



DEPARTMENT OF  
**ECOLOGY**  
State of Washington

## **Response to Comments**

### **Cleanup Action Plan, Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, and State Environmental Policy Act – Determination of Non-Significance**

### **Maury Island Open Space Cleanup Site Vashon, WA**

---

*Facility Site ID: 2901216*

*Cleanup Site ID: 1532*

November 2019

# Publication and Contact Information

This document is available on the Department of Ecology's Maury Island Webpage at:  
<https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=1532>

For more information contact:

Brad Petrovich  
Project Planner & Public Involvement Coordinator  
Ecology – Northwest Regional Office  
3190 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE  
Bellingham, WA 98008  
425-649-4486

Cris Matthews  
Site Manager  
Ecology – Bellingham Field Office  
913 Squalicum Way, Unit 101  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
360-255-4379

Washington State Department of Ecology – [www.ecology.wa.gov](http://www.ecology.wa.gov)

- Headquarters, Olympia 360-407-6000
- Northwest Regional Office, Bellevue 425-649-7000
- Southwest Regional Office, Olympia 360-407-6300
- Central Regional Office, Union Gap 509-575-2490
- Eastern Regional Office, Spokane 509-329-3400

*To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-255-4400 or visit <https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility>. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.*

*This page is purposely left blank*



## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Public Outreach .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Comment Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Next Steps .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Comments and Responses .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Comment From: Eric Pryne .....	6
Comment From: Cheryl Weise .....	7
Comment From: Todd Pearson .....	7
Comment From: Robert Thomas .....	8
Comment From: Diane Emerson .....	9
Comment From: Michael Meyer.....	9
Comment From: Bruce Morser .....	12
Comment From: Jar Lyons .....	13
Comment From: Cosmo Diskan .....	14
Comment From: Mairead Geraghty .....	14
Comment From: Lynn St. Martin .....	15
Comment From: Rhonda Hobgood.....	16
Comment From: Pamela Courtney .....	16
Comment From: Roxanne Lyons.....	17
Comment From: Cosmo Diskan .....	17
Comment From: Allison Trundle.....	18
Comment From: anne gordon gordon.....	19
Comment From: Mary Walker.....	20
Comment From: Diane Leigh .....	21
Comment From: bruce frey.....	22
Comment From: Ursula Dashiell .....	23
Comment From: Devin Branson 2066502940 .....	23
Comment From: Mary O'Brien.....	24
Comment From: Mark VanDevanter .....	24
Comment From: Stephanie Vandevanter.....	25

Comment From: Megan Minier .....	25
Comment From: Matthew Bradrick .....	26
Comment From: Bri Bradrick .....	26
Comment From: Sapphire Blue .....	26
Comment From: Blythe Bartlett .....	27
Comment From: Lise Ellner .....	27
Comment From: Craig Harmeling .....	28
Comment From: Lee Roger Deaver .....	29
Comment From: France O'Reilly .....	29
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>30</b>

## **List of Tables**

Page

### **Tables**

Table 1: List of commenters during 30-day comment period .....5

## Public Outreach

From April 9 – May 23, 2019, the Department of Ecology (Ecology) invited public review and comments on a draft cleanup action plan and associated documents for the Maury Island Open Space Cleanup Site on Vashon Island. The plan specifies environmental standards, cleanup methods, and scheduling as part of an existing agreement between Ecology and King County. A future legal agreement will implement the cleanup work described in the plan.

Our public involvement activities related to this 45-day comment period included:

- **Fact Sheet:**
  - US mail distribution of a fact sheet providing information about the cleanup documents and the public comment period to approximately 3000 people including neighboring businesses and other interested parties.
  - Email distribution of the fact sheet to approximately 100 people, including interested individuals, local/county/state/federal agencies, and interested community groups.
- **Legal Notices:**
  - Publication of one display ad in *The Seattle Times*, dated Thursday, April 5, 2019.
- **Public Meeting:**
  - Ecology held a public meeting on Wednesday, April 11 2019, from 6 – 8 p.m. at the Vashon High School in Vashon, WA.
  - Ecology along with King County and their engineering consultants presented about the draft Cleanup Action Plan and took questions.
- **Site Register:**
  - Publication of 5 notices in Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Site Register:
    - 45-day Comment Period Notice:
      - April 5, 2018
      - April 19, 2018
      - May 3, 2018
      - May 17, 2018
    - Response Summary Notice:
      - **Month DAY**, 2019
    - Visit [Ecology's Site Register website](#)<sup>1</sup> to download PDFs.
- **Website:**
  - Announcement of the public comment period and posting of the fact sheet, postcard, and associated documents for review on Ecology's [Maury Island Website](#)<sup>2</sup>
- **Document Repositories:**
  - Provided copies of the documents for public review through three information repositories:
    - Vashon Public Library, Vashon WA
    - Ecology's Northwest Regional Office in Bellevue

---

<sup>1</sup><https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/UIPages/PublicationList.aspx?IndexTypeName=Program&NameValue=Toxics+Cleanup&DocumentTypeName=Newsletter>

<sup>2</sup> <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=1532>



## Comment Summary

Ecology received 34 comments during the 45-day comment period (April 9 – May 23, 2018).

**Table 1: List of commenters during 30-day comment period**

	First Name	Last Name	Agency/Organization/Business	Submitted By
1	Eric	Pryne		Individual
2	Cheryl	Weise		Individual
3	Todd	Pearson		Individual
4	Robert	Thomas		Individual
5	Diane	Emerson		Individual
6	Michael	Meyer		Individual
7	Bruce	Morser		Individual
8	Jar	Lyons		Individual
9	Cosmo	Diskan		Individual
10	Mairead	Geraghty		Individual
11	Lynn	St. Martin		Individual
12	Rhonda	Hobgood		Individual
13	Pamela	Courtney		Individual
14	Roxanne	Lyons		Individual
15	Cosmo	Diskan		Individual
16	Allison	Trundle		Individual
17	Ann	Gordon		Individual
18	Mary	Walker		Individual
19	Diane	Leigh		Individual
20	Bruce	Frey		Individual
21	Ursula	Dashiell		Individual
22	Devin	Branson		Individual
23	Mary	O'Brien		Individual
24	Mark	VanDevanter		Individual
25	Stephanie	VanDevanter		Individual
26	Megan	Minier		Individual
27	Matthew	Bradrick		Individual
28	Bri	Bradrick		Individual

	First Name	Last Name	Agency/Organization/Business	Submitted By
29	Saphire	Blue		Individual
30	Blythe	Bartlett		Individual
31	Lise	Ellner		Individual
32	Craig	Harmeling		Individual
33	Lee Roger	Deaver		Individual
34	France	O'Reilly		Individual

## Next Steps

Design and permitting for the cleanup action is expected to take about two years. Implementation of the cleanup action plan will occur in the future under a separate legal agreement, which will be issued for public review and comment.

## Comments and Responses

Ecology has reviewed and considered all comments received on the draft Cleanup Action Plan and associated documents. Based on Ecology's evaluation of the comments, no changes were made to the documents, and they are considered final.

The comments are presented below, along with Ecology's responses.

### Comment From: Eric Pryne

My wife and I walk in the Dockton Forest/Dockton Natural Area/Maury Island Open Space complex regularly. Some of the trails that would be decommissioned under the preferred alternative are among our favorites, particularly the loop just north of the indentation near the site's southwest corner. Decommissioning these trails would close off a number of shorter loops and make the site less accessible to walkers. Retaining shorter hiking options is particularly important on Vashon, where the median age is over 50 (oldest community in King County) and likely to continue increasing. We were told at the public meeting that capping the trails proposed for decommissioning would cost only another \$100,000. This seems like a modest expenditure to keep these trails open and maintain public access to the site. Also -- in the future, please extend the maps in your materials to show the trails and trailheads in the adjacent Dockton Forest complex, especially to the west. This would have made the map on Page 5 of your mailer easier to understand. Thank you.

