

## **Appendix G – Scoping Comments and Agency Responses**



## Appendix G – Scoping Comments and Agency Response

### Scoping Comments:

Below are ID Team responses to comments received during the scoping period from seven commenters.

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
<p>Dana Burwell 06/10/2002</p>	<p>Frissell - We talked about moving this landing across the river and down stream to a better location. Not able to do that, it would be good to put in boulders and make a lower grade ramp.</p> <p>Paradise – Build another raft launch at the very East end of the loop drive or somewhere between the east end of the loop and the current landing. This landing gets very heavy use at times and the current landing is inadequate. Another landing at the far end of the loop would be best.</p> <p>Bruckart – We need to move the landing down stream 100 yards to a better location and make it a wider two slot landing. Also, need to improve parking with a loop road off of Road 19.</p>	<p>Frissell - The proposed action and alternative 3 addresses these concerns. The proposed action would relocate the ramp to a better location, and alternative 3 would change the angle of the existing ramp and lower the grade.</p> <p>Paradise - This specific comment was not incorporated into the EA. Concerns about having two different boat ramps and impacts to the river bank drove the proposed action to double the size of the ramp at the existing site where river bank disturbance has already occurred.</p> <p>Bruckart – The proposed action would move the ramp downstream of Bruckart Bridge on a cobble bar. The ramp would not be doubled in size, but the cobble bar would provide sites to park boats while the ramp is busy. Parking would be improved and the loop road entrance would no longer be off Highway 126. The design includes a loop road coming off Forest road 1900-360.</p>

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
<p>Ken Helfrich 05/24/2002 and 03/03/2003</p>	<p><b>Frissell</b> (emphasis added) landing becomes very difficult to launch a boat during low flows. The facility does not allow more than two boats to be parked or loading passengers at one time. The highway noise and the fact that big trucks and RV's use this Frissell as a rest area, makes the present boat ramp a difficult facility to use.</p> <p>I feel we need to move <b>Frissell</b> (emphasis added) landing across the river and below the bridge. There is an eddy to park more than one boat and much more gradual slope to the river. Parking could still be on the highway side and a small road could allow a drive around type of put-in. I fell it would be a better use of funds to construct a low impact landing on the north side of Frissell Bridge, rather than trying to fix the existing site.</p> <p>The proposals for improvements at <b>Paradise</b> (emphasis added) are much needed. Paradise has become the most popular put-in spot on the river, especially during low water years. It is necessary to give boaters a easy way to get boats and trailers in and out of the river. I feel it is appropriate to sacrifice certain aesthetics of boat landing facility to allow people access to a beautiful resource area. The area needs to be expanded to accommodate several groups at one time. A trail from the ramp down the riverbank would give better access to the boats. The road into and around the launch area needs to be widened to allow traffic easy access in and out of the area.</p> <p>The <b>Bruckart</b> (emphasis added) landing was established in a poor location because of the fast river current the ramp is subjected to. The present ramp being 90% into a fast and deep cutting riverbank presents some boater challenges. There is a lack of pools above and below the ramp so boats have no place to park or get stopped. It is no surprise that the ramp continues to wash out. We need to build a new ramp below the bridge where the water is slower, and more parking space is available.</p> <p>(McKenzie River) <b>Trailhead</b> (emphasis added) is a necessary boat ramp. The <b>Trailhead</b> (emphasis added) landing is a vested and historical boat landing that has been open to the public for years.</p>	<p>Frissell - The proposed action would relocate the ramp in the eddy described. A staging area would also be provided near the ramp for safety talks away from highway noise.</p> <p>Paradise – The proposed action addresses these concerns. In the proposed action, the ramp would be doubled in size, an additional staging area would be designated, and the existing user trail would be improved (i.e. gravel additions, trimming vegetation along the trail, and relocating woody material that blocks the trail).</p> <p>Bruckart – In the proposed action the site would be relocated downstream of Bruckart Bridge.</p> <p>Trailhead launch – There is no proposal to change this boat launch from the current condition. The primary use for this site is as a trailhead for the National Recreation Trail, and as an interpretive site for the West Cascades National Scenic Byway.</p>

