language in the design criteria for the proposed alternative.

The League believes that bike lanes and shared use paths (sometimes called bike paths) enhance the transportation system. We also feel strongly that bicycle facilities, whether separated, on-road or off-road, should be designed in accordance to national and state standards and only by professionals fully conversant with the benefits and inherent problems in lanes and paths, and with bicyclists' needs.

There certainly are advantages for shared use paths. Shared use paths may be used to provide bicycle access when no suitable road exists: to bypass barriers; to avoid more circuitous, less safe routes; as is currently the case with a large section of the Olympic Discovery Trail route which uses a state highway that is narrow, heavily traveled, and lacks shoulders.

For this reason, the League supports the proposed bypass route along the north shore of the lake utilizing an abandoned railroad grade, the Spruce Railroad Trail (SRRT). However, we strongly oppose the proposed 6 foot minimum width for this section of the path. We know from experience that 6 foot paths are dangerous not only for cyclists, but for all users of the path and that the NPS 6 foot proposal for the SRRT does not provide for the use of

the path by bicyclists.

Since 1981, the bicycle facilities design standards of the American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) have been reasonably good - although not by themselves sufficient to guarantee a good facility. It is important to note here that the design criteria contained in the AASHTO Bicycle Facilities Guide has established an 8-10 foot MINIMUM guidelines for shared use paths depending on the anticipated use of the path.

However, just adhering to the standards is not sufficient to guarantee good design because many factors that go into good design are not part of any standards manual. Good judgment by the designer is essential and it is difficult for a designer to design effective bicycle facilities without being reasonably proficient as a bicyclist. We would also urge that all bicycle facility designers to be conversant with the League's Bicycle Education program in order to maximize this proficiency.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 32

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tim McNulty
Organization: Olympic Park Associates
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/12/2011 | Date Received: 10/12/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Olympic Park Associates
168 Lost Mountain Lane
Sequim, WA 98382

October 12, 2011

Superintendent Karen Gustin
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion and Improvement EA

Support for NPS Preferred Alternative (3)

Olympic Park Associates (OPA) appreciate the opportunity to comment on this plan. We have reviewed the EA for the Spruce Railroad Trail and we support the National Park Service's (NPS) preferred alternative (3). This approach strikes a difficult balance between providing for a range of trail uses, preserving natural and cultural resources, and maintaining a trail users experience in keeping with the outstanding natural values of Olympic National Park. Although many of our members prefer the Spruce trail as it is, we understand the need to extend the Olympic Discovery Trail through this part of the park, to bring the trail up to multi-use standard (in compliance with draft Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas), and to offer a safe alternative for cyclists traveling the potentially dangerous stretch of US 101 around Lake Crescent.

Since road cyclists and handicapped users would use the trail, we understand the desire for an asphalt surface. Six feet in width is more than adequate to accommodate cyclists and wheelchair users if cyclists use this multi-use trail responsibly. Since hikers and stock users will also be using the trail, we support the proposal for an additional 4-foot gravel shoulder to accommodate these uses.

Opposition to Clallam County Proposal (Alternative 4)

OPA strongly opposes the wider, 8-foot asphalt surface and wider trail profile proposed in the County alternative (4). This standard, recommended by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), may be appropriate for public trails in metropolitan areas, but it is inappropriate for trails in a world-class national park like Olympic where resource protection and preserving natural character are high priorities (Management goals and Objectives, pp. 5 ? 7). For these reasons we also oppose the level of new trail construction (Segment D) proposed in Alternative 4. For all practical purposes, this would constitute new road construction through natural second-growth forest habitat. The County proposal necessitates clearing a 20 foot-wide (up to a 53 foot-wide) corridor (p. 90) to maintain a 5 percent accessible grade on Section D. The County proposal would excavate 45,539 cubic yard of soil (p. 117) and cut 632 trees (p. 118), 374 more than would be cut under the preferred alternative. The total disturbed area for this alternative would be 14.4 acres, nearly a quarter more than the preferred alternative's 11. This heavy-handed approach to trail development reflects a misunderstanding of the mandates governing management of our national parks.

Further, the County proposal -- even a lesser, modified version of the proposal -- qualifies as having significant impacts on the natural environment and begs the question of what is legally permissible under a limited environmental assessment (EA). In our view, the preferred alternative already pushes the limits of what can be adequately evaluated under an EA. We believe the project would be better served by a full environmental impact statement (EIS). If the preferred alternative is modified in the direction of the County proposal, we are certain a full EIS is required.