## **Response:**

The original plan has changed and currently no trails are proposed for closure. King County was considering closure of some minor trails as maintenance and cost-saving measures. However, as a result of public comment and concern, King County has decided not to close/decommission these trails.

## **Comment From: Cheryl Weise**

After informing myself at the public meeting on April 11, 2018 at Vashon High School, I would like to voice my opinion that as little as possible should be done to clean-up this public area. I am also not convinced that a new parking area is necessary. Rather than repeat his remarks, I would like to simply underline my agreement with Mr. Pryne's comments about not closing trails. A major personal reason for purchasing property in the upper area of Sandy Shores was the close proximity to the system of wonderful trails in the southern portion of the Maury Island Natural area. Another concern was the indefinite period for clean-up measures which mean trails and areas may be fenced off and closed to the public for perhaps months or years. Thank you for this opportunity to submit an opinion.

## **Response:**

The planned parking area has been the subject of much comment and/or concern. As long as the project's cleanup objectives are met, development plans for the Maury Island Natural Area (MINA) as a public space are at the discretion of King County. However, as a result of the special interest in the parking area, King County responds to this and other issues in a MINA Cleanup Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) found [here](#).

## **Comment From: Todd Pearson**

I attended the Maury Island Open Space meeting at Vashon Island High School last week. A lot of gray-headed Islanders attended, most of them fervently advocating for as little change to the site as possible. Those people showed up, and spoke up, because they love the park just as it is. Most of their objections seemed to be over proposed changes to the existing trails. Though my concerns about changes to the park have little to do with the trail system, I support the general tone of those who commented. We understand the Department of Ecology is charged with reducing toxic levels of arsenic in the park. We just ask that, to the extent it's possible, leave this beautiful place alone. My concern is not about what might be taken away from park users, it is about what might be added. There are trails all over Vashon, but few that are used as much as those in the Maury Island Natural Area. The reason seems clear to me. There simply aren't any comparable properties on Vashon/Maury Island that offer the openness of country and views available there. Many years ago, it was possible to look out, all over Maury and Vashon Islands, to see the local terrain, Puget Sound and the

mountains on all sides. Those views are now largely gone, as trees, especially fir trees, have grown up and blocked those views. People instinctively are drawn to the places where views are open, where they can see into the distance. The Maury Island Natural Area delivers this ability like no other place on Vashon. Yet there are plans to install plants that will, in the near future, but more worryingly, in the long term, seriously erode those views. Please, please reconsider plans that will harm these views in any way. Specifically, don't plant any fir, or large coniferous tree. Don't impede the magical views that are pretty close to perfect right now.

### **Response:**

Comments noted. In addition to the elimination of hazardous material, a principal goal of the cleanup is to preserve and enhance the quality and state of the Natural Area.

### **Comment From: Robert Thomas**

I attended the public meeting on April 11, 2018, and I wish to elaborate on some of the comments I made then. Of particular concern to me is the inclusion in the plan of possibly decommissioning some trails, as well as what are referred to as redundant trail spurs. Looking at the color-coded map provided on page 5 of Ecology's handout at the meeting, none of the trails identified are redundant; nor do any of the trails that are marked meet any of the usual definitions of a trail spur (e.g., leads to a dead end, does not loop or connect to another trail, leads one way to an overlook, etc.). Please keep in mind that all of the existing trails have a purpose and are not redundant in the sense of being unnecessary, superfluous or duplicative. They could only be redundant if the sole purpose of the trails were to get as directly and quickly from one point to another. But that is not their current purpose for many users. By having the warren of existing trails, the users (hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, strollers) can take what otherwise might be a 10 minute walk, and extend it to an hour walk by meandering along the many trails, never backtracking, and even rarely crossing a path previously taken. This is a remarkable feature and benefit of the current trail system. Decommissioning trails, especially some of the ones currently identified for possible closure, would significantly diminish the enjoyment of the forest for many current users. Some of the trail segments identified on page 5 of Ecology's handout do not appear to have taken into account the aesthetics of the various parts of the trail system. In particular, the most westerly segment identified happens to be one of the most picturesque parts of the entire forest, passing by some pastures with horses and deer, and some amazing ant mounds. This trail segment should be highest on any list for trail preservation. In addition to the point above that the trails currently identified are not redundant, please consider that any reduction of trails through some kind of closure would mean that the current traffic of trail users, plus new users, would be restricted to fewer trail options. This certainly would increase congestion. Already, bikes, horses and dogs are sometimes not a good combination. Forcing congestion is not a good idea. One other thing I ask to be considered is the notion that closing trails would even work. The experience with the recently built mountain bike terrain trails in Dockton Forest shows that people will cut new trails when they find it convenient – in spite of prohibitions against doing so, and in spite of efforts to close off the shortcuts. Part of the

problem in that particular case is that the new terrain trails were built too close to existing trails, pretty much inviting people to make shortcuts. My point here is that closing trails that have a present, definite purpose probably will not work in the long run, and would likely have the unintended consequence of people creating unsightly detours around barriers, and exposing more of the contaminated soil – just like what is currently happening near the new terrain trails. Thank you for your attention to these comments. If it were an either/or situation, I would prefer leaving the existing trails intact, as is, with some warning/informational signs, rather than decommissioning any of the existing trails. One reasonable alternative would be to provide the mitigation on only a few of the most widely used, direct route trails, but leaving the others as is, except for the notice signs about precautions to take to avoid contamination (cleaning off boots, rinsing pets' feet, etc.).

**Response:**

Proposed trail closures were a common topic of interest/concern. As a result of those public concerns and input from the public, King County has chosen not close/decommission existing trails.

**Comment From: Diane Emerson**

My comment concerns this statement: "The proposed cleanup action (Alternative 5) involves limited soil and vegetation removal" It is not perfectly clear how the vegetation is to be removed. If the removal includes herbicides, I strongly oppose that method. There are already enough toxics in the soil here, without adding more. The vegetation removal method should be physical removal only.

**Response:**

The elimination of vegetation where necessary to achieve cleanup objectives will consist of simple removal and the use of physical weed barriers for control. No herbicides will be used.

**Comment From: Michael Meyer**

1. Requiring cleanup to the MTCA Method A standard on this property is not consistent with the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) requirements for cleanup on immediately adjacent residential properties exhibiting the same COCs from the same source. No action is being required for residential properties exhibiting arsenic below 100 mg/kg, however action is being taken on this recreational property where concentrations exceed 20 mg/kg. Either the cleanup standard being applied to residential properties is insufficiently protective, or the cleanup standard being applied to this recreational property is overly protective. The consequence of adopting a table value (MTCA Method A) that is overly protective is additional expenditure of County (i.e., taxpayer) dollars on unnecessary cleanup. For instance, if the cleanup standard of 100

mg/kg arsenic was applied to this property, capping would not be required anywhere along the access road.

Rather than apply a potentially overconservative table value as the cleanup standard, Ecology should utilize a more rigorous sampling methodology and conduct a human health risk assessment that incorporates the true reasonable maximum exposure (RME) parameters representative of the recreational exposures. Such a risk assessment would account for the typical behavior on trails (hiking, biking, riding), as well as the behavior of children. Children in this area often play off trail, where contamination is higher.

However, they only play this way for a few years of their lives.