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
Steve Schaefers 05/30/2002	I like the idea of pads like the one at McKenzie Bridge CG being used at the landings. As for putting large boulders above the landing to block the current, I would have a hydrologist look at this first. In high water events, these large rocks can create more damage to shoreline and may undercut the cement pad.	The proposed action addresses this comment. Conceptual designs found in Appendix F, have a ramp similar to the ramp at McKenzie Bridge campground.
Justin Wellman 05/24/2002	I received the letter about possible improvements and so far everything looks good. The access that needs the most attention is <b>Bruckart</b> and in addition to your list the culvert pipe just below the launch needs to be angled downstream or a guard needs to be put in place to keep rafts from being gouged on the corner of the pipe. This is more of a concern at high water.	In an action separate from this EA, the Forest Service cut the culvert so that it does not stick out into the river channel.
Melinda Allan for Al Law (no date)	<p>Frissell – Concrete pad would be good for driftboats, also launch rafts faster and reduce congestion. Calmer waters are wonderful for getting those first-time guests loaded safely.</p> <p>Paradise – An eddy to land in would be nice. Currently when the ramp is busy, there is no landing site for boats arriving from upstream. More trailer parking would be nice. Change the ramp from gravel to concrete with a lower grade so that non-SUVs can back trailers in; this would make launching faster and easier. A parking/launching/staging site on the loop itself would be great, or at least a flat spot on the loop with a picnic table so rafters don't take tables from non-rafters. Staging site might be located a little more away from the river so you don't have to shout over rapids to be heard by guests.</p> <p>Bruckart – Please! Lower grade concrete launch pad!! In the old days (before the old pavement washed away), we could load a heavy raft with only three people, now we need a group of six or more! Please also consider adding more boulders to increase eddy size (now we are landing with a throwbag, in higher waters). The one way loop road idea also sounds great.</p> <p>In conclusion, our main concerns for launch sites are:</p>	<p>Frissell - The proposed action would relocate the ramp to slower water, reduce the grade, and provide a concrete ramp. Alternative 3 would not move the ramp to slower water, but would provide a concrete ramp.</p> <p>Paradise - The proposed action would relocate small boulders near the ramp that will improve access. A double wide concrete ramp would replace the existing gravel ramp, and a new staging area would be designated.</p> <p>Bruckart – Both the proposed action and Alternative 3 would reduce the grade of the ramp. The proposed action would improve conditions by relocating the ramp downstream of Bruckart Bridge to slower water.</p>

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Guest safety</li> <li>2. Disabled easy access</li> <li>3. Ease of launching, which increases efficiency so other boaters don't get impatient waiting.</li> <li>4. Keep ramps open, not having rigs parked on them, or boaters taking forever to launch.</li> <li>5. Appearance of ramp, porta-johns, garbage cans, etc.</li> <li>6. Guide safety, for backing trailers, etc.</li> </ol>	
Jim Berl (no date)	<p><b>At Frissell Launch the current site problems include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ramp is located on Hwy 126 with no guardrail for safety protection from highway traffic. The proximity to the highway makes it very difficult to give safety/paddle talks with traffic noise.</li> <li>• There is limited space for parking vehicles and also the ramp can be blocked by vehicles and 18 wheel trucks stopped for a rest break.</li> <li>• Many different kinds of craft use this launch including: rafts, pontoon boats, drift boats, inflatable and hard shell kayaks. There is very fast water at the put in with very little parking for boats in the water.</li> <li>• The ramp itself needs work for better and more easy access for boats dropping in and safety for people trying to load into their water craft.</li> </ul> <p>In my opinion a launch site over Frissell bridge on the opposite side of the river from the current site would alleviate all these problems.</p> <p><b>At Paradise Launch current site problems include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lack of adequate staging areas.</li> <li>• Compliance with use of staging area and not blocking ramp to inflate boats or give safety talks.</li> <li>• Lack of signs about not blocking ramp and river etiquette.</li> <li>• Lack of vehicle <b>with</b> trailer parking.</li> </ul>	<p>Frissell – The proposed action addresses this concern by relocating the ramp on the opposite side of the river just downstream of Buck Bridge.</p> <p>Paradise – The proposed action addresses these concerns by providing an additional staging area, and by doubling the size of the ramp. The proposed action would also add vehicle parking with trailer space in the existing day use area.</p> <p>The conceptual design does not limit the</p>