Concerns with Preferred Alternative

We are deeply concerned over the level of shoreline armoring, 0.28 miles, under both the preferred and County alternatives. This treatment has deleterious impacts on the lake's fisheries, which include rare and endemic stocks, as well as on nearshore habitats, which may include populations of water lobelia, a Washington state threatened species. As you know, shorelines are critical rearing and early-life habits for a number of fish species. Bank armoring eliminates shade, nutrient inputs, and protective cover for juvenile fish. Best management practices while installing rip-rap fails to address these larger habitat issues. We urge NPS to seek more resource-friendly alternatives to bank armoring in these cases, and to incorporate wood (as was used in the Hoh River boat launch), plantings or other mitigations to lessen the impacts of bank armoring to the lake's aquatic environment.

We also question the wisdom of paving the expanded parking area on East Beach Road. Wouldn't a gravel parking area be less likely to flush harmful automotive fluids into the lake and present easier opportunities for cleanup? Or could not some porous surface material be used here? This is a particular concern given the parking area's close proximity to the only known spawning area for the lake's endemic Beardslee trout (p. 135).

Lastly, we note that the EA acknowledges the displacement of some traditional trail users following new trail construction. "Some current users of the SRRT may be displaced because the trail experience may be modified from a narrow unpaved trail to a wider asphalt paved trail with a gravel shoulder?" (p. 112). Since OPA represents perhaps a disproportionate number of these trail users, allow us to suggest a mitigation. The bypass trails around the east and west tunnels could be closed to all but foot traffic, thereby preserving a remnant of traditional trail use and offering an opportunity for quiet appreciation of the lakeshore free of wheeled and hooved traffic. We note that the

Devil's Point bridge is no longer safe for stock use. It should be an easy matter to close these trail sections to bike use as well. Consider it historic preservation of the Spruce Railroad Trail of the past half-century.

We hope you find these comments useful in refining your plan for Spruce Trail expansion. We urge you to resist popular pressure to comply with state and County road standards. Please manage this project in a way that reflects the trail's location in one of our nation's most magnificent natural preserves. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Tim McNulty
Vice president, Olympic Park Associates

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 33

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Forks, WA 98331
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
NO

Topic Question 2:
No




Topic Question 3:
I think it is wonderful as long as the paths will accomodate equestrians and remain multi use. No expansion of ONP

Topic Question 6:
I think you did a pretty good job-lets get it done!

Topic Question 7:
I would use the area as long as animals and multiple use is allowed. Don;t let it become urbanized. Restrooms=great idea, leave no trace

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 34

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tim McNulty
Organization: Olympic Park Associates  Official Rep.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: 

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Olympic Park Associates,  Sequim, WA 98382
October 12, 2011

Superintendent Karen Gustin
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: Spruce Railroad Trail Expansion and Improvement EA

Support for NPS Preferred Alternative (3)

Olympic Park Associates (OPA) appreciate the opportunity to comment on this plan. We have reviewed the EA for the Spruce Railroad Trail and we support the National Park Service's (NPS) preferred alternative (3). This approach strikes a difficult balance between providing for a range of trail uses, preserving natural and cultural resources, and maintaining trail users' experience in keeping with the outstanding natural values of Olympic National Park. Although many of our members prefer the Spruce trail as it is, we understand the need to extend the Olympic Discovery Trail through this part of the park, to bring the trail up to multi-use standard (in compliance with draft Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas), and to offer a safe alternative for cyclists traveling the potentially dangerous stretch of US 101 around Lake Crescent.

Since road cyclists and handicapped users would use the trail, we understand the desire for an asphalt surface. Six feet in width is more than adequate to accommodate cyclists and wheelchair users if cyclists use this multi-use trail

responsibly. Since hikers and stock users will also be using the trail, we support the proposal for an additional 4-foot gravel shoulder to accommodate these uses.

Opposition to Clallam County Proposal (Alternative 4)

OPA strongly opposes the wider, 8-foot asphalt surface, turnouts, and wider trail profile proposed in the County alternative (4). This standard, recommended by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), may be appropriate for public trails in metropolitan areas, but it is inappropriate for trails in a world-class national park like Olympic where resource protection and preserving natural character are high priorities (Management goals and Objectives, pp. 5 ? 7). For these reasons we also oppose the level of new trail construction (Segment D) proposed in Alternative 4. For all practical purposes, this would constitute new road construction through natural second-growth forest habitat. The County proposal necessitates clearing a 20 foot-wide (up to a 53 foot-wide) corridor (p. 90) to maintain a 5 percent accessible grade on Section D. The County proposal would excavate 45,539 cubic yards of soil (p. 117) and cut 632 trees (p. 118), 374 more than would be cut under the preferred alternative. The total disturbed area for this alternative would be 14.4 acres, nearly a quarter more than the preferred alternative's 11. This heavy-handed approach to trail development reflects a misunderstanding of the mandates governing management of our national parks.