More rigorous sampling could provide more representative sample results that are applicable to specific exposures. For instance, trail segments could be designated as DUs under a multi-incremental sampling (MIS) methodology. A single MIS sample could then be used to estimate the mean exposure concentration for each trail segment DU. MIS sampling is commonly applied to sites like this where metals concentrations in soil are shown to vary substantially over very short distances

(<https://www.itrcweb.org/Team/Public?teamID=11>).

Note that Section 9.1.1 of the RI states, “For the Cleanup Unit, logic would dictate that remediation levels would be developed from a human-health risk assessment based on the current and future site use as an open space property.” Understanding that under MTCA remediation levels are not the same as cleanup levels, still, the logic of a human health risk assessment is applicable. Ecology appears to have used a similar approach to allow a cleanup level of 100 ppm on adjacent residential properties.

2. The institutional controls (ICs) component of the proposed remedy should include prevention of the creation of new ad hoc social trails by users (this will require on-going observation and maintenance by the County). The remedy is only being applied to the existing trail system, and higher COC concentrations are present off trail. The ICs should be specific to DU (some ICs need not apply to the working face area of the gravel mine – DU 2a).
3. O&M costs are not accounted for in the cost estimates. The costs of O&M on a cap that must support active foot traffic, horse traffic, and bike traffic will be borne by the County (taxpayers). How will the five-year review document that the cap remains in place and continues to be protective? Will the County be required to perform periodic sampling? Annual inspections of the cap? Inspections that document no new trail creation? Capping as a remedy is not a once-and-done remedy, and this fact does not seem to be fully addressed in the dCAP, although cap maintenance is mentioned in the IC component of the remedy.
4. It would be helpful to show an estimated firing fan on the figures for DU 5, with estimates of the range of lead shot from “misses” and the expected primary fall arc of “hit” targets. This would provide assurance that the sampling pattern covered the likely firing fan where COCs would be expected.
5. The description of several samples within the former shooting range includes “abundant shot” (RI Table 7-1). However, the maximum lead concentration is 3,200 mg/kg. With “abundant shot” present, I would expect at least some samples to exhibit percent-level

lead, even given the high variability in metals concentrations over short distances. Is Ecology confident that the highest lead concentrations in this area have been identified and delimited?

6. The RI does not mention the presence of two pole-mounted transformers on an abandoned power pole. The transformers could be a source of PCBs in soil at the base of the pole. The cleanup action should include removal of these transformers and testing of the soil at the base of the pole for PCBs. The location of the power pole is shown on Figure 1.
7. The proposed trail closures are unclear. There are symbols for “trail closed” signs on Figure 10 of the dCAP shown on trails that do not have the “Existing Footpath to be Decommissioned” color code. Some of the trail closures are unlikely to be effective since they close short trail sections that connect between groups of longer trails, eliminate trails that have a long history of use, or would incentivize equestrians to ride on the bike-only trail system. Given the low concentrations, what is the purpose of closing the trail section represented by sample #144?
8. The location of the parking lot, although convenient for use as a cap, is a poor choice for traffic patterns in the Gold Beach neighborhood. The SEPA checklist included a presumption that traffic would not be noticeably changed by the presence of the parking lot. I believe that this presumption is incorrect and did not consider the increased traffic that has already occurred in the neighborhood, and the often dangerous speeds of park visitors as they travel the relatively straight roads to the entrance at 79<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW and SW 260<sup>th</sup> St. This situation will only worsen with a parking lot in the area. The parking area should be relocated, and the remedy adjusted as necessary. I recommend that the lot be relocated to the main entrance on 260<sup>th</sup> St. (near the Mountain Bike Trailhead). There is already an existing paved area there and easier ADA access to trails.

## **Response:**

Thank you for your comments.

- 1) The soil cleanup level used for this site is 20 mg/kg (ppm) arsenic. This is a tabular Method A value from the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). Method A cleanup levels are established for approximately 30 of the most common hazardous substances found in soil and groundwater. These cleanup levels are protective of human health and often applied to sites undergoing routine cleanup actions where there are few hazardous substances. While MTCA allows other methods to set cleanup levels that use site or chemical-specific information, Method A values, where appropriate, are conservative, protective and straightforward. King County chose to apply Method A cleanup levels for purposes of this project and the Department of Ecology (Ecology) has agreed.

By comparison, the Tacoma Smelter Plume (TSP) yard cleanup program uses a “residential action level” of 100 ppm arsenic. This is not a cleanup level. Due to the very large, area-wide nature of TSP contamination, Ecology determined that meeting a 20 ppm cleanup level throughout the impacted area was not possible. Instead, to manage

risk and make widest use of available funding, Ecology established a 100 ppm action level for private residential properties. The action level is voluntary to property owners who choose to participate in the TSP residential cleanup program.

- 2) Comment noted. Specific institutional control measures to address the prevention of ad hoc trails will be added to King County's implementation of the remedy.
- 3) King County estimates trail and parking lot maintenance costs will be approximately \$10,000 per year. The five year review process will require King County to document trail cap competence and efficacy over time.
- 4) & 5) Sampling density in terms of numbers and area coverage is considered adequate to characterize contaminants of concern in Unit 5 that includes the historic shooting range.
- 6) King County Parks is aware of the transformers and will follow all regulatory requirements related to either future use and/or eventual decommissioning.
- 7) Based on public comment, as noted elsewhere, King County does not now intend to decommission/close trails.
- 8) The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to MINA. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's explanation and discussion of this issue is found in the MINA FAQs page here.

## **Comment From: Bruce Morser**

Thank you for the chance to comment. I live a mile from the proposed "Maury Island Open Space Cleanup Site", and I visit as a walker at least once or twice per week, every week of the year (for the last 18 years). While I appreciate your desire to "clean up" the site, I think you should leave it alone - no changes except to post signs describing the dangers of contamination at trail access points. Here's why: - Most of the users are local to Vashon/Maury and know about the contamination and risks. We take our own precautions as you would with any dangers at any site. - Most of our own yards have the very same contamination, and making changes to the Park helps our health little. - The beauty of this incredible park is it's unimproved nature. I was very disappointed with the fence and bench at the bluff. I was especially disappointed in the reforestation effort. Vashon has so few public open view park lands. This is a great chance to save \$ and leave a naturally re-balancing site alone. - Efforts to enlarge a few trails while eliminating many small ones will increase the traffic and narrow the traffic into a smaller area, reducing the experience. Some people will



assuredly keep using the old trails - probably me. - Attracting more folks with improved trails and a large parking lot will actually expose more people to the contamination. - People will assume there is no longer a health hazard there - but there will be for all that venture off the groomed trail - this seems irresponsible to me. - Leaving the trails as is (no new parking lot) and posting health hazard signs will decrease the pedestrian traffic there and lower the human exposure. Thanks for the chance to comment.

## **Response:**

Thank you for your comments.

The general reason to engage in cleanup is to prevent or minimize public exposure to arsenic and lead in soil at hazardous levels in a property under development as a public park. General accessibility requires consideration of exposure risk to the public using the park, and that risk is required to be minimized or eliminated.

King County is reconsidering site restoration plans in order to accommodate public interest in preserving view corridors.

Based on expressed public concern, King County has decided that no trails will be closed/decommissioned for now.

## **Comment From: Jar Lyons**

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 2. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location. I just walked the adjacent trail today and could not even find a suggestion of it's location. I've never seen anyone off the trail in this area, which is largely a wetland (as you know!) 3. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved here to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW would be critical. 4. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. If I had to guess, I would say it was graded for this purpose in the past for heavy equipment. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. -- Jar Lyons (Gold Beach Resident)

**Response:**

Thank you for your comment. Concerns for parking were shared by many. However, as long as overall cleanup objectives are met, Ecology's project role does not include aspects of future site development like parking or management of traffic. King County's response to these issues may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQ [here](#).

