

## Appendix D: Scoping History and Comments

---

### Introduction

**2004 to 2006 scoping:** In 2004, the Forest Service mailed a scoping letter describing initiation of the environmental analysis of repairs to roads across the MBS National Forest that were damaged in 2003. The Darrington Ranger District proposed to restore vehicular access to the Suiattle drainage by making repairs to three segments along Road 26 (MP 14.4, MP 20.9, and MP 22.9). The public was involved in the public meetings and the Forest web site provided updates.

During the month of May 2004, two public meetings were held. The first meeting was held in Darrington on May 6, 2004, and the second meeting was held at the Mountlake Terrace Supervisors Office on May 18, 2004. A total of 50 people attended these two meetings, and several people provided their name and address so that they could receive further information. Forest Service staff made presentations to various groups about the flood damage throughout 2004. The Forest Service also used the Forest web site (<http://www.fs.usda.gov/mbs>) to share information on flood damage, proposed repairs, and contacts.

Twenty-nine articles regarding the flood damaged roads, trails, and meetings appeared in the Everett Herald, Seattle PI, Tacoma News Tribune, Marysville Globe, Lake Stevens Journal, and Seattle Times newspapers. These articles described the various road projects and whom to contact concerning individual projects. By the end of the scoping period, 17 letters and emails had been received specific to the Suiattle Road 26 Repair.

An EA was prepared for the Suiattle Road 26 Repair Project with a Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact signed in March of 2006. A contract was awarded in 2006 and road repair work was initiated at MP14.4 when the fall 2006 flood event resulted in additional damage to Road 26. The 2006 Forest Service contract was terminated due to lack of access after the 2006 floods.

**2007 to 2011 scoping:** In the spring 2007, Forest Service staff discovered additional damage from the fall/winter 2006 flood impacts to Road 26. The 2006/2007 damaged sites were located at MP 6.0, MP 12.6, MP 13.0, MP 13.4, and MP 20.8. Since that time, the Forest Service along with FHWA staff inventoried the new damage and documented it in Damage Survey Reports, which identify what flood damage qualifies for ERFO funding.

Due to a lack of Forest Service staff to fully analyze the new flood damage, the Forest Service requested Federal Highway Administration to be the lead agency for the 2007 projects qualifying for ERFO funding. The Forest Service provided support to the planning efforts with field surveys, various specialists' reports, and Section 7 Endangered Species consultation. In 2007 and 2008 the Darrington District held open houses where Suiattle ERFO projects were discussed with interested parties. The Forest Service and Federal Highways individuals met numerous times with Tribal representatives, state, and federal agency staff persons, and other specialists in the development of repair options for Suiattle Road 26.

In 2010, Western Federal Lands Highway Division issued a Categorical Exclusion (CE) for the repair of Road 26 at Milepost 12.6 to 14.4, awarded a road repair contract and initiated additional tree felling at MP 14.4. In May 2011 FHWA terminated the construction contract and withdrew the CE because of the initiation of a lawsuit.

The lawsuit was dismissed in July of 2011, and in August 2011 the Forest Service and FHWA personnel discussed a proposed project that would address the concerns raised by the lawsuit.

Between 2007 and 2011, there were meetings with Tribal representatives, state, and federal agency staff persons, other specialists and interested parties. Additional information on the new proposed action was shared at the 2011 Darrington Ranger District Open House (September 15, 2011). Federal Highway Administration distributed a scoping pamphlet on the proposed repairs to a mailing list of over 300, and posted the information and contacts on their website. <http://www.wfl.fhwa.dot.gov/>. The Forest Service website (<http://www.fs.usda.gov/mbs>) had historic information on Suiattle Road 26 and flood damage posted as well as a copy of the FHWA information pamphlet on the proposed repair action with a link to the FHWA information site.

## Results

Table 19 lists each comment letter or communication, the name of the commenter, the code number assigned to it, the comment, and the section of this report where each comment is addressed. Because of the 2011 public outreach, an additional alternative (Alternative C) was added for analysis and is included in this Amended Environmental Assessment.

## Processing of Comments

A key step in the scoping process is methodologically reviewing comments to determine which comments affect the scope of the NEPA analysis and which do not. Comments that do not affect the scope of the analysis include those that:

- Express an opinion without an associated issue or concern.
- Are outside the scope of the decision to be made.
- Are addressed by other regulations, laws, or higher-level decisions (e.g., the Forest Plan).
- Are conjectural or not supported by science.

The letters/communications received included comments associated with this NEPA process as well as various resource areas. All comments are addressed in this report regardless of whether they affect the scope of analysis.

“Significant” issues are those that help to formulate alternatives, prescribe mitigation measures, or analyze environmental effects. Note that two or more comments may be addressed by a single discussion.

## Process

Most process questions do not have the potential to affect the scope of the A-EA *per se* (suggested alternatives and some others being the exception). As a result, most are addressed in discussion in this report. Some of the major process comments may be addressed in various sections of A-EA Chapters 1 and 2.

A question was raised on the purpose and need statement for vehicle access to the terminus of Road 26, with the concern that this purpose and need limited consideration for non-motorized access options or alternatives to meet purpose and need. The purpose and need was adjusted to state there was a need for safe motorized vehicular access for administrative, recreational and tribal cultural uses within the Suiattle River drainage. The need statement did not identify a specific location of the motorized access.

Comments on the repairs at MP 20.8, Downey Creek and Sulphur Creek Bridges on potential impacts to aquatic resources (Issue #1) and questions on risk of repairs and cost-effectiveness (Issue #3) resulted in Alternative C with Road 26 repaired to the junction of Roads 26 and 2680, with further action on the last four miles of Road 26 deferred to the USFS.

## **Proposed Action**

Table 19 lists the comments and questions received in scoping.