Further, the County proposal -- even a lesser, modified version of the proposal -- qualifies as having significant impacts on the natural environment and begs the question of what is legally permissible under a limited environmental assessment (EA). In our view, the preferred alternative already pushes the limits of what can be adequately evaluated under an EA. We believe the project would be better served by a full environmental impact statement (EIS). If the preferred alternative is modified in the direction of the County proposal, we are certain a full EIS is required.

Concerns with Preferred Alternative

We are deeply concerned over the level of shoreline armoring, 0.28 miles, under both the preferred and County alternatives. This treatment has deleterious impacts on the lake's fisheries, which include rare and endemic stocks, as well as on nearshore habitats, which may include populations of water lobelia, a Washington state threatened species. As you know, shorelines are critical rearing and early-life habits for a number of fish species. Bank armoring eliminates shade, nutrient inputs, and protective cover for juvenile fish. Best management practices while installing rip-rap fails to address these larger habitat issues. We urge NPS to seek more resource-friendly alternatives to bank armoring in these cases, and to incorporate wood (as was used in the Hoh River boat launch), plantings or other mitigations to lessen the impacts of bank armoring to the lake's aquatic environment.

We also question the wisdom of paving the expanded parking area on East Beach Road. Wouldn't a gravel parking area be less likely to flush harmful automotive fluids into the lake and present easier opportunities for cleanup? Or could not some porous surface material be used here? This is a particular concern given the parking area's close proximity to the only known spawning area for the lake's endemic Beardslee trout (p. 135).

Lastly, we note that the EA acknowledges the displacement of some traditional trail users following new trail construction. "Some current users of the SRRT may be displaced because the trail experience may be modified from a narrow unpaved trail to a wider asphalt paved trail with a gravel shoulder?" (p. 112). Since OPA represents perhaps a disproportionate number of these trail users, allow us to suggest a mitigation. The bypass trails around the east and west tunnels could be closed to all but foot traffic, thereby preserving a remnant of traditional trail use and offering an opportunity for quiet appreciation of the lakeshore free of wheeled and hooved traffic. We note that the Devil's Point bridge is no longer safe for stock use. It should be an easy matter to close these trail sections to bike use as well. Consider it historic preservation of the Spruce Railroad Trail of the past half-century.

We hope you find these comments useful in refining your plan for Spruce Trail expansion. We urge you to resist popular pressure to comply with state and County road standards. Please manage this project in a way that reflects the trail's location in one of our nation's most magnificent natural preserves. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Tim McNulty
Vice president, Olympic Park Associates

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 35

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 2:

Clallam County has worked with private land owner to create an alternative routing through the eastern end of the trail that would allow for an acceptable grade for ADA and bicycle use.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative 3 does not work because it does not adequately provide for a safer bicycle route than 101, and does not adequately provide ADA access. Both of those goals are the whole reason for the project starting in 1989.

Topic Question 4:

It seems like a valid alternative is to pave the trail 8 feet wide in most places, and in places where there is risk of undercutting the bank than narrow the trail as appropriate by reducing either the paved or gravel width. There is also an opportunity to cooperate with the National Forest and DNR to create an alternative trail similar in tread width to the Discovery Route that follows the DNR road west from near the trailhead and would connect to 3068 Road. This could eliminate some traffic, provide an alternative for through farers.

Topic Question 5:

Not ADA

Topic Question 6:

It's too long without any real information.

Topic Question 7:

I would lose the existing qualities of the Spruce Railroad Trail without any appreciable gain. I enjoy the trail as it is. I am willing to sacrifice my enjoyment for the greater good of a cross county alternative transportation corridor. I

don't see the point of paving the trail it still not being a viable alternative around Lake Crescent or being fully ADA compliant.

The Spruce Railroad Trail process is an example of the NPS at its worst, where conflicting mandates create a compromise solution that doesn't address any of the NPS priorities.

A five plus year process, over 500 pages of EIS with more to come, three public comment periods, and countless man hours of work to come up with a solution that does not solve the problem.