**Comment From: Cosmo Diskan**

Please make the location of parking lots and "primary" access to the park WEST of the existing gated service road in the middle of SW 260th st. Please also ensure that all signage for accessing the park indicates that the route to access the park is via Dockton Road to SW 260th street, NOT through the residential neighborhood of Gold Beach. Our neighborhood has experienced an enormous jump in vehicle traffic since the county started to rehab and advertise the park. While we are happy that the public is using the space (The biggest reason we moved to the neighborhood is for access to the green space around it) please help us ensure that the primary route for access is through the highway and (non-residential) SW 260th street instead of directly past 30 houses along SW 256th St. and 79th Ave SW. This minor adjustment of parking lots and "Official Location" as listed in Google Maps will automatically ensure that anyone using Google/Apple/Bing maps will be routed along Dockton Road SW instead of through the neighborhood. Thanks for all the work on the park!

**Response:**

Thank you for your comment. Parking concerns have been a common question. However, as long as overall cleanup objectives are met, Ecology's project role does not include aspects of future site development like parking or management of traffic. King County's response to these issues may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQ [here](#).

**Comment From: Mairead Geraghty**

I would like to suggest that the parking lot that is being proposed at the corner of 79th Ave SW and 260th be moved further down 260th to the main entrance to the park (near Dockton Forest bike trails). There is already an access road there and PLENTY of room to clear out trees etc. to put in a parking lot. It would make a lot more sense to put the parking lot further down 260th for the following reasons: 1. You're not upsetting the aesthetics, or quiet & serenity of a neighborhood by putting a parking lot across the street, not to mention ruining the natural view. No one in the neighborhood wants to live across from a parking lot, when it's not essential that the parking lot be located there, especially when it's not like there is a lack of land to put it on. 2. There are no residences anywhere near the main entrance so no one is going to be disturbed by having traffic coming and going all day, especially in peak usage time (summer/weekends). 3. If the parking lot were to be put at the main entrance perhaps people using the park would be more encouraged to stay on Dockton Road and access the park that way rather than using 79th ave SW as a speedway as is happening on a regular basis and particularly on weekends. More signage on Dockton Road encouraging

drivers to get to the trail head via Dockton as opposed to Upper Gold Beach would be a great idea. 4. The volume of parking on the corner of 79th ave SW & 260th has increased considerably in the past 18 months to the point that traffic can sometimes barely make it around that corner due to people parking on both sides of the street. This is a metro route and a school bus route and it makes it almost impossible to pass at times. 5. Weekends are a nightmare in fine weather for residents of 79th ave SW due to people using their drives as turnarounds due to the volume of vehicles using this entrance and turning around to try and find parking. From a practical stand point I would encourage those in charge to REALLY take this into consideration and think about moving the parking lot. I attended the meeting and I know about the capping of the old firing range and that a parking lot would be a convenient way to do this. It's been uncapped for years and not bothered anyone. Why not clear and cap an area that's nowhere near any homes instead? The old firing range gets hardly any foot/horse or bike traffic compared to the park across the street and thus it's not stirring up any major quantities of arsenic or chemicals to a level that's dangerous. I urge you to take my comments and concerns into consideration and I would appreciate if you would reach out to me via the email or mailing address provided if you have any counter to said concerns. Thank you.

### **Response:**

Thank you for your comments. Traffic and parking area concerns are shared by others. However, as long as overall cleanup objectives are met, Ecology's project role does not include development of site features (like parking) or management of traffic. King County's response to these issues may be found in the MINA Cleanup FAQ [here](#).

### **Comment From: Lynn St. Martin**

I also sent an email, but please change the parking spaces to start no closer to the Gold Beach neighborhood (at the Eastern end of 260th) than the existing access road midway down 260th. This will prevent people from driving through our neighborhood, where a great number of children play on the streets that would be and are used to access the park. Changing the official location of the park on Google Maps and elsewhere to reflect this will route people down Dockton Road, which is meant for higher traffic volumes. Signage that reflects this will also avoid what we in this neighborhood wish to avoid.

### **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to MINA. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Rhonda Hobgood**

To Whom It May Concern - I applaud the efforts being made to clean up the Maury Island Natural Area. As a resident within walking distance of both Dockton Forest and the old gravel mine, I do not believe a 25 car parking lot to be necessary as I never see useage high enough to necessitate such a large sized parking area and oppose the parking lot. There is already sufficient parking to access all points of the parks. If the sole purpose of the parking lot is to close the skeet range, what about fencing it off and re-vegetating it, in the same manner that has been done at the corner of Dockton forest and upper Gold Beach? Kind regards Rhonda

### **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to MINA. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Pamela Courtney**

I live in Lower Gold Beach. We utilize the walking trails as well as the mountain biking area. We love our walks through the woods. We love our trails. We all agree that something needs to be done about parking as this area becomes more well known and congested. My opinion would be to keep an official parking area AWAY from the homes of Upper Gold Beach and the back access of the recreation area. I think it would be beneficial for park users AND homeowners if the proposed parking area was down 260th closer to Dockton Park/Dockton Rd instead of so close to the homes. Many children and pets live here, and traffic is getting to be a problem entering/leaving driveways ~ site is hindered for children playing or on their bikes. Sometimes property owners don't have room in front of their homes for visitors to park. If you put the parking lot on the midway point of 260th, it would be easy access to Dockton Park, Dockton Trails(biking) as well as the Maury Marine Preserve area. Let's try to keep the residential area just that - residential.....or possibly overflow. But not a parking lot on the corner of 79th and 260th, please. Thank you for your consideration, Pamela Courtney

### **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to MINA. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## Comment From: Roxanne Lyons

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice! Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a quiet, residential neighborhood with many small children. Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. Leave it this way! 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach with small children who enjoy walking and riding bikes in the neighborhood. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space on gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Too, it lead directly to the main, large open trail. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. Roxanne Lyons (Gold Beach resident)

## Response:

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to MINA. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. You can find explanation and discussion of this issue in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## Comment From: Cosmo Diskan

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgJNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. The neighborhood does not have sidewalks, nor does it have enough space in many locations to facilitate walking anywhere other than in the roadway. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

## **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Allison Trundle**

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is not a good choice at all. It will greatly affect my life and my children's and my neighbors. Years ago we had traffic from the mine (the land before it was bought by King County) and the workers and other traffic came down the road incredibly fast and around the blind corner- it's that same road that visitors will use if this parking lot plan is used- and it's dangerous. We have lots of kids on bikes and scooters on our road and many elderly use the road for walks. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

## **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: anne gordon gordon**

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAlNc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving

the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

### **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

### **Comment From: Mary Walker**

Dear Planners: I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Please consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:  
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>  
Bing directions for proposed location:  
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtydBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>  
Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:  
[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A2](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A2)

2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep



it that way. 5. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 6. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. Thank you!

## **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Diane Leigh**

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfT\\_nvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfT_nvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o) Bing directions for proposed location: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ> Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb\\_3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb_3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A) 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

**Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

**Comment From: bruce frey**

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAlNc2fxQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260<sup>th</sup> will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75<sup>th</sup> Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260<sup>th</sup> would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

**Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Ursula Dashiell**

This concerns the proposed parking lot at the old skeet range. If it is necessary to put a parking lot there, please consider the traffic flow and direct it via Dockton Rd and NOT through the neighborhood of Upper Gold Beach!!! Also have in mind to design the lot in such a manner that it doesn't stick out like a sore thumb but blend in with nature! Thank you, Ursula Dashiell, Resident Upper Gold Beach, Vashon

### **Response:**

The decision to position and place a parking area along SW 260<sup>th</sup> Street is part of King County's plan to provide public access to the Maury Island Natural Area. The Department of Ecology's project role does not include future site development so long as cleanup objectives have been met and maintained. King County's discussion of this issue may be found in a MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Devin Branson 2066502940**

This plan must be implemented quickly, and I fully support almost every aspect of the plan. I am a resident of Gold Beach, adjacent to the park, and have 2 small children. Though we are careful after we hike in the park, I was not aware of contamination concerns via inhaled dust, and this new revelation is quite frightening to me. The trails must be capped, as soon as possible. Any naysayers to this idea must be written off as those who do not fully understand the human health risks associated with this contamination, and their aesthetic desires must be outweighed by the need to keep vulnerable populations safe while preserving a natural area for generations to come. The only changes I would like to see in this plan is trying to close fewer trails. Though I understand some redundant trails must be closed for cost reasons, some trails being cut would result in dead-end trails that end on property lines. For the sake of the park's usefulness, a few of the trails slated to be closed should be re-examined. Additionally, as a consolation to losing trails, the Northeast beach trail (former road that dead-ends with a fork at the beach and a spur to a eroded cliff that used to connect to the old dock and the service road) should be fixed and re-connected. This repair could go along way in appeasing those who may be upset and losing some upland trails, and most of the trail infrastructure is already existing along this path. Finally, the parking lot at the skeet range. This is actually a good idea, and it was nice to see a connecting trail to this spot. However, another trail needs to be constructed from the parking lot heading first west and then northwest to connect to the trail system on the north side of the park complex that includes Dockton forest. Since some of this trail would be on non-contaminated land, the land trust and local volunteers (and I would happily include myself as a potential volunteer) could be utilized to complete this section of the project. Thank you very much for your time.

### **Response:**

Comments noted. Based on public concern and comment, King County has decided not to close/decommission any trails for now.

## **Comment From: Mary O'Brien**

I am very concerned about adding overlay to the trails in the Natural Area. I strongly support the option of NO ACTION NECESSARY Please consider this to avoid further damage to the area from trucks hauling material and equipment spreading it. Please do not eliminate side Trail's as "redundant" as they give us more overall distance to roam, which is after all what we are doing there. Island residents are aware that we all live with the smelter residue, so if you need signage to indicate Trail's may have increased contamination, that would be preferable to hauling in material and continuously retesting it. I do support additional parking areas at the edges of the park. The two small parking areas that exist can easily be filled with cars and not leave enough space for horse trailer turnaround. The island has a large contingent of riders who trail ride regularly. There are no safe approaches to the park without trailers. I also wish that State or King County reinstitute the original community advisory committee. Members of the community have been walking, jogging, biking and horseback riding in these areas for decades and have useful knowledge of the area and its visitors.

### **Response:**

Based on public concern and comment, King County has decided not to close/decommission any trails for now. Development plans are intended to try and accommodate traditional equestrian use of the area.

## **Comment From: Mark VanDevanter**

I am concerned about the language in your posting that included planting dense vegetation to restrict access in the Glacier Park. I consider much of what you did at the Maury Marine Park a costly mistake that threatens established view corridors and the diversity of the ecosystems that include established South Sound Prairie and Madrona forests. The random planting of Doug Fir in these areas is a serious threat to the broader vistas that attract users to these rare "open spaces" with breathtaking views of both the Olympics and Mt. Rainier. They are also not required for remediation in these areas and present a maintenance issue where there was little to none before. You have repeated this approach on the Glacier property with expensive fencing, plastic fabric, plastic water tanks and irrigation lines. The Evergreens in this area threaten to choke the expansive view of the Olympic Range at the entrance to the "open space" down to a narrow corridor and totally change the character of the walk to the main overlook. Attached are 2 shots that I took today of vanishing vistas in the Marine Park. The shot of Mt. Rainier shows evergreen planting in an established, low maintenance Prairie area where there was recent scour activity that would put this as an extremely low risk for contamination.

### **Response:**

King County is reconsidering site restoration plans in order to accommodate expressed public concern and interest in preserving view corridors.

## **Comment From: Stephanie Vandevanter**

As a 25 year resident of Vashon Island I have grown to love and require opportunities to enjoy open, scenic viewpoints whenever possible. There are many forested areas to enjoy on the Island but the real treasures to me are the Madrona forests, scenic vistas of the mountains and water, and the open dry areas of Maury Island. King County planning seems to have a different idea of what is desired and they have planted ( and are perhaps planting more) fast growing, rather oppressive firs that will soon change the character of our open trails and block the views. Please stop! There are plenty of native plants besides firs that can mitigate the effects of Asarco without darkness, dominance, and closing us in.

### **Response:**

King County is reconsidering site restoration plans in order to accommodate expressed public concern and interest in preserving view corridors.

## **Comment From: Megan Minier**

I have two main concerns about the proposed cleanup plan: 1) The location of the proposed parking lot route visitors through residential neighborhoods rather than around on the more arterial and well-travelled Dockton Road. To reduce traffic and other impacts to the Upper Gold Beach neighborhoods, it would be preferable for the parking lot be located closer to existing Dockton Park parking lots and the trail access points toward that end of the cleanup site. 2) Because of cleanup site interacts and intersects with other trails that are not specifically included in the cleanup site, it is difficult to have a clear image of which trails are being proposed for capping and closure. It would be incredibly helpful to have an on-site walk-through with trail users in order to better understand specifically which trails are under discussion and how that impacts use and access of adjoining trails. I love the trails as is, I wish the connecting trail that runs parallel to the beach just above the high tide line were one that could be re-opened or reinstated. It's a great option for connecting the trail system at high tide and provides some pretty spectacular views.

### **Response:**

Your concern is noted. However, traffic and the placement of proposed parking are the responsibility of King County. A discussion of this issue may be found in their MINA Cleanup FAQs page [here](#). Proposed trail closures were a common topic of interest/concern. Based on public concern and comment, King County has decided not to close/decommission any trails for now.

## **Comment From: Matthew Bradrick**

I live about as close to the park as you can be. I have numerous cars parking in front of my house and leaving their cars there( sometimes for more than a day). Without a proper " parking lot" it is haphazard where cars park. Most of the cars arrive by driving through my neighborhood instead of staying on dockton road and coming up to the park from the main highway . This includes a lot of late night " guests" who are very loud and often leave their beer cans/bottles on the ground that I pick up later. I think a parking lot by the MAIN gate near the mountain bike park would be fair to the residents of Gold Beach as when I bought my house this was not a problem or something we could have prepared for. Visitors being urged to park on the East/West street instead of 79th Ave sw would be a welcome change. Thank you Matt Bradrick ( 14 yr resident with young children)

### **Response:**

Your concern is noted. However, traffic, noise, and nuisance issues in the area are the responsibility of King County. The process to provide parking for the Maury Island Natural Area is part of King County's general plans for public access. A more complete treatment and discussion of this issue can be found in the MINA Cleanup FAQ page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Bri Bradrick**

I live by the corner of 79th Ave SW & 260th. Many people park by the trail head. People are loud, drive fast and dogs are unleashed. Teenagers party here and very late.

### **Response:**

Your concern is noted. However, traffic, noise, and nuisance issues in the area are the responsibility of King County. A more complete treatment and discussion of this issue is found in King County's FAQs page [here](#).

## **Comment From: Sapphire Blue**

I was unable to attend the Vashon meeting recently but a friend who did, informed me that he did not hear phytoremediation discussed. I believe that sword ferns as well as other plants are capable of removing contamination from soil. Are you considering the role that plants could play in the cleanup? Thank you, Sapphire Blue. Vashon Island

## **Response:**

Thank you for your comment and suggestion. Phytoremediation of soil metal contamination is an interesting and developing treatment method for some sites but was not considered for this cleanup. However, this could be useful in future action, if necessary, at MINA.

## **Comment From: Blythe Bartlett**

Don't do anything!

No parking lot.

Don't bring anything onto the property.

Don't take anything away from the property.

Keep all the trails!

Thanks for letting me voice my opinion.

Blythe Bartlett

## **Response:**

Thank you taking time to comment. In the overall scope of the 266 acre site, planned cleanup activity is extremely minimal consisting primarily of spot soil removal/replacement where appropriate. King County is not now considering trail closures. Parking for future park use is not part of Ecology's role in this cleanup. Many have commented on this feature, however, and King County addresses these questions on a MINA Cleanup FAQ [here](#).

## **Comment From: Lise Ellner**

I have lived in Dockton for 27 years. I am dismayed by the proposed cleanup plan for the Dockton trains area. The plan to cap trails and discontinue others falls far from the mark. First there are no redundant trails call are used by runners bicyclists horses and walkers. Second capping will turn the trails into the eroded mud pits examples at the top of 260th. How about planting in areas where there is loose dirt? Almost all of the existing trails are well packed and the only time dangerous material will be released into the atmosphere is if you dig up these trails. Lise

**Response:**

There is considerable public interest in maintaining the existing trail system. As a result, King County is not now planning trail closures. Soil contamination will be removed in some areas and replaced with clean material.

**Comment From: Craig Harmeling**

If nobody is going to use an area does it have to be rehabilitated to meet Dept of Ecology rules or is this something that KC wants to remove blackberries, scotch broom, etc., like the proposed parking lot.

If the trails do not have enough arsenic on them to cause health problems, do they have to be covered? Which ones do not have to be covered? How are the trails that are covered going to be monitored?

I would like to make a recommendation that KC activate the Planning Advisory Group per the 2013 document:

page #8 paragraph 5

page #10 paragraph 1 item 3

page #10 objection #7

page #11 restore scenic values page #12 maintain the existing soft surface trail system and all items under this page #13 last item

page #14 first item create a Friends of Maury Island Natural Area Advisory Group

A lot of the ill feelings toward the work that was done at the site could have been taken care of if KC had worked with a group and got feedback. There are a lot of things that could have been done better. This should be done before the planning for the site, there may be some major changes. With the growing sites on Vashon Maury Island, it would make sense that one person be in charge of all of them to work better in coordinating them and work to be done.

**Response:**

Most areas away from trails and other forms public access where exposure to contamination might be encountered will be left alone. A primary feature in the development of the cleanup alternative was consideration of “net environmental benefit”. That is, over much of the site where there will be no developed access, removing soil to eliminate contamination would do more harm than good to the existing environmental status.

Based on public concern and comment, King County has decided not to close/decommission any trails for now.

King County has discussed interests with the Friends of Maury Island Marine Park to help facilitate the Public Advisory Group’s efforts to work on the Site.



## **Comment From: Lee Roger Deaver**

- 1) As taxpayers we encourage you to spend out money wisely and only the minimum to achieve the objective.
- 2) Based on information offered, you only need to "cap" selected roads & trails with 3" of gravel - no mineral soil.\*
- 3) Use minimum invasive/impact gravel trucks like those used by Forest Service & Park Service trail builders.
- 4) Do not construct "hygiene stations." Use signage to instruct trail users to their own hygiene.
- 5) Do not construct the 20 to 25 stall parking stalls. Widen and gravel existing parking area.

\* I am an experience road & trail builder & maintainer.

\*\* Adding soil surfacing to a rock base is to "spoil" the load bearing properties of a rock sub-surface. Consult your engineer or road maintenance people on this matter. To achieve your objective to significantly reduce human (&pets) exposure to the existing toxic soil, capping the selected road and trails will be the best method. Adding a "topping" layer of soil will only diminish the load bearing properties of the rock, add risk of invasive species, and increase the complexity and cost of road and trail maintenance. Eliminate the topping of soil.

## **Response To: Lee Roger Deaver**

Comments noted and appreciated. The engineering, construction, and services specifications for capped trails will be determined by King County to best serve project needs and future use, as well as ensuring that cleanup objectives for public protection are met and maintained.

## **Comment From: France O'Reilly**

I really think that the "redundant trails" are very useful and needed and should not be closed. I do like the parking lot (with a few double stalls for horse trailers) so we can park off the traveled road. I am dubious about the trail capping - it may require a lot of maintenance.

## **Response:**

Due to public interest and concern, King County has decided that no trails will be decommissioned/closed. Trail capping is necessary in some areas in order to eliminate public exposure to arsenic and lead in shallow soil and the basis for the cleanup project. The final design of the capped areas is intended to minimize maintenance as well as provide protection.

## Appendices

### Appendix A. Public Comments in Original Format

#### Comment From: Eric Pryne

I--1-1

My wife and I walk in the Dockton Forest/Dockton Natural Area/Maury Island Open Space complex regularly. Some of the trails that would be decommissioned under the preferred alternative are among our favorites, particularly the loop just north of the indentation near the site's southwest corner. Decommissioning these trails would close off a number of shorter loops and make the site less accessible to walkers. Retaining shorter hiking options is particularly important on Vashon, where the median age is over 50 (oldest community in King County) and likely to continue increasing. We were told at the public meeting that capping the trails proposed for decommissioning would cost only another \$100,000. This seems like a modest expenditure to keep these trails open and maintain public access to the site. Also -- in the future, please extend the maps in your materials to show the trails and trailheads in the adjacent Dockton Forest complex, especially to the west. This would have made the map on Page 5 of your mailer easier to understand. Thank you.

#### Comment From: Cheryl Weise

I-0-1

After informing myself at the public meeting on April 11, 2018 at Vashon High School, I would like to voice my opinion that as little as possible should be done to clean-up this public area. I am also not convinced that a new parking area is necessary. Rather than repeat his remarks, I would like to simply underline my agreement with Mr. Pryne's comments about not closing trails. A major personal reason for purchasing property in the upper area of Sandy Shores was the close proximity to the system of wonderful trails in the southern portion of the Maury Island Natural area. Another concern was the indefinite period for clean-up measures which mean trails and areas may be fenced off and closed to the public for perhaps months or years. Thank you for this opportunity to submit an opinion.

#### Comment From: Todd Pearson

I-1-1

I attended the Maury Island Open Space meeting at Vashon Island High School last week. A lot of gray-headed Islanders attended, most of them fervently advocating for as little change to the site as possible. Those people showed up, and spoke up, because they love the park just as it is. Most of their objections seemed to be over proposed changes to the existing trails. Though my concerns about changes to the park have little to do with the trail system, I support the general tone of those who commented. We understand the Department of

Ecology is charged with reducing toxic levels of arsenic in the park. We just ask that, to the extent it's possible, leave this beautiful place alone. My concern is not about what might be taken away from park users, it is about what might be added. There are trails all over Vashon, but few that are used as much as those in the Maury Island Natural Area. The reason seems clear to me. There simply aren't any comparable properties on Vashon/Maury Island that offer the openness of country and views available there. Many years ago, it was possible to look out, all over Maury and Vashon Islands, to see the local terrain, Puget Sound and the mountains on all sides. Those views are now largely gone, as trees, especially fir trees, have grown up and blocked those views. People instinctively are drawn to the places where views are open, where they can see into the distance. The Maury Island Natural Area delivers this ability like no other place on Vashon. Yet there are plans to install plants that will, in the near future, but more worryingly, in the long term, seriously erode those views. Please, please reconsider plans that will harm these views in any way. Specifically, don't plant any fir, or large coniferous trees. Don't impede the magical views that are pretty close to perfect right now.

## **Comment From: Robert Thomas**

I-2-1

I attended the public meeting on April 11, 2018, and I wish to elaborate on some of the comments I made then. Of particular concern to me is the inclusion in the plan of possibly decommissioning some trails, as well as what are referred to as redundant trail spurs. Looking at the color-coded map provided on page 5 of Ecology's handout at the meeting, none of the trails identified are redundant; nor do any of the trails that are marked meet any of the usual definitions of a trail spur (e.g., leads to a dead end, does not loop or connect to another trail, leads one way to an overlook, etc.). Please keep in mind that all of the existing trails have a purpose and are not redundant in the sense of being unnecessary, superfluous or duplicative. They could only be redundant if the sole purpose of the trails were to get as directly and quickly from one point to another. But that is not their current purpose for many users. By having the warren of existing trails, the users (hikers, horse riders, mountain bikers, strollers) can take what otherwise might be a 10 minute walk, and extend it to an hour walk by meandering along the many trails, never backtracking, and even rarely crossing a path previously taken. This is a remarkable feature and benefit of the current trail system. Decommissioning trails, especially some of the ones currently identified for possible closure, would significantly diminish the enjoyment of the forest for many current users. Some of the trail segments identified on page 5 of Ecology's handout do not appear to have taken into account the aesthetics of the various parts of the trail system. In particular, the most westerly segment identified happens to be one of the most picturesque parts of the entire forest, passing by some pastures with horses and deer, and some amazing ant mounds. This trail segment should be highest on any list for trail preservation. In addition to the point above that the trails currently identified are not redundant, please consider that any reduction of trails through some kind of closure would mean that the current traffic of trail users, plus new users, would be restricted to fewer trail options. This certainly would increase congestion. Already, bikes, horses and dogs are sometimes not a good combination. Forcing congestion is not a good idea. One other thing I ask to be considered is the notion that closing trails would even work. The experience with the recently built mountain bike terrain trails in

Dockton Forest shows that people will cut new trails when they find it convenient – in spite of prohibitions against doing so, and in spite of efforts to close off the shortcuts. Part of the problem in that particular case is that the new terrain trails were built too close to existing trails, pretty much inviting people to make shortcuts. My point here is that closing trails that have a present, definite purpose probably will not work in the long run, and would likely have the unintended consequence of people creating unsightly detours around barriers, and exposing more of the contaminated soil – just like what is currently happening near the new terrain trails. Thank you for your attention to these comments. If it were an either/or situation, I would prefer leaving the existing trails intact, as is, with some warning/informational signs, rather than decommissioning any of the existing trails. One reasonable alternative would be to provide the mitigation on only a few of the most widely used, direct route trails, but leaving the others as is, except for the notice signs about precautions to take to avoid contamination (cleaning off boots, rinsing pets' feet, etc.).

### **Comment From: Diane Emerson**

I-3-1

My comment concerns this statement: "The proposed cleanup action (Alternative 5) involves limited soil and vegetation removal" It is not perfectly clear how the vegetation is to be removed. If the removal includes herbicides, I strongly oppose that method. There are already enough toxics in the soil here, without adding more. The vegetation removal method should be physical removal only.

### **Comment From: Michael Meyer**

I-4-1

#### **Meyer Comments**

#### **Maury Island RI/FS/dCAP**

9. Requiring cleanup to the MTCA Method A standard on this property is not consistent with the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) requirements for cleanup on immediately adjacent residential properties exhibiting the same COCs from the same source. No action is being required for residential properties exhibiting arsenic below 100 mg/kg, however action is being taken on this recreational property where concentrations exceed 20 mg/kg. Either the cleanup standard being applied to residential properties is insufficiently protective, or the cleanup standard being applied to this recreational property is overly protective. The consequence of adopting a table value (MTCA Method A) that is overly protective is additional expenditure of County (i.e., taxpayer) dollars on unnecessary cleanup. For instance, if the cleanup standard of 100 mg/kg arsenic was applied to this property, capping would not be required anywhere along the access road.

Rather than apply a potentially overconservative table value as the cleanup standard, Ecology should utilize a more rigorous sampling methodology and conduct a human health risk assessment that incorporates the true reasonable maximum exposure (RME)

parameters representative of the recreational exposures. Such a risk assessment would account for the typical behavior on trails (hiking, biking, riding), as well as the behavior of children. Children in this area often play off trail, where contamination is higher.

However, they only play this way for a few years of their lives.

More rigorous sampling could provide more representative sample results that are applicable to specific exposures. For instance, trail segments could be designated as DUs under a multi-incremental sampling (MIS) methodology. A single MIS sample could then be used to estimate the mean exposure concentration for each trail segment DU. MIS sampling is commonly applied to sites like this where metals concentrations in soil are shown to vary substantially over very short distances

(<https://www.itrcweb.org/Team/Public?teamID=11>).

Note that Section 9.1.1 of the RI states, “For the Cleanup Unit, logic would dictate that remediation levels would be developed from a human-health risk assessment based on the current and future site use as an open space property.” Understanding that under MTCA remediation levels are not the same as cleanup levels, still, the logic of a human health risk assessment is applicable. Ecology appears to have used a similar approach to allow a cleanup level of 100 ppm on adjacent residential properties.

10. The institutional controls (ICs) component of the proposed remedy should include prevention of the creation of new ad hoc social trails by users (this will require on-going observation and maintenance by the County). The remedy is only being applied to the existing trail system, and higher COC concentrations are present off trail. The ICs should be specific to DU (some ICs need not apply to the working face area of the gravel mine – DU 2a).
11. O&M costs are not accounted for in the cost estimates. The costs of O&M on a cap that must support active foot traffic, horse traffic, and bike traffic will be borne by the County (taxpayers). How will the five-year review document that the cap remains in place and continues to be protective? Will the County be required to perform periodic sampling? Annual inspections of the cap? Inspections that document no new trail creation? Capping as a remedy is not a once-and-done remedy, and this fact does not seem to be fully addressed in the dCAP, although cap maintenance is mentioned in the IC component of the remedy.
12. It would be helpful to show an estimated firing fan on the figures for DU 5, with estimates of the range of lead shot from “misses” and the expected primary fall arc of “hit” targets. This would provide assurance that the sampling pattern covered the likely firing fan where COCs would be expected.
13. The description of several samples within the former shooting range includes “abundant shot” (RI Table 7-1). However, the maximum lead concentration is 3,200 mg/kg. With “abundant shot” present, I would expect at least some samples to exhibit percent-level lead, even given the high variability in metals concentrations over short distances. Is Ecology confident that the highest lead concentrations in this area have been identified and delimited?
14. The RI does not mention the presence of two pole-mounted transformers on an abandoned power pole. The transformers could be a source of PCBs in soil at the base of the pole. The cleanup action should include removal of these transformers and testing of

the soil at the base of the pole for PCBs. The location of the power pole is shown on Figure 1.

15. The proposed trail closures are unclear. There are symbols for "trail closed" signs on Figure 10 of the dCAP shown on trails that do not have the "Existing Footpath to be Decommissioned" color code. Some of the trail closures are unlikely to be effective since they close short trail sections that connect between groups of longer trails, eliminate trails that have a long history of use, or would incentivize equestrians to ride on the bike-only trail system. Given the low concentrations, what is the purpose of closing the trail section represented by sample #144?
16. The location of the parking lot, although convenient for use as a cap, is a poor choice for traffic patterns in the Gold Beach neighborhood. The SEPA checklist included a presumption that traffic would not be noticeably changed by the presence of the parking lot. I believe that this presumption is incorrect and did not consider the increased traffic that has already occurred in the neighborhood, and the often dangerous speeds of park visitors as they travel the relatively straight roads to the entrance at 79<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW and SW 260<sup>th</sup> St. This situation will only worsen with a parking lot in the area. The parking area should be relocated, and the remedy adjusted as necessary. I recommend that the lot be relocated to the main entrance on 260<sup>th</sup> St. (near the Mountain Bike Trailhead). There is already an existing paved area there and easier ADA access to trails.

## Comment From: Bruce Morser

I-6-1

Thank you for the chance to comment. I live a mile from the proposed "Maury Island Open Space Cleanup Site", and I visit as a walker at least once or twice per week, every week of the year (for the last 18 years). While I appreciate your desire to "clean up" the site, I think you should leave it alone - no changes except to post signs describing the dangers of contamination at trail access points. Here's why: - Most of the users are local to Vashon/Maury and know about the contamination and risks. We take our own precautions as you would with any dangers at any site. - Most of our own yards have the very same contamination, and making changes to the Park helps our health little. - The beauty of this incredible park is it's unimproved nature. I was very disappointed with the fence and bench at the bluff. I was especially disappointed in the reforestation effort. Vashon has so few public open view park lands. This is a great chance to save \$ and leave a naturally re-balancing site alone. - Efforts to enlarge a few trails while eliminating many small ones will increase the traffic and narrow the traffic into a smaller area, reducing the experience. Some people will assuredly keep using the old trails - probably me. - Attracting more folks with improved trails and a large parking lot will actually expose more people to the contamination. - People will assume there is no longer a health hazard there - but there will be for all that venture off the groomed trail - this seems irresponsible to me. - Leaving the trails as is (no new parking lot) and posting health hazard signs will decrease the pedestrian traffic there and lower the human exposure. Thanks for the chance to comment.

## **Comment From: Jar Lyons**

I-7-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 2. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location. I just walked the adjacent trail today and could not even find a suggestion of it's location. I've never seen anyone off the trail in this area, which is largely a wetland (as you know!) 3. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved here to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW would be critical. 4. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. If I had to guess, I would say it was graded for this purpose in the past for heavy equipment. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. -- Jar Lyons (Gold Beach Resident)

## **Comment From: Cosmo Diskan**

I-7-1

Please make the location of parking lots and "primary" access to the park WEST of the existing gated service road in the middle of SW 260th st. Please also ensure that all signage for accessing the park indicates that the route to access the park is via Dockton Road to SW 260th street, NOT through the residential neighborhood of Gold Beach. Our neighborhood has experienced an enormous jump in vehicle traffic since the county started to rehab and advertise the park. While we are happy that the public is using the space (The biggest reason we moved to the neighborhood is for access to the green space around it) please help us ensure that the primary route for access is through the highway and (non-residential) SW 260th street instead of directly past 30 houses along SW 256th St. and 79th Ave SW. This minor adjustment of parking lots and "Official Location" as listed in Google Maps will automatically ensure that anyone using Google/Apple/Bing maps will be routed along Dockton Road SW instead of through the neighborhood. Thanks for all the work on the park!

## **Comment From: Mairead Geraghty**

I-8-1

I would like to suggest that the parking lot that is being proposed at the corner of 79th Ave SW and 260th be moved further down 260th to the main entrance to the park (near Dockton Forest bike trails). There is already an access road there and PLENTY of room to clear out trees etc. to put in a parking lot. It would make a lot more sense to put the parking lot further down 260th for the following reasons: 1. You're not upsetting the aesthetics, or quiet & serenity of a neighborhood by putting a parking lot across the street, not to mention ruining the natural view. No one in the neighborhood wants to live across from a parking lot, when it's not essential that the parking lot be located there, especially when it's not like there is a lack of land to put it on. 2. There are no residences anywhere near the main entrance so no one is going to be disturbed by having traffic coming and going all day, especially in peak usage time (summer/weekends). 3. If the parking lot were to be put at the main entrance perhaps people using the park would be more encouraged to stay on Dockton Road and access the park that way rather than using 79th ave SW as a speedway as is happening on a regular basis and particularly on weekends. More signage on Dockton Road encouraging drivers to get to the trail head via Dockton as opposed to Upper Gold Beach would be a great idea. 4. The volume of parking on the corner of 79th ave SW & 260th has increased considerably in the past 18 months to the point that traffic can sometimes barely make it around that corner due to people parking on both sides of the street. This is a metro route and a school bus route and it makes it almost impossible to pass at times. 5. Weekends are a nightmare in fine weather for residents of 79th ave SW due to people using their drives as turnarounds due to the volume of vehicles using this entrance and turning around to try and find parking. From a practical stand point I would encourage those in charge to REALLY take this into consideration and think about moving the parking lot. I attended the meeting and I know about the capping of the old firing range and that a parking lot would be a convenient way to do this. It's been uncapped for years and not bothered anyone. Why not clear and cap an area that's nowhere near any homes instead? The old firing range gets hardly any foot/horse or bike traffic compared to the park across the street and thus it's not stirring up any major quantities of arsenic or chemicals to a level that's dangerous. I urge you to take my comments and concerns into consideration and I would appreciate if you would reach out to me via the email or mailing address provided if you have any counter to said concerns. Thank you.

### **Comment From: Lynn St. Martin**

I-9-1

I also sent an email, but please change the parking spaces to start no closer to the Gold Beach neighborhood (at the Eastern end of 260th) than the existing access road midway down 260th. This will prevent people from driving through our neighborhood, where a great number of children play on the streets that would be and are used to access the park. Changing the official location of the park on Google Maps and elsewhere to reflect this will route people down Dockton Road, which is meant for higher traffic volumes. Signage that reflects this will also avoid what we in this neighborhood wish to avoid.



### **Comment From: Rhonda Hobgood**

I-10-1

To Whom It May Concern - I applaud the efforts being made to clean up the Maury Island Natural Area. As a resident within walking distance of both Dockton Forest and the old gravel mine, I do not believe a 25 car parking lot to be necessary as I never see useage high enough to necessitate such a large sized parking area and oppose the parking lot. There is already sufficient parking to access all points of the parks. If the sole purpose of the parking lot is to close the skeet range, what about fencing it off and re-vegetating it, in the same manner that has been done at the corner of Dockton forest and upper Gold Beach? Kind regards Rhonda

### **Comment From: Pamela Courtney**

I-12-1

I live in Lower Gold Beach. We utilize the walking trails as well as the mountain biking area. We love our walks through the woods. We love our trails. We all agree that something needs to be done about parking as this area becomes more well known and congested. My opinion would be to keep an official parking area AWAY from the homes of Upper Gold Beach and the back access of the recreation area. I think it would be beneficial for park users AND homeowners if the proposed parking area was down 260th closer to Dockton Park/Dockton Rd instead of so close to the homes. Many children and pets live here, and traffic is getting to be a problem entering/leaving driveways ~ site is hindered for children playing or on their bikes. Sometimes property owners don't have room in front of their homes for visitors to park. If you put the parking lot on the midway point of 260th, it would be easy access to Dockton Park, Dockton Trