

ERRATA

for

Spruce Railroad Trail

May 2012 Environmental Assessment

Olympic National Park

The Spruce Railroad Trail Environmental Assessment (EA) was released for a 30-day public review from May 9 to June 8, 2012. A total of 77 comments from individuals, organizations, and local and tribal governments were received during the public review period.

The EA analyzed impacts from the construction related to improving to the 3½-mile section of the Spruce Railroad within Olympic National Park. Based on comments received from the public, the selected action is Alternative 5.

Part 1 of the Errata documents minor edits to text in the EA. These changes correct, clarify or modify original text. There are no edits or corrections which modify the determination of potential effects or which substantively amend proposed actions.

Part 2 documents substantive comments (or concerns expressed by more than one respondent) received during public review, and park responses. Twelve comments (italicized) are grouped into 5 topic categories.

These Errata must be attached to the original EA to comprise the full and complete record of the environmental impact analysis completed for this initiative.

Part 1: Edits and Corrections to the EA

1. The term "crushed rock" is used many times throughout the EA. Its meaning is intended to describe a surface that is stable and firm that does not contain loose rock materials but rather angular materials that fit together like a puzzle. Within Table 32 on pages 97- 98, "crushed rock" should be replaced with "gravel surface."
2. On page 185 in the EA, the term "crushed gravel" is inaccurate; the word "gravel" should be replaced with the word "rock."
3. The term "accessible" is used many times throughout the EA. In most cases, it should be clarified that the access provided is "ADA accessible" or "universally accessible."

Part 2: EA Comments and Responses

This section summarizes the substantive comments received during the public review period of the EA and general comments needing further clarification. It does not include the entire correspondence text from any individual letter, but captures the primary concerns organized by topic. All correspondence received by the park is contained in the project administrative record.

Topic 1: Trail Construction and Trail Grades

1. *The steepness of the grades and crushed rock surface are not appropriate for an accessible multi-use trail.*

The park has selected Alternative 5, which will provide a paved surface and gravel shoulder to meet the needs of multiple user groups. The park believes the trail will be constructed appropriately to meet and exceed the guidelines for providing an accessible trail as described in the Draft Final Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas published on October 19, 2009 (Access Board, 2009). These guidelines are proposed by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) pursuant to the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) for camping facilities, picnic facilities, viewing areas, outdoor recreation access routes, trails, and beach access routes that are constructed or altered by or on behalf of the federal government. These guidelines are described below. We are confident that the trail grades and paved surface with a gravel surface shoulder will provide a universally accessible multi-use trail for a variety of users.

1017.7.1 Running Slope. No more than 30 percent of the total length of a trail shall have a running slope steeper than 1:12. The running slope of any segment of a trail shall not be steeper than 1:8. Where the running slope of a segment of a trail is steeper than 1:20, the maximum length of the segment shall be in accordance with Table 1017.7.1, and a resting interval complying with 1017.8 shall be provided at each end of the segment.

Table 1017.7.1 Running Slope and Resting Intervals

Running Slope of Trail Segment		Maximum Length of Segment
Steeper than	But not Steeper than	
1:20	1:12	200 feet (61 m)
1:12	1:10	30 feet (9 m)
1:10	1:8	10 feet (3050 mm)

2. *The grades of the switchbacks are missing from this document.*

For Segment D, the switchbacks will not exceed 1:12 (8.33 percent) to stay within the Draft Final Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas published on October 19, 2009 (Access Board, 2009) guidelines. The NPS follows these guidelines established by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) pursuant to the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA).

On page 49 of the EA states that the spur trail would include switchbacks on the hill above the Camp David Junior Road at a grade of five (5) percent.

3. *Detail about the historical width of the original RR bed is missing from this document.*

The historic width of the original railroad bed varies depending on if there were sidings or other related features. These are represented in the trail profiles on pages 6 through 11 of the EA. In general, in sections where there are no additional features to the railroad grade, the historic railroad bed will accommodate the adaptive use as a trail to the widths that are proposed in this EA.