**Table 19: Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	1	Yes, please do complete this project to restore vehicle access to the wilderness along Road 26, especially the trail for handicapped persons. I am an older person who can no longer hike into the mountains, due to damaged knees. But I enjoy the forests and rivers and need to drive to wonderful places like this! Older folks like myself and young families all need access to nature. Please do not limit access to this historically important area. Thank you.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	2	This area attracts visitors from all over the world who enjoy seeing the flora and fauna of the area known as the Swiss Alps of America. To make certain areas inaccessible for day hikes sends the message that visitors aren't welcome. With the proper facilities provided, revenue can be generated which would be used for necessary maintenance. Trails should be kept open. If you build it, they will come.	Restore the road so that access is available to all The restored road will generate local revenue	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus. Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	3	I am looking forward to seeing the Suiattle Road reopened. The loss of this road has had negative economic impact on the Darrington Community. Darrington realizes a large portion of its economy form outdoor recreation.	Restore the road so that access is available to all The restored road will generate local revenue	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus. Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	4	Don't close this road!	Don't close the road	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	5	I want the road to be open + "____" I think you should stay out of our business.	Open road	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	6	The Suiattle road repair should be restored for historic, safety, and economic reasons. Losing access to campgrounds, (the few remaining on the North end of the district) and other recreational opportunities are all vital to our community. Limiting these opportunities has had an adverse effect on the remaining open areas in the district, concentrating more people and activity in a smaller portion of the forest.*we need a moratorium on all road closures!!	Restore the road so that access is available to all  The restored road will generate local revenue	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.  Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	7	This road needs to be opened. As a teenager, our church group spent many hours at the Buck Creek Campground. There are older people who enjoy getting out in the woods for a ride as they are not able to hike anymore. I have talked to people at several trailheads that were complaining that Road 26 was closed. It really needs to be rebuilt.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	9	The Suiattle is a great recreation area. Having the road open would provide access for hunting, fishing, hiking, horseback riding and camping. There are many individuals who spent childhood years recreating off Road 26 who like to revisit the area.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Anonymous	10	As an advocate of the wilderness being available to all – reasonable access is a must. The lakes I've read about as being accessible as a day hike are not doable for those of a younger age and definitely not for those of us approaching a more mature age. The economic impact on small towns surrounding our forests can be disastrous when campgrounds and roads continue to be taken from us. If logic could prevail in these government made decisions, the benefit for keeping our forests accessible to all is in keeping with respect and awe we need to experience and appreciate.	Restore the road so that access is available to all The restored road will generate local revenue	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus. Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Catherine Austin	11	I am interested in seeing the Suiattle road open to vehicle traffic to Downey Creek at least, even if it means closing some other roads due to understandable lack of maintenance funds for so many road miles. The Suiattle is a major access point for many recreational opportunities in the back country for a variety user groups – hikers, hunters, backpackers, stock users, etc. Thanks.	Restore the road at least to Downey Creek	Alternative B would restore Road 26 to the terminus, so access would be restored to Downey Creek. Alternative C would restore Road 26 to the junction of Road 26 and Road 2680., which would be approximately 2 miles of closed road west of Downey Creek
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Robert Burkhart	12	Forest User friendly Gating Policy for Construction areas: Gating for construction jobs shall be at the discretion of the contractor with coordination with local Ranger District. Generally speaking, the gating policy is to be considerate as possible of Forest users concerns (recreation, hunting, fishing, hiking, etc.) Areas should be gated only when expected, and equipment is left at the job site, then gating can continue thru the night. But if work is suspended for 3 days or more then gating should be unlocked. Warning signs	Restore the road so that access is available to all The restored road will generate local revenue Reduce current gating frequency Increase security cameras	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus. Security cameras on Forest Service Roads was not addressed in this EA which focused on the decision to repair or not repair flood damaged sites.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>for Road Work, or temporary Primitive Road warnings should be used when gating is unlocked. Obvious no go washouts should have road closed signs beyond that point. Gating should not be more than 1 mile from job site and at an appropriate wide spot for a turn-around. Only minimum turnaround is required as all people have the option of backing up to the nearest wide spot. See Security measures below for companion policy.</p> <p>Forest Service Security Policy</p> <p>Local Forest Service districts will provide battery or solar powered security cameras for each main road approaching road construction sites, with the purpose of gaining vehicle license numbers. Based on complaints from contractors, the camera memories will be downloaded for 48 hours prior to incident and turned over to proper authorities.</p> <p>Note: 6 road jobs in a district would be 6 cameras, at an estimated relative small cost.</p> <p>Note: Private timber companies are already using cameras on gates. In my opinion, this puts the District in the know and involved in the issues of road maintenance, but not overly burdened, or burdened more than they already are with these issues.</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <p>Generally the author has observed excessively cautious gating policies, slow to be revised, and overly considerate of contractor risks. This means people like myself who enjoy the use of the National Forests are met by too many and too restrictive road blocks. I give the example of North Fork</p>		

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>Sauk Road could have been opened to access some trailheads this summer. It is also my opinion that the Suiattle Road could have been declared a "Temporary Primitive Road" with warning signs, and road closure signs at the Downey Creek, until the funding and study issues were resolved. This would have been just as easy to accommodate as the horse packers and their large horse trailers, numerous Forest Service vehicles, etc.</p>		
<p>September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House</p>	<p>Steve Babbit</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>The 210' bridge extension of the Downey Creek Bridge is an expansion of the scale of the immediate repair; right now, only the downstream approach ramp needs repair. Why the large increase in the scope of the repair? The road reroute proposals (MP 6.0, 12.6, 14.4, and 20.8) look feasible.</p> <p>The 1.1 mile reroute encompassing the washouts at MPs 13.0 and 13.4 is a much greater repair than I had been expecting! Any reroute that moves the road to a higher elevation is preferred to leaving the road at its existing floodplain location; using a portion of FSR2670 is a good idea and will minimize taking of trees.</p> <p>Thanks for presenting this open house!</p>	<p>Restore the road out of the floodplain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downey Creek bridge expansion is too big</li> </ul>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p> <p>The benefits of the Downey Creek Bridge expansion are described in the fisheries and hydrology sections of the EA.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Bruce Danielson	14	<p>It is encouraging to see the Forest Service persisting in finding an environmentally sensitive reconstruction of the Suiattle Road. The road is the access for a number of superb day-hikes (especially Green Mt., as well as Huckleberry Mt.), for one of the finest low-elevation old-growth hiker in the state (Suiattle River Trail) of which there are very few – and a gateway to numerous extraordinary backpacks. It needs to be repaired, and the proposals also appear to be lasting solutions to the road's problems. With the increasing loss of good lower elevation old-growth access (Carbon River Road, White Chuck Road, Dosewallips Road, etc.) the Suiattle Road is especially valuable.</p> <p>Thank you, again, and I encourage you to continue to pursue this high-quality repair of the vital access artery.</p>	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Carol Anne Erickson	15	<p>It is my hope that the Suiattle River Road be repaired and re-opened for access to wonderful back country area. I like the plans for relocating some parts of the road out of the river's bed area.</p> <p>I'm hoping my nephews, cousins, and younger friends will also be able to enjoy this area as I have.</p>	Restore the road so that access is available to all Relocate the road away from the river bed	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Curtis Green	16	I have lived in Darrington my whole life and spent much time on Mountain roads and hiking. We are losing so many roads to storm damage and shut down logging roads. Our access is so limited that the Suiattle drainage is very important for fishing, camping, hiking, hunting, etc. I used to hunt Green Mountain every year, now 15 miles of road hiking before the hunt is too much. My folks used to take us on picnics Sundays on various roads around Darrington and I would like to be able to continue that with my grandsons. Repairing an existing road seems like a good idea since this road has so many things to offer. Thank you.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Ray Hanby	17	Adamantly want the road open to the final trailhead.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Diane Holz	18	<p>Suiattle Road Access</p> <p>Our family has experienced many great memories in the Suiattle drainage over the past several years. We've enjoyed camping at Buck Creek and Sulphur Creek, hiking the Suiattle, Tupso Pass, Boulder Lake, Downy Creek, and Green Mountain trails. Other recreational activities we have enjoyed and hope to continue to enjoy include: hunting the Green Mountain meadows, picking blueberries at the end of Grade Creek, grouse hunting off the Grade Creek and Tenas Creek roads, enjoying the wildflowers and the lookout on Green Mountain, and fishing the many creeks and lakes.</p> <p>There are so many roads, bridges, trails, and campgrounds already established along the Suiattle which allows so many recreational opportunities for all forest visitors.</p> <p>My Dad is now 76 years old and cannot hike the miles that he once was able to. He is anxiously waiting for the road to reopen so he once again can drive to Buck Creek Campground for a picnic, hike to the meadows on Green Mountain and take a walk up Downy Creek.</p> <p>We are hopeful that the Suiattle Road will reopen and our family, along with many other forest users, will get to enjoy the Suiattle area for many years to come.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Heidi Hooper	19	As an avid user of the Suiattle Road 26, I would like for it to remain open. We camp and fish at Buck Creek Campground. We love to ride our horses up Green Mountain, Huckleberry and the Suiattle trails. We enjoy the views and berry picking that can be had from Huckleberry and Green Mountain trails. It would be a huge loss of access to the Darrington and surrounding areas! Especially as we age, access is very important.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Jon Knechtel	20	The Suiattle River Road needs to be relocated and completed. This road is not in Wilderness, and is the main access point to the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail as well as the main access to Holden Village on Lake Chelan.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Don Knowles	21	I have lived in Darrington area all my life (77 years). Have hiked all local trails and fished local creeks. Now, because of road closures and gates, am restricted to where I can travel. I am very strongly opposed to Forest Service closures or lack of road repairs. I hope all these draft proposals will come to past.  Suiattle Road Repair Comment Sheet Darrington District Open House	Restore the road	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Paul Lehtinen	22	<p>I believe that Road 26 should be repaired, relocated, and opened. I'm a senior citizen who lived my entire life around the Cascade Mountains. 70 years of my taxes have supported these areas. I'm too old to "hike" now. I don't think it's morally right that a few pointy heads from Seattle should be able to shut down my mountains for their selfish, narrow-minded purposes.</p> <p>The area where repair and relocation are to take is such a minimal thing that any damaged places will recover in a year or two.