In the 1980's, before the ODT was even thought of, the park stated the goal of a safe bicycle corridor around Lake Crescent as part of the Lake Crescent management plan. The preferred solution does not achieve this goal. It also does not accomplish universal access or continuation of the ODT as a viable cross (multi) county alternative transportation route.

Furthermore, the Park's preferred alternative does not qualify for the existing grant funding through another federal agency. Under the preferred alternative the earliest funding may be available is 4-6 years, even if using entrance fee money currently used for other important ONP projects. Given the current political and financial realities 4-6 years is the same as never.

The fundamental issue is: Should the SRRT be paved or unpaved? Once the decision to pave the trail is made (and that decision was made during the LCMP in 1987) arguing whether the paved portion is 8 feet wide or 6 feet wide is ludicrous. The incremental damage to park resources between the two is minimal. Preserving enough ballast rocks to tell the story can be done either way. Cutting up to 100 trees over a 5 mile stretch of trail will not substantially affect a Park with hundreds of millions of trees. Furthermore, it was stated at the public comment period in Port Angeles that they could use the same techniques to preserve trees in both plans. The trees to be removed aren't in the way of the trail; they are related to the methods of re-constructing the trail. Any disturbance to the environment or increased tree removal is insignificant compared to the original process of creating the railroad in 1914, where quarter mile sections of the trail were blasted at the same time, and the entire east bank of the Lyre was a wasteland. Since that time, Park resources have done just fine.

To the Park's credit, they have moved closer to a usable end result as a consequence of the public comments and grudging cooperation with the County. But now they've dug in their heels over the last 2 feet of paving. "Park spokeswoman Barb Maynes and Tucker said the park likely will not change its proposal unless factual errors are found in the plan."

The 350 page document obfuscates any real public analysis, and instead reverts to pseudo-conservationist inanities where preserving all 15 miles of rock ballast is more important than providing less than 1% of park trails for disabled persons to enjoy.

I agree with the Olympic Trails Coalition...it is better to leave the trail as it is than spend money (at some future date) to pave the trail without providing ADA access and an alternative bicycle route. The Park's proposal destroys what we have without any significant reward in exchange.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 36

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED], Port Angeles, WA 98362
port angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/14/2011 | Date Received: 10/14/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

I am a resident of Port Angeles, WA and supporter and frequent user of ONP. My 8 year old daughter, [REDACTED] ambulates with the use of a power wheelchair. Understandably, many areas of the park are not accessible to her. With the proposed work to be done on the Spruce Railroad Trail ONP and the local community have an opportunity to create more wheelchair accessible areas to the park in the context of an upgrade already moving forward. I support all efforts to prioritize accessibility in this project. This needs to include appropriate grading and trail width that allows wheelchair users access. To ignore this fundamental component to the planned upgrade would be inexcusable.

thank you for your consideration of my comments.

[REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 37

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: [REDACTED]
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363-1623
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

The variations between proposal 3 and 4 in area D are not clearly delineated.

Topic Question 2:

It appears that a revision to the "county proposal" was not considered. (Reference Peninsula Daily News 14Oct11)
Are there plans to reconcile this discrepancy?

Topic Question 3:

There appears to be significant differences of opinion on the availability of supplemental funding given the trail configuration in proposal #3. Will the funding source difficulties effect the decision on which proposal to put into effect?

Topic Question 4:

Reference my response to Question 2.

Topic Question 5:

I am not a lawyer, but every thing appears to be subject to interpretation and litigation.

Topic Question 6:

Are the two goals listed as a priority listing?

In other words, Is goal 2 subordinate to goal 1? Or, are they equally desirable?

Topic Question 7:

I bicycle the ODT frequently. I will not cycle to a trail head using highway 101. So to reach the current facilities I must use a motor vehicle. The availability of an alternative route would increase my access to the park.

Referencing Page 122 of the document: Why is the NPS preferred alternative (#3) estimated to be more costly than the County Proposal (#4)?

Proposal #4 appears to provide access to more different capability users, so the difference in cost does not seem to be in keeping with stated goal 2 on page 6.

If proposal #4 is a more significant violation of Goal 1, that conclusion is inadequately explained.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 38

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
vashon, WA 98070
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

The exact need for having the trail width suddenly compressed down to 6', from the standards mandated 8', for the last 4 miles of the trail.

Topic Question 3:

Reducing the bike trail width would not only defy regulations/standards apparently, more critically it just isn't safe to have such variable widths and 8' is needed for safety's sake.

Topic Question 5:

The reduction of hardened surface from 8' to 6' appears to lie outside the standards for this type of activity.