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
	<p>I need to speak very strongly for continued access for trailers to back into the ramp to unload boats. There is a wide variety of water craft used for recreation including drift boats, pontoon boats and large rafts that are either impractical or impossible to carry to the water. I am not in favor of any design that would limit these types of water craft from using the sites.</p> <p><b>At Bruckart Launch current site problems include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Space for parking boats at ramp in water is extremely limited with only one or two water craft at a time able to launch or take out.</li> <li>• Parking is limited and it is not easy to back to the ramp when vehicles are in the parking area.</li> <li>• Site distance from the river to the ramp is poor, causing conflicts with boaters trying to put in and take out.</li> <li>• The ramp itself is on a very steep slope, again causing problems for backing trailers and public safety when getting in or out at the site.</li> <li>• Proximity to highway and public safety.</li> </ul> <p>The ramp itself is not good. I am not sure what improvements could be made, if any, at the current site. The issues of adequate water craft parking in the river, limited parking for vehicles, site distance from on the river, highway and vehicle safety as well as safety for people in the parking area and walking up and downs the ramp probably can not be solved here.</p> <p>Because of all these major issues at the current Bruckart launch site my suggestion is to build downstream at the bridge itself to alleviate these problems.</p> <p><b>At the Trail Head launch the current site problems include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to the highway for public safety as well as highway noise during client paddle talks.</li> <li>• Somewhat limited parking.</li> <li>• Boat ramp is not obvious or well signed.</li> </ul> <p>Possible ramp improvements might be:</p>	<p>type of water craft that could use the Paradise launch site. By placing a concrete ramp at the site it should be easier and safer to back a trailer down to the river.</p> <p>Bruckart – The proposed action addresses these concerns by relocating the ramp downstream of the Bruckart Bridge. Conceptual designs would reduce the grade of the ramp and improve parking.</p> <p>Trailhead - An alternative with improvements to this ramp was considered in response to this comment but not fully developed. A 1999 Decision Memo, which implemented development of the pullout where this boat ramp is located, states that the primary uses will</p>

Submitter and Date	Comment	Response and Where Addressed in the EA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better marking of ramp and signs stating not to block ramp at any time.</li> <li>• Depending on how much use this site gets with ramps 2 miles either direction that are good ones there might be a possibility for removal and restoration of this ramp.</li> </ul>	<p>be as a trailhead for the National Recreation Trail, and as an interpretive site for the West Cascades National Scenic Byway.</p>
<p>Steve Ponder 09/23/2003</p>	<p>In general, I endorse the Forest Service recommended action alternatives for the Frissell, Paradise and Bruckart boat ramps. The existing Frissell and Bruckart ramps are not only inconvenient but represent a safety hazard to boaters who try to use them.</p> <p>The proposed Bruckart ramp area is a much more appropriate location for parking. Building a new ramp somewhere in the vicinity of the bridge seems appropriate. I am somewhat concerned that locating the boat ramp and the parking is on different sides of the busy highway to Cougar reservoir would create a safety hazard to pedestrians and to boaters moving rigs back and forth. Traffic controls may need to be considered. I also wonder whether Delta Campground has been evaluated as a potential ramp site, since it already has a road and parking network.</p>	<p>The proposed action and Alternative 3 were designed in a fashion that reduces hazards associated with the existing ramps.</p> <p>The design for parking at Bruckart considers appropriate signage and what types of traffic controls would be necessary.</p> <p>Delta Campground was not considered as a potential site because a ramp at that site would be on the outside bend of the river, and would require cutting thru the river terrace. This would maintain some of the existing problems associated with the current Bruckart ramp.</p>