</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>Relocate the road away from the river bed</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Nels @. Rasmussen OABA, President	23	<p>Repairing the Suiattle Road will be great for recreation opportunities and wonderful for Darrington area businesses! Please complete the road ASAP!</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>The restored road will improve local economy</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Randall Schroder	24	<p>Project Name: Suiattle Road #26 Repairs</p> <p>Comments: Restore the road to the end at Sulphur Creek. This is the most important access for backcountry recreation in the central cascades. It can be done with no impact to fish or birds using standard construction practices.</p>	<p>Restore the road to the end of Sulphur Creek</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House		25	<p>I am interested in balancing the preservation of our wilderness and creating access in order to allow people to appreciate, learn, and enjoy our natural assets. Closing or allowing trails and roads to disappear may have a negative effect on the area's economic viability. We need entrepreneurs and environmentalists at the table, crafting a solution that takes into account more than just a lopsided view. The answer is somewhere in the middle.</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>The closed road may affect the local economy</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p> <p>Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Tony Gobroski	26	I am interested in balancing the preservation of our wilderness and creating access in order to allow people to appreciate, learn, and enjoy our natural assets. Closing or allowing trails and roads to disappear may have a negative effect on the area's economic viability. We need entrepreneurs and environmentalists at the table, crafting a solution that takes into account more than just a lopsided view. The answer is somewhere in the middle.	Restore the road so that access is available to all The closed road may affect the local economy	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus. Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.
September 15, 2011, Darrington District Open House	Cindy White	27	RE: Suiattle River Road and surrounding area My extended family has enjoyed the Buck Creek campground and Suiattle Trail for many generations. I can remember the first time camping in the old lean-to with my family and waking up to the sound of Buck Creek when I was only 5 years old. As a young girl I would drive to Big Creek just to watch its beautiful fast water. My family and I have spent hot summer days up at Buck Creek to cool down at night and commute back to Darrington for work.  I have memories of my nephew catching a fish in the creek, my kids playing on the Big Rock, and many happy hours around the campfire reliving tales of the many adventures we have had. My father's family used the Suiattle and Green Mountain trails to pack their horses in to hunt and carry supplies to the Miner's Ridge Lookout. He often talked about the beauty of that trail; it is one I hope to get to visit myself some day.  My husband, son, and I have spent many days with other friends and family at deer camps in areas within the	Restore the road	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>Suiattle drainage.</p> <p>I have a respect for the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe recognition of this special place which mirrors my family's feeling for the beauty, bounty, enjoyment, and peace found there.</p> <p>The Suiattle Road has led our family to many happy memories and if closed, it will be a huge loss for not only us, but for our community and beyond. Our relatives who spent their childhood camping at Buck Creek wanted to get together with us to share a trip this summer. Of course, we couldn't, but it reminded me that the area is home to many who grew up near it, and have carried those memories with them to share with their children.</p>		
<p>email September 9, 2011</p>	<p>Bruce Barnbaum</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>I received a small fold-out brochure in the mail approximately a week ago outlining seven road repair projects slated for construction along the Suiattle River in Washington's North Cascade Mountains. The brochure also shows two photographs of washed out roads, apparently at river junctions. It is clear from the photographs that the river is at least 30 feet below the severed road, and perhaps as much as 60 feet below.</p> <p>The projects listed are each major projects. None are simple. Several involve major realignments of the roadbed, which would entail a great deal of tree removal, including many large (generally referred to as "old growth") trees. Clearly the geologically active Suiattle has taken out riverbanks, and with it roads and bridges.</p> <p>It should be clear that the river is wild, and cannot be contained. It can shift course</p>	<p>Should be EIS level of NEPA. Future flooding will occur.</p>	<p>No significant effects were identified at the initiation of the proposed project, not during the analysis of this project. If significant effect(s) would have been identified, the documentation would have been changed to an EIS to analyze and disclose any significant effects.</p> <p>The risk of future flooding impacts is discussed in the roads and hydrology sections of the EA.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>dramatically overnight due to heavy rains and runoff. Any realignment of roads, and any rebuilding of bridges, is subject to destruction in the next flooding event. With the added push from global warming, it is evident that such flooding events are now both more extreme, and closer together in time, than ever before.</p> <p>Yet these projects are allegedly to be pushed ahead by the FHWA via a low level environmental assessment (EA), rather than a much more stringent environmental impact statement (EIS). This is unconscionable. This is clearly wrong, and clearly wrongheaded.</p> <p>I have spoken by phone to both Karl Gleason, FHWA project manager, and Denise Steele, FHWA Environmental Protection Specialist, and have already expressed my view that nothing less than an EIS for these projects is required. Each individual project is large enough to warrant an EIS on its own merits. Cumulatively, the seven projects demand an EIS.</p> <p>For the FHWA to even consider proceeding with these projects under the auspices of an EA is reprehensible. I request that the FHWA reconsider, and place these projects under the far more diligent—and needed—scrutiny of an EIS. Anything less is a poke in the eye to the public. It basically tells the public that the FHWA will proceed with these projects its own way, and the public be damned. No governmental project should proceed in that manner, for in a democracy, it is the people who control the government, not the other way around.</p> <p>Among the options that must</p>		

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>be considered on each and every one of these projects—each individually—is whether it is worth the money and effort to repair the damage. Again, we're dealing with a highly active river from a geological point of view, and any man-made construction is vulnerable to future geological shifts and surprises, negating in seconds what may take months and perhaps many hundreds of thousands of dollars—maybe more—to construct.</p> <p>I thank you for your consideration of these views, and I hope you will take them seriously.</p>		
<p>email September 12, 2011</p>	<p>Jim Scarborough</p>	<p>29</p>	<p>Hello. I'm unable to attend the open house in Darrington, though would like to request that the "purpose and need" for the upcoming environmental analysis be slightly expanded to restoring public access along the Suiattle road corridor (FSR 26), and not simply limited to restoring motorized access for the full length of the road. In this context, I request that FHWA study an alternative that would convert the Suiattle road into a non-motorized trail (open to foot, bicycles, and stock) above and east of the junction with FSR 2680.</p> <p>As an outdoorsman who frequently visits and enjoys the Suiattle, I believe it is unnecessary, ecologically damaging, and unnecessarily expensive to reconstruct FSR 26 for motor vehicles beyond the 2680 turnoff to the Green Mountain trailhead. Converting the 26 road into a trail beyond the 2680 junction would be the preferable means of protecting Downey Creek salmon habitat, while also opening up a relatively small (but rare) swath of</p>	<p>Restore public access along the road...not just motorized access Add alternative for non-motorized trail above FSR 2680</p>	<p>The purpose and need statement for the project was changed from "restoring motorized access for the full length of the road" to "to restore safe motorized access within the Suiattle drainage". This shift in the purpose and need statement provided for the development of Alternative C which would close the road at the junction of Road 26 and 2680.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>bottomland for non-motorized recreation. Note that the Glacier Peak Wilderness above Sulphur Creek is essentially bereft of bottomland. Removing vehicle use above the 2680 road would close this recreational gap while preventing unnecessary degradation of adjacent riparian areas.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this perspective. Please keep me on the mailing list for the EA.</p>		
<p>email September 14, 2011</p>	<p>Steve McElfresh</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>As a 30+ year land owner in the Suiattle river drainage I am in favor of any improvements done to the road.</p> <p>Since the road washouts we have had an increase in trespassers shooting, stealing and picking brush, this I believe can be attributed to the road closure which is compressing activities good and bad in the lower section of the valley.</p> <p>This road once accessed trailheads, campgrounds and tribal areas, access to these areas are vital to the enjoyment of this area and to the economy of Darrington.</p> <p>V/r</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p> <p>Economic effects of the alternatives are displayed in Chapter 3, the recreation and social-economic sections.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
email September 14, 2011	Terry Nield	31	I own 5 acres 9 miles up the suiattle river road #26, I am happy to see the road work that has been done, all the new culverts and the repair of the bridge that goes to road #25 at the 9 1/2 mile mark. we have had lots of people trespassing on our property, it is my opinion that the road work and repair should continue, not only for people who want to camp, but for search and rescue, also for fire protection, I visit my property up there quite often, It is my hope that the repair to the road will to continue, as I would like to go up to bear creek campground again someday.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
email September 19, 2011	Mike Torok	32	<p>I am pleased to see this project proceeding, but it's been too long. Having no vehicle access for almost a decade is not serving public recreational needs. But happy to see things moving again after some user groups have made every effort to stop the project cold.</p> <p>I would like to see this project proceed at a record pace from this point forward and get the road open ASAP to 1/4 mile before Downey Creek for 2012, and to MP 23 by 2013. I also would like to see all users treated the same, meaning that the administrative access be cancelled. I also would like the construction to start this current Winter, given if snow conditions allow. I also would like to see less bridge construction on the new Downey Creek bridge to save tax payer dept, unless the user group that wishes for the "Cadillac" solution pays for it. Can this all be done?</p> <p>Can temporary repairs be made at the three sites from MP 12 to get the road open to the public early?</p> <p>Mike Torok, a frequent user of the trails in the area</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>Speed up the construction fix</p> <p>Save taxpayer money by reducing the proposed size of the Downey Creek Bridge</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>
email September 19, 2011	David Huey	33	<p>Thank you for attending the meeting in Darrington last Thursday night. The information that you and Karl provided regarding the Suiattle River Road repair project was most informative. For those of us who have used that area for literally decades to hike, fish, tour, hunt, etc. the prospects for the repair of this road are highly anticipated.</p> <p>As I understand it, you will be leading the environmental assessment process that WFL is undertaking as part of the repair process. Hopefully my comments that follow are</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>relevant to that effort.</p> <p>My comments:</p> <p>1) After viewing and digesting the information related to the various areas of repair, it appears to me that these projects should have little negative impact on the area's environment and due to the way the projects are being undertaken, will likely be beneficial to fish runs. Moving the road in several places several hundred feet away from the river would also likely be beneficial overall; both to the longer term life of the road and lessened potential pollution to the river itself.</p> <p>2) This repair is designed to fix a road that has provided access to the Suiattle River drainage for decades. Thousands of people over the years have enjoyed and used that area for recreating. This repair would just allow that usual and normal use to continue.</p> <p>3) Keeping this area effectively open to public use would help minimize the impact on other areas that have to carry the load of recreational use.</p> <p>4) This roadway/corridor is part of the national forest. It is not in wilderness and will allow continued access for traditional uses.</p> <p>I look forward to the timely completion of the assessment and opportunity to comment on it. If there is an electronic or hard copy mailing list for information related to this project I would appreciate being added to it.</p> <p>Again, thanks for coming out and sharing the information.</p> <p>Regards,</p>		