4. *How were the construction requirements, which provide volumes and quantities, calculated in Table 26, page 85?*

Volumes and quantities calculations were determined using AutoCAD, a computer design program. The entire length of the proposed trail alignment and cross-sections at regular intervals were placed over professional topographic surveys to calculate volumes of cuts and fills. This type of analysis is too complex and detailed to capture in an EA document.

Topic 2: Trail Segment D

5. *The new alignment route planned for Segment D in Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 is not specified in the EA, and the actual construction grades (length of steeper portion) is not described.*

On page 73, Figure 17 in the EA there is a plan view drawing depicting the alignment and location of Segment D.

Construction grades are described in the EA on page 69, Table 1017.7.1 Running Slope and Resting Intervals –when the running slope of the trail is steeper than 1:20 (5 percent) but not steeper than 1:12 (8.33 percent) a maximum trail segment of 200 feet between rest stops is required. Overall, the proposed Spruce Railroad trail does not exceed 1:20 (5 percent) grade with the exception of these portions in Segment D as referenced above.

6. *The cut and fills for Segment D are not included in the impact analysis.*

Page 89, Table 31 provides the volume of excavation or cuts and volumes of fill required for Alternative 5, Segment D. Page 144, Table 35 provides a summary of the volumes of new excavation or cuts required and volumes of fill for all project alternatives.

7. *How the cuts and fills in segment D will be retained is not included in the document.*

We agree. Detailed trail structures, such as how the cuts and fills will be retained are not included in the EA. This level of detail will be included in the construction details and drawings for the project. Construction drawings are typically developed prior to project implementation.

Topic 3: Private Land

8. *The Park should approach the inholding landowner to acquire access through easement or purchase of the parcel of land at the immediate end of East Beach Road to allow for trail alignment to be routed through the property affording the minimum amount of environmental impacts.*

The action alternative for trail alignment with the least environmental impacts would be to stay on the historic Spruce Railroad grade starting at the Lyre River trailhead and reconnecting within the park. This would eliminate the need for any switchbacks in this area. In the past, the park had discussions about the

use of the historic Spruce Railroad grade located on private lands. However, at this time, use of this section of the historic grade is not possible. The park feels that Alternative 5 in the EA describes the most environmentally sensitive alignment.

Topic 4: Highway 101

9. *The document needs further development and is incomplete because it does not consider the need to reroute touring bicycle traffic from US Highway 101 to the Spruce Railroad Trail and Olympic Discovery Trail (ODT) sections in the Lake Crescent vicinity, and lacks a public safety impact analysis of US Highway 101 cyclists.*

We disagree. Rerouting or eliminating touring bicycle traffic from US Highway 101 to the Spruce Railroad Trail and Olympic Discovery Trail sections in the Lake Crescent vicinity is not within the scope of this project.

Topic 5: Other General Comments

10. *The southwestern part of this segment is critical to the ODT as the connector between the Mt. Muller bypass and the 2918 Road. Dismissing the Sol Duc section will leave a portion of the proposed route of the ODT within the Park unaddressed, necessitating further negotiation, and possibly another EA, necessary to resolve the route.*

At this time, the park feels that all viable alternatives for the Sol Duc section could not be fully considered. Access to the historic Spruce Railroad grade on the Sol Duc section may be feasible in the near future. If access were gained, this would be the most desirable route for future trail development. While it may take additional NEPA compliance to take action on this section, it is in the best interest of the park and park visitors not to include this section in this EA.

11. *There is no map available showing trail sections to reference Segments A, B, C, and in the EA or online.*

The map on page 42 of the EA displays each section of the trail including labels for Segments A, B, C, and D.

12. *During the public meeting in May 2012, participants asked the NPS to define the phrase "universally accessible."*

The NPS is using this term to refer to providing direct access to people of all ages and abilities.