Topic Question 7:

I'd be less likely to use or recommend a substandard trail. Doing so might expose me to liability...

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 39

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: [REDACTED]
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
The environmental assessment ignores thermal and climate issues. It also ignores maintenance issues which will require access by heavy equipment.

Topic Question 3:
There are serious safety issues.

Topic Question 5:
No, the environmental assessment ignores thermal and climate issues.

Topic Question 6:
No

Topic Question 7:
I am visually handicapped and have neuromuscular problems. Paving this trail would make it painful for me to walk there and greatly increase my risk of colliding with a bicycle.

There are a good number of reasons to object to the proposed changes to the Spruce Railroad Trail. The plan as presented is to turn a hiking trail offering an accessible wilderness experience into a road and in the process to destroy many of the natural and historical resources that bring people to the park. Transportation and urbanization are not part of the National Park Service mission. There are alternate routes for the proposed road, but they were not

addressed.

The proposal is flawed in a number of respects:

1) Environmental Impact

The proposed plan is to install a massive heat sink, replace and remove existing vegetation and expedite the flow of runoff into the lake. There is no discussion of the thermal impact of obliterating 90 years of history and installing a 10-12 inch thick roadbed. There is no analysis of the impact of replacing the existing rock slide ecology with concrete graffiti walls. There is nothing about the impact of replacing vegetation and permeable soil with an expedited runoff system. There is nothing about the impact of tree removal. As anyone who has walked the trail realizes, building a wide road bed will require removing many more trees than admitted in the plan and damaging the shallow root systems of many others.

The more open sections of the trail are at least five degrees warmer than the cooler sections and host a number of invasive plants such as scotch broom. This suggests that the proposed plan will raise local temperatures by about five degrees and encourage invasive vegetation. The forest is already under pressure from global warming, and the north shore of Lake Crescent receives a great deal of sun. It is in a rain shadow and the reflection from the lake further warms all south facing areas along the lake. Right now, there is plenty of green forest, but let a construction crew in, install a heavy road bed and rip out tons of undergrowth, and you will irreversibly damage the existing rain forest which is home to a variety of small creatures, including the native salamanders often seen crossing the dirt track, but unlikely to survive crossing a paved roadbed.

There is also the rather blithe statement that increased runoff after rains will have no environmental effect, but removing water from the surrounding environment will cause harm. There's a reason people build rain gardens, like the one at Peninsula College, and consider installing "green" roofs. The current proposal is to eliminate 3 or 4 acres of rain garden along Lake Crescent and replace it with a Walmart parking lot. It is a perilous experiment in local climate modification and not conducive to preserving the existing rain forest.

2) Safety issues

The Spruce Railroad Trail is one of the few trails in the park open to walkers in all seasons. The proposed plan replaces the hiking trail with a road. The current proposal tries to be a compromise between a road and a hiking trail. The sealed portion of the road, designed for wheeled vehicles is marked as being for mixed bicycle and pedestrian use. This is unrealistic as a short walk along any portion of the Olympic Discovery Trail would reveal. Bicyclists need long sight lines in order to see and avoid pedestrians. This trail has many blind curves. In fact, most of it is blind. Even the best intentioned, most responsible cyclists will find themselves facing close calls or worse as they encounter pedestrians. This proposed compromise is a formula for accidents. It does not serve the needs of bicyclists or nature walkers.

3) Disability issues

Many disabled Americans are not confined to wheelchairs and currently use the existing trail as it provides one of the few year round soft walking surfaces in the area. The nearest substitutes are the Hoh Rain Forest Trail and the trails at Cape Alava. It is easy to forget people who can walk, but must walk slowly, suffer from impact related joint trouble, or who have visual handicaps that might for example prevent them from seeing a bicyclist in time to get out of the way. This will only get worse as baby boomers age.

4) Historical preservation

The proposed plan calls for obliterating 90 years of history. It will neither restore the trail as a railroad nor preserve it as a hiking trail built along a disused railbed. It will replace it with a road.

Olympic National Park is one of the last great wildernesses left on earth, and Lake Crescent is one of its jewels. This more than anything else should prevent us from proceeding along this destructive path.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 40

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Bellingham, WA 98225
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 2:
AASHTO guidelines specify a minimum width of 10 ft for a multi-use path

Topic Question 3:
A minimum width of 6 ft does not allow wheel chair users to pass each other. Such a narrow width is unsafe for cyclists and equestrians and pedestrians to share.