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
email September 20, 2011	Mary Ann Monty	34	My husband and I are both 4th generation Snohomish County residents and have always enjoyed this area. We have tried to share our love of the outdoors with our five children and five grandchildren. We have now adopted our great-granddaughter, and cannot enjoy the forest the way we used to. The elitist city people have taken away our ability to enjoy our own land. We urge you to complete the road repairs as planned so that we all may enjoy our land, not only those who wish to keep it wilderness. They will someday be our age and unable to hike as they formerly did; they may then realize the error of their ways.	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
email September 26, 2011	Nancy Sosnove	35	I would like to emphasize that the Suiattle River Road is the access point to a great many miles of trails that are now effectively unavailable to us. We have been hiking these trails for decades, and feel strongly that the road should be repaired. We support environmentally sound policies, and of course want the work done in a careful manner, but stopping the road is actually harmful to environmental protection because if people have no access to the mountains, they do not support trails and preservation. If you want to keep an area pristine, it is not helpful to make it totally unavailable to the voters who would be asked to pay for it. I consider myself an environmentalist, but I want to be able to enjoy the Glacier Peak Wilderness, and the road was a key entry point. I support repairing it. Thank you,	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
email October 5, 2011	Nancy Brodie	36	<p>I heartily approve your plans to repair the Suiattle River Road. This area has some of the most beautiful hiking trails in western Washington and access has been denied to the public for far too long. If I had my way, I would vote for repair work to begin immediately.</p> <p>I have seen pictures on nwhiker.net of the beautiful new PCT bridge over the Suiattle. It is terrific. Thank you so much for building it.</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>Speed up the construction fix</p>	<p>Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.</p>
email October 6, 2011	Katherine Johnson	37	<p>Pilchuck Audubon Society represents members in the north Puget Sound region of Washington State. Our mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems focusing on birds and other wildlife for the benefit of the earth's biological diversity. We have worked to protect local forests and other wild lands since 1970. Our members use the Suiattle River Road area for various forms of passive recreation including bird and other wildlife-watching, hiking, mountain biking, camping; spiritual renewal; and gathering berries, mushrooms, and medicinal plants.</p> <p>This letter constitutes our comments on the current Suiattle Road No. 26 repair project.</p> <p>Pilchuck Audubon Society has a long history of involvement with planning on this road. We have submitted formal comments regarding its reconstruction on at least six occasions since 2004, as well as filing an appeal in 2006 and, as you know, the recent lawsuit that led to this NEPA analysis. We urge you to review these documents and incorporate them by reference, as the concerns we raised previously remain</p>	<p>A full range of alternatives are displayed., including conversion to road to trail from MP 12.6</p> <p>Consider an alternative for Road 26 closure at the junction with Road 2680.</p> <p>Incorporate campground construction at the end of any new road terminus. Compare cost of new campground to road repairs.</p> <p>Concern with repairs impacts to large trees and TES habitat with road repairs at MP 12.6 to MP 14.4.</p> <p>Considerate road decommissioning due to the Suiattle being a Tier 1 watershed.</p> <p>Consider risk to road from future flooding from climate change.</p> <p>Concern with impacts to federally listed species and habitat.</p> <p>Concern for proper utilization of ERFO funding.</p>	<p>A full range of alternatives is described in Chapter 2 – alternative considered and not further pursued as well as the three alternatives in the EA.</p> <p>The purpose and need statement for the project was changed from “restoring motorized access for the full length of the road” to “to restore safe motorized access within the Suiattle drainage”. This shift in the purpose and need statement provided for the development of Alternative C which would close the road at the junction of Road 26 and 2680.</p> <p>Costs of the alternatives are described in Chapter 3, the roads and recreation sections of the EA.</p> <p>Development of new facilities is described in Chapter 2, alternatives considered and not further pursued.</p> <p>Impacts of roads</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>valid. We would be glad to provide copies if you need them.</p> <p>First and foremost, the EA must include a broad range of alternatives, as required by law. These should include fully decommissioning the road and converting it to a trail, at least from the location of the first washout on USFS land at milepost 12.6. This option would be the most beneficial for water quality, fish and wildlife, including ESA-listed species such as salmon, bull trout, spotted owls and marbled murrelets.</p> <p>This alternative would enhance recreation opportunities by creating a non-strenuous, highly scenic route along a beautiful river through old growth forest that would be accessible to “differently abled” individuals including families with young children and elders. It could incorporate the construction of a new Green Mountain lookout trail with a trailhead on the Suiattle Road (now trail), avoiding the less pleasant long uphill road walk on the Green Mtn. road.</p> <p>Another alternative that should be examined is to close the Suiattle Road at Downey Creek, after the Green Mtn. Rd 2680. This would allow motorized access to the Forest Service cabin (although rentals could certainly continue without it) and keep the Green Mtn. trail as a short dayhike. It would also avoid the deleterious effects and expense of rebuilding the Downey Creek bridge for motor vehicles.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this option would remove significant portions of mature forest including large trees within the Wild and Scenic River corridor and adjacent to Late Successional Reserve at</p>		<p>repairs to federally listed species and habitat is described in Chapter 3 fisheries and wildlife sections.</p> <p>Future risk to roads from flooding is addressed in Chapter 3, roads and hydrology section.</p> <p>Climate change is addressed in Appendix C.</p> <p>Use of ERFO funding with the project is discussed in Chapter 1, introduction of the project.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>mileposts 12.6, 13, 13.4 and 14.4, negatively impacting marbled murrelet and spotted owl habitat.</p> <p>Either of these alternatives could incorporate a campground at or near the new road end for those who prefer to drive to their campsites. Creating this campground would be less costly than the road reconstruction that would be avoided.</p> <p>Indeed, road decommissioning is by far the most cost-effective means of protecting the watershed, which as you know is a Tier 1 Key Watershed.</p> <p>Furthermore, this watershed and the adjacent Upper Sauk watershed have been identified as the highest priorities on the Forest for aquatic restoration.</p> <p>This goal, as well as the objectives and requirements of the NW Forest Plan ROD, including ACS objectives, can best be met by full road decommissioning.</p> <p>Reconstruction and maintenance may ameliorate some problems in the short term, but will allow continued impairment of water quality and wildlife habitat. The next significant flood event, likely not far in the future, will start the cycle anew. One need only look at the number of times in the past two decades that the Suiattle River Road has been washed out and repaired to see the validity of this concern.</p> <p>Furthermore, climatologists predict more frequent and intense storms, which will certainly increase the incidence of flooding and road washouts. The EA needs to evaluate the effects of climate change on future flood events. And the analysis must not neglect the</p>		

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>effects of restoring motor vehicle access on climate change.</p> <p>The EA must consider effects on ESA listed and sensitive species including but not limited to the marbled murrelet; spotted owl; gray wolf; grizzly bear; Chinook, coho, pink, and sockeye salmon; bull trout; steelhead; and coastal cutthroat trout. The USFWS had found it necessary to issue an “incidental take” of spotted owl and marbled murrelet for the project proposed in the 2010 Suiattle ATM EA. This level of species impact is unacceptable when other options (i.e. less than full road reconstruction) are available.</p> <p>Alternatives must respect the Suiattle’s Wild and Scenic River designation, as well as impacts on the Glacier Peak Wilderness, which is accessed by the Suiattle Road.</p> <p>The scoping information did not indicate whether the use of ERFO funds for these projects is planned. If so, this would violate federal regulations, as more than two years have elapsed since the fiscal year in which the disaster occurred.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Forest Practices Committee Chair</p>		

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
email October 12, 2011	Fred Harnisch	38	<p>The Suiattle River Road provides access to Buck Cr. Campground, one of the favorite campgrounds of many people visiting the North Cascades. The road also allows access beyond Buck Creek for many elderly folks and others who are not able to walk long distances, allowing them to enjoy the benefits of this beautiful area.</p> <p>I would like to see the Suiattle River Road (Forest Highway 26) repaired and reopened to allow vehicle access as proposed by the Federal Highway Administration.</p>	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
email with attachments October 21, 2011	Sarah Krueger and Martinique Grigg	39	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment during the scoping period for the Environmental Assessment of the Suiattle River Road (FR 26) repair. The Mountaineers represents nearly 10,000 members in Washington State, many of whom have long enjoyed access to the trails, campgrounds and climbing opportunities along the Suiattle River corridor and within the Glacier Peak Wilderness. Closure of the road due to flood damage has impacted many of our organization's activities and outings in the area.</p> <p>While our members are eager to regain access to the recreational opportunities along the Suiattle River, the Mountaineers is also concerned with preserving the quality of the surrounding forest and the Suiattle River, part of the Wild &amp; Scenic Skagit River System. We urge the Federal Highway Administration to conduct a comprehensive Environmental Assessment that considers both the importance of access and the integrity of the natural resources along the road corridor.</p>	<p>Restore the road so that access is available to all</p> <p>Add an alternative that analyzes motorized access just to MP 20.7</p>	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>In addition to the alternatives to repair the road to its end at milepost 22.9 or closing the road at milepost 12.5, the Mountaineers recommends that the Environmental Assessment consider an alternative to repair and reopen the road to vehicle traffic to milepost 20.7, before the confluence of Downey Creek and the Suiattle River. Hiking trails and campsites beyond milepost 20.7 could still be easily accessed by the pedestrian bridge, but this alternative would avoid a costly and intensive repair in an area that may be prone to future washouts.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments. We have attached more detailed observations from Edward Henderson, a long-time volunteer with the Mountaineers and a professional civil engineer, for your consideration.</p> <p>The Mountaineers look forward to participating in the public process to repair the Suiattle Road, please notify us when the Environmental Assessment is published.</p>		
<p>email attachment October 20, 2011 email Sarah Krueger October 21, 2011</p>	<p>Edward Henderson</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>Suiattle River Road Observations &amp; Concerns Prepared by Edward Henderson, Civil Engineer &amp; Mountaineers Volunteer October 20, 2011</p> <p>After a survey of the Suiattle River Road conducted in September of 2011, I offer the following observations and recommendations for the pending Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Milepost 12.6: The river meander here appears to have eroded back to bedrock; therefore further erosion should be minimal. Please investigate the possibility of armoring the existing slope</p>	<p>Armor the slope at MP 12.6 instead of upslope construction.</p> <p>Provide preliminary drawings in the EA</p> <p>Add an alternative that analyzes motorized access just to MP 20.7</p>	<p>Armoring the slope at MP 12.6 was not developed due to fisheries concerns for riprap hardening along rivers' edges.</p> <p>Preliminary drawings are available as separate documents</p> <p>Alternative C would restore Road 26 to the junction of Road 26 and Road 2680, which would be approximately 2 miles of closed road west of MP 20.8.</p> <p>Future risk to roads from flooding is addressed in Chapter 3, roads and</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>between the river and the road with some type of revetment such as gabion baskets and maintaining the road on the present alignment. This will preclude the necessity of clearing over an acre of old growth and blasting bedrock for a relocated road.</p> <p>Milepost 13.0 &amp; 13.4: Before an assessment can be made of the proposed action to reroute the road via FS Road 2670 and an upslope bench in the forest, a survey must be conducted, complete with staking and flagging. Preliminary design drawings should be included in the EA. This will allow on-site inspection and evaluation of the impact of the proposed action.</p> <p>Milepost 20.8: This area presents a challenge. The slope consists of loose sand and gravel with embedded cobbles. The Suiattle River and Downey Creek will continue to washout the toe of the slope and the loose material will continue to erode with the erosion migrating up slope in a continuous effort to reach stability. The design of the proposed action to relocate the road back into the slope must address the twin problems of lower and upper slope erosion. Simple hydro seeding will not be sufficient. Long-term maintenance will be a major problem at this location. The EA should thoroughly investigate and address an alternative to repair and reopen the road to vehicle traffic to milepost 20.7 and close the road at that point without attempting to repair and maintain the road beyond the washout at milepost 20.8.</p>		<p>hydrology section. Climate change is addressed in Appendix C.</p>

### Suiattle Road Comments Summary

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
email October 24, 2011	Kim R Brown	41	<p>Keenly interested in getting the Suiattle Road repaired without further interruptions. Careful consideration should be made regarding the contents of the EA to ensure that any stall tactics can be addressed swiftly, and that there be little or no ambiguity regarding the process and/or content.</p> <p>A full public comment period should be utilized, and a separate No Action alternative should be included.</p> <p>Thanks for your hard work!</p>	Include a full public comment period and a No action alternative	Full public comment period has occurred in the past and will occur again with the release of this EA. A No Action Alternative is included in this EA.
email October 30, 2011	Paul Wagner	42	<p>I have looked at plan areas on the ground and details for repair of those areas. I believe the plan to re-establish vehicle access to the terminus of road 26 is sound, best serves the public &amp; tribal interests and provides necessary protection for fish, wildlife and the environment in general. Repair of road 26 as proposed will allow the public to once again enjoy favorite campgrounds and have good access to well loved trails and areas.</p> <p>I say good work and full speed ahead!</p>	Restore the road so that access is available to all	Addressed in Alternative B which repairs road 26 to the terminus.
email September 7, 2011	Bruce Barnbaum	43	<p>I received a small fold-out brochure in the mail approximately a week ago outlining seven road repair projects slated for construction along the Suiattle River in Washington's North Cascade Mountains. The brochure also shows two photographs of washed out roads, apparently at river junctions. It is clear from the photographs that the river is at least 30 feet below the severed road, and perhaps as much as 60 feet below. The projects listed are each major projects. None are simple. Several involve major realignments of the</p>	<p>Raise the level of NEPA to an EIS</p> <p>The proposed repairs are too expensive</p>	<p>No significant effects were identified at the initiation of the proposed project, not during the analysis of this project. If significant effect(s) would have been identified, the documentation would have been changed to an EIS to analyze and disclose any significant effects.</p> <p>The risk of future flooding impacts is discussed in the roads and hydrology sections of the EA.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>roadbed, which would entail a great deal of tree removal, including many large (generally referred to as "old growth") trees. Clearly the geologically active Suiattle has taken out riverbanks, and with it roads and bridges.</p> <p>It should be clear that the river is wild, and cannot be contained. It can shift course dramatically overnight due to heavy rains and runoff. Any realignment of roads, and any rebuilding of bridges, is subject to destruction in the next flooding event. With the added push from global warming, it is evident that such flooding events are now both more extreme, and closer together in time, than ever before.</p> <p>Yet these projects are allegedly to be pushed ahead by the FHWA via a low level environmental assessment (EA), rather than a much more stringent environmental impact statement (EIS). This is unconscionable. This is clearly wrong, and clearly wrongheaded.</p> <p>I have spoken by phone to both Karl Gleason, FHWA project manager, and Denise Steele, FHWA Environmental Protection Specialist, and have already expressed my view that nothing less than an EIS for these projects is required. Each individual project is large enough to warrant an EIS on its own merits. Cumulatively, the seven projects demand an EIS.</p> <p>For the FHWA to even consider proceeding with these projects under the auspices of an EA is reprehensible. I request that the FHWA reconsider, and place these projects under the far more diligent—and needed—scrutiny of an EIS. Anything less is a poke in the</p>		

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>eye to the public. It basically tells the public that the FHWA will proceed with these projects its own way, and the public be damned. No governmental project should proceed in that manner, for in a democracy, it is the people who control the government, not the other way around.</p> <p>Among the options that must be considered on each and every one of these projects—each individually—is whether it is worth the money and effort to repair the damage. Again, we’re dealing with a highly active river from a geological point of view, and any man-made construction is vulnerable to future geological shifts and surprises, negating in seconds what may take months and perhaps many hundreds of thousands of dollars—maybe more—to construct.</p> <p>I thank you for your consideration of these views, and I hope you will take them seriously.</p>		
email September 19, 2011	William (Bill) Lider	44	<p>I was unable to attend the open house presentation last week in Darrington. Please keep me posted on the status of the Road 26 EA for this project and notify me when it is published. These comments are preliminary and I reserve the right to augment or modify them upon receipt of the EA and construction documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have a more varied public input on these projects, you should also schedule an open house at the Supervisor’s Office in Everett, WA. Holding open houses in only Darrington skews the public input on this project.</li> <li>• Any further road repairs on the Suiattle River Road are well outside the two year sunset period for the use of</li> </ul>	<p>Location of open house besides Darrington.</p> <p>Concern for sue of ERFO funding on the project.</p> <p>Road 26 should not be open beyond junction with Road 2680.</p> <p>Abandon road repairs with impacts large trees.</p> <p>Show wetland impacts and mitigations.</p> <p>Prohibit explosives.</p> <p>All stream crossing have fish passage culverts.</p> <p>No geotextile fabric or riprap in streams.</p>	<p>A public meeting is scheduled in Everett for March 29, 2012.</p> <p>Use of ERFO funding with the project is discussed in Chapter 1, introduction of the project.</p> <p>Alternative C would repair Road 26 to the junction with Road 2680.</p> <p>Road repairs in place that would reduce the impacts to large trees would not reduce the road vulnerability to future floods, or would use riprap in the active river channel which was also a concern raised in comments.</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>ERFO funds, pursuant to paragraph 2.12C of the ERFO Manual, which states in part, "If the damage persists with no correction for an extended period of time, it will eventually become unreasonable to continue to classify it as a disaster-related emergency regardless of the reason for the delay." Funding sources other than ERFO must be utilized. Any use of ERFO funds for any further repairs on Road 26 is now unreasonable and will likely lead to a legal appeals and further delay to the project. • Clearly state the funding source for all proposed Road 26 repairs in the EA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road 26 should be opened no further than Road 2680 (Green Mtn. Lookout Road). Beyond that point road construction is not sustainable due to the high probability of washouts. Beyond Road 2680 intersection, Road 26 should be decommissioned and turned into a hiking trail with no motorized vehicles permitted.</li> <li>• The currently proposed road alignment from Station 118+00 to Station 177+50 should be abandoned and not used. This road alignment has severe impact to old growth forest and wetlands, fracturing the existing low elevation Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet habitat.</li> <li>• Accurately show and call out the acreage of all wetlands impacted by the road construction. This includes those wetlands that are hydraulically affected by water flow interception from the road. All Class I wetlands must be mitigated at the ratio of not less than eight new to 1 impacted (8:1); All Class II wetlands must be mitigated at</li> </ul>	<p>Show OHWM on all stream crossings.            Maintain road in current location.            No motorhomes or recreational vehicles on Road 26            Provide preliminary drawings of proposed repairs.</p>	<p>Rock ripping is expected before the use of explosives. See Chapter 2 Alternative B description. See Chapter 3, fisheries section for discussion of culverts and fish passage. See Chapter 3, hydrology section for discussion of OHWM, stream crossings and location of road in current location (Alternative A – No Action).            Comment noted on preference for no motorhomes or recreational vehicles on Road 26.            Preliminary drawings are available as separate documents</p>

**Suiattle Road Comments Summary**

Date of Comment	Commenter	Comment Number	Comment	Comment Summary	Action Item
			<p>a ratio of not less than six new to 1 impacted (6:1). This mitigation ratio is generally accepted as the minimum requirement for Class I &amp; II wetland mitigation and is used by local jurisdictions such as Snohomish County. Show wetland buffers and impacts to those buffers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of high explosives should be prohibited in all instances.</li> <li>• All stream crossings must have fish passable culverts installed. Even if fish access is impeded by the existing Road 26 alignment, all streams must have fish passable culverts that will also assist in passage during debris flow events. Do not place geotextile fabric or riprap in streams.</li> <li>• Show the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) at all stream crossing, wetlands, and along the Suiattle River. Show the 200' offset from these water bodies to determine their buffers.</li> <li>• Maintain the road alignment in its current location and reduce road width to one lane, 14 feet wide, with no shoulder at current washouts. Reduce road speed to 15 mph in these areas.</li> <li>• Prohibit motor homes, RV's, and trailers from using Road 26. Post this requirement at SR 530.</li> <li>• To help avoid the possibility of further litigation, please provide me copies of draft and final design drawings for any road construction or reconstruction along Road 26.</li> </ul>		