Topic Question 5:
the minimum width of the path is contrary to legal mandates of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 41

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 7:

I am categorically opposed to paving the trail; my husband and I use the trail often. i have arthritis, and find it is a comfortable walk. The paved trail would not be. There are plenty of ADA-compliant trails in the area; it would be criminal to spoil the beauty of this spot to add another. This is the ONLY relatively flat, easy to walk trail around, and it would be ruined by widening and paving.

I am categorically opposed to paving the trail; my husband and I use the trail often. i have arthritis, and find it is a comfortable walk. The paved trail would not be. There are plenty of ADA-compliant trails in the area; it would be criminal to spoil the beauty of this spot to add another. This is the ONLY relatively flat, easy to walk trail around, and it would be ruined by widening and paving.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 42

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: [REDACTED]
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 2:
Alt. 4 info contains errors as documented by Clallam County.

Topic Question 3:
Alt. 1 does not meet public needs -- accessible only to small elite class of hikers.
Alt. 2 unacceptably bars equestrian use. Closing part of trail to horses closes all of it to horses. We cannot pick our horses up and carry them. Also, barring horses will not magically make this section handicap accessible.
Alt. 3 a half-assed attempt to look like you're doing something while actually going with Alt 1
Alt. 4 - as corrected by Clallam County - a good design that meets public access needs for ADA and equestrians, without causing any real harm to the park --a definite improvement and enhancement to the park and park experiences.

Topic Question 4:
Corrected Alt. 4 as explained by Clallam County

Topic Question 6:
no - negative impacts are overstated, including those based on mininterpretation and misrepresentation of facts of Alt. 4

Topic Question 7:
Alt. 4 would make it possible for me to visit this area of the park. I am physically unable to visit much of the park, except as an equestrian. More horse trails will vastly increase and improve my use of the park.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 43

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Foxborough, MA 02035-1726
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/15/2011 | Date Received: 10/15/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 3:

The proposed path width of 6 feet for the last four-mile section of the trail would be unsafe for a shared use path.

Topic Question 4:

Making the last four-mile section a minimum of 8 to 10 feet wide consistent with the 8-10 foot minimum guidelines established in the AASHTO bicycle facilities guide. This is a MINIMUM that MUST be adhered to.

Topic Question 7:

My family and I enjoy vacationing in the area. We are avid cyclist. I would avoid using a trail that is so narrow as to be unsafe.

I would like to reiterate that for a shared use path, the 8-10 foot minimum guidelines established in the AASHTO bicycle facilities guide is a MINIMUM that MUST be adhered to - And as an experienced cyclist, I KNOW, based upon my own personal experiences, that a 6 foot path is unsafe for all users. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on what is a wonderful national resource and asset to tourism in the area.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 44

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Seattle, WA 98122
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/15/2011 Date Received: 10/15/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
Yes. The ONP proposal will not make the trail sufficiently accessible for families on bikes, disabled hand-crank cyclists, and wheelchairs.

Topic Question 3:
The alternative proposed by the County is feasible.

Topic Question 4:
Yes. Follow the proposed County alignment through the elevation high point of the trail in segment D- ADA to achieve a handicapped accessible grade in the critical 1200 feet of this trail segment west of the Lyre River Trailhead.
2. Pave the trail to the federally recognized minimum width standard for shared use paths of 8 feet of paved width (AASHTO Bicycle Guide) to allow safe passing distances for multiple user types and to allow the trail to be fundable from sources other than the NPS.
3. Provide for an overall width of 12 plus feet to provide a safe trail for all user groups and to rehabilitate the historic railroad grade to a reasonable approximation of its former width (roadbed width of 16 feet) as documented from the historic notes of the Spruce Railroad engineers.

Topic Question 5:
Yes

Topic Question 6:

Yes

Topic Question 7:

When we bicycle with our 9 year old daughter, we look for trails that are safe and uninterrupted. We would not be able to use a trail that was interrupted by a dangerous section of 101 highway. We also prefer to use trails that can be used by the disabled as well as us.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 45

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: Tri-Cities Bicycle Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Richland, WA 99354
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/15/2011 Date Received: 10/15/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for accepting comments on the General Management Plan for the Spruce Railroad Trail (SRRT). Some of the proposed changes have been discussed even here in eastern Washington (Richland, Kennewick, Pasco).

One item of concern is the possibility that part of the path will consists of a 6 foot wide paved shared use path with a parallel 4 foot wide gravel trail (6+4), and that at the eastern end of the path there will be an incredibly (18%) steep grade.

We have several sections of bike trails in our community that are only 6 feet wide, and these are where our accidents occur. In one location, a cyclist was unable to swerve around a child wondering onto the path; the cyclist crashed with a broken neck (non-fatal). I myself was recently hit while walking down one of these sections of narrow bike paths when a cyclist swerved around other pedestrians and clipped my arm, throwing me to the ground and the cyclist over his handlebars.

Based on my personal experience and those of other cyclists in our community, and also the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standard for bicycle facilities , I urge you to complete the trail with a 8-10'-wide paved path with 4'-wide adjacent trail for horses. The more narrow option is simply not safe and will likely result in physical harm to both cyclists and pedestrians, greatly reducing use of the trail and the benefits that would otherwise be possible.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 46

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Silverdale, WA 98383
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: New | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/15/2011 | Date Received: 10/15/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 3:

I'm concerned with the proposed width of less than the recommended 8-10'. The lesser width you're proposing makes passing difficult and accidents much more likely. Please clear room for the wider path. Even if there are not enough funds to pave it immediately, making the space available is essential.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 47

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: Peninsula Trails Coalition
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Houston, TX 77005
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/15/2011 Date Received: 10/15/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 3:
I'm very concerned that some of the alternatives have narrow widths.

It is important that a width of 10 feet be used so cyclists, walkers and others can pass without the risk of hitting each other.

Topic Question 7:
I'm a cyclist. It is important that the width be wide enough so I can go around walkers and slow cyclists going in the same direction and not risk hitting somebody coming the opposition direction.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 48

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
port townsend, WA 98368
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/15/2011 | Date Received: 10/15/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

my may concern is, just go ahead and fix the trail to match the rest of the Olympic Discovery Trail. as noted, the 6ft width is NOT wide enough to be safe for both bicyclist and pedestrians. you would NOT need to fix anything else, you already have the old Railroad bed to work with as has been done in other sections of the Discovery Trail, so just continue with fixing what is already there.....
thanks

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 49

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Blaine, WA 98230
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 3:

Alternative three would certainly not work for anyone who needs ADA compliant access.

Topic Question 5:

Alternative three is not consistent with applicable legal mandates in that it ignores the requirements of making this project ADA compliant. Were it a matter of a slight difference tht would be one thing, but this alternative constitutes a gross violation (e.g. 18 percent grades on the trail). People in wheel chairs pay taxes, too, and have just as much a right to access as anyone else. One could make the case that they have a greater need for a specially provided wilderness experience than normally able-bodied people in terms of their apelial access needs in that they would have fewer choices due to their lesser degree of agility and mobility.

At Hurricane Ridge (Olympic National Park), for example, the road gets everyone there but the paved trails, made in part to preserve the tundra-like conditions, allow access to people who otherwise would be limited to the parking lot and lodge.

I would hope, as a tax paying citizen, that alternative #3 is included in this proposal purely for purposes of showing the range of possibilities. To imagine that the NPS would seriously consider doing such a project in a way (i.e. non-ADA compliant in terms of width of the paved surface and grades)that deliberately excludes so many people based on circumstances beyond their control is as unbelievable as it is disgusting.

A copy of this comment is being directed to my congressman and to my two senators.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 50

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: New | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:

I strongly feel that Alt.4, wheelchair accesible, should be applied at the Spruce Railroad project, especially since the funds are available. Thank you!

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392

Correspondence: 51

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization: user
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
No

Topic Question 3:
As the parent of a disabled adult who was part of the opening of the Madison Falls trail, I know how important having trails that are accessible can be. There are many places in Olympic National Park that are not wheelchair accessible, so we should try extra hard to make it possible WHEN it is possible. I also understand that the funding is in hand for a wheelchair accessible trail and do not understand why in these times when funding is available it is not utilized.

Topic Question 4:
I do not know all of the alternatives considered, only those that are written down likely from a culled list. Perhaps in there somewhere is another alternative that might be better than the one chosen, but no alternative is better than one that allows all to utilize and access nature.

Topic Question 5:
Don't know.

Topic Question 6:
Don't know

Topic Question 7:

It would be lovely if I could take my wheelchair mobile daughter on this trail. The Madison Falls trail is so short. She would very much enjoy, and I would enjoy accompanying her on this adventure.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 52

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles,, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: New | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 7:

We live within 5 miles of the eastern trailhead of the Spruce Railroad Trail. We love this trail, but we are getting older now. Alternative #4, which the County already has funds to support, is the best choice for us.

I strongly support Alternative #4, which meets ADA standards and has a reasonable grade throughout. I love this trail, but am now a cancer survivor and my husband has a knee replacement. We would like to be able to use the new trail. We also think that all citizens should have access to trails in our National Parks, particularly low-land trails where accessibility should be no issue. Since Clallam County has already received funds that could be used for Alternative #4, it seems foolhardy not to choose this option.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 53

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: New | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
Yes

Topic Question 3:
I like Alternative 4 because it is in compliance with the American Disabilities Act.

Topic Question 4:
No

Topic Question 5:
Yes

Topic Question 6:
Yes

Topic Question 7:
No comment.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 54

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98363
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I can't believe you would entertain any trail design that isn't wheelchair accessible.

Put yourself in a wheelchair and see how far you get on a trail that has not been created for handicapped access.

We need to move in a forward direction with regard to disabled citizens, not backward.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 55

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
port angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

I am writing in support of Option #4. ADA access is important for Americans and there are funds available. This is a wild area where ADA access is feasible and we should not stop short of this goal in improving the Spruce Railroad Trail. Thanks for your consideration. [REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 56

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Port Angeles, WA 98362
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: Reviewed | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

There are four alternatives for improving Spruce Railroad Trail on Lake Crescent on which people are invited to comment. The forth choice, improving the trail to ADA standards, is very important! This is a beautiful trail and making it accessible for individuals requiring a wheel chair, and the elderly with decreased mobility would be an incredible gift. Please complete the trail improvements making it accessible to individuals with disabilities!

Thank you for the opportunity to share comments and for your consideration of this recommendation.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 57

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Portland, OR 97225
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Status: New | Park Correspondence Log: |
| Date Sent: 10/16/2011 | Date Received: 10/16/2011 |
| Number of Signatures: 1 | Form Letter: No |
| Contains Request(s): No | Type: Web Form |
| Notes: | |

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 3:

Alternative #4 would open the trail to more use for more differently abled people, old and young, with and without wheelchairs.

Please choose alternative #4.

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 58

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Freeland, WA 98249
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
Not at all.

Topic Question 2:
To the best of my limited knowledge, yes.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative 4 is the best in terms of persons with specific disabilities and persons like myself that are just not in the best of health.

Topic Question 4:
Not that I know of.

Topic Question 5:
As far as I know.

Topic Question 6:
I'm not an expert, but the impacts appear to have been dealt with fully and accurately.

Topic Question 7:
Alternative 4 would probably lead me to use the trail in the future, certainly making it more likely than the first three.

I'm a typical desk jockey, overweight and out of shape, and pushing sixty. I also have a history of asthma and have

had at least one stroke. I'm in the difficult position of being seriously in need of additional exercise but in such a condition that most options for that are too strenuous for me to even get started.

Several years ago, when I was in better shape than I am today, I learned of the Spruce Railroad Trail, found the parking lot, and spent a pleasant afternoon walking it and taking pictures. I remember the first stretch of trail with its significant grade and suspect that I would have difficulty getting past that and onto the grade of the historical track. It might not be an absolute barrier, but it certainly would make it less likely that I would decide to spend an afternoon walking the part of the trail that I currently can comfortably, and beneficially, do.

I grew up at Port Angeles and currently visit the area a half dozen times a year. I would not be a frequent user of the trail if Alternative 4 were implemented, but I would consider it very likely that I would use the trail once a year if that came to pass.

I am also supportive of the possibility that a handicapped person who could not negotiate the trail at all might still benefit from the experience of spending time along that grade in his or her wheelchair. The current start of the trail, even if paved, would be difficult for someone pushing a wheelchair on the uphill side, possibly dangerous on the down.

In the interest of persons like myself, that need an easy way to get out and walk in a safe and spiritually-rewarding setting, and for those with more severe handicaps, I strongly urge the implementation of Alternative 4.

And I think it would really neat to have those tunnels open!

[REDACTED]

PEPC Project ID: 29848, DocumentID: 43392
Correspondence: 59

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
Sequim, WA 98382
USA
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 2:
Yes

Topic Question 3:
The Clallam County Plan seems to be a better option.

Topic Question 4:
The Clallam County Plan seems to be a win-win. It offers opportunities to the greatest number of citizens with minimal adverse impact.

Topic Question 5:
DK

Topic Question 6:
The plan offered by the Park Dept seems to catastrophize about impacts. It's like a "Chicken Little" phenomenom.

Topic Question 7:
I'm a biker, and the Park's Plan is not biker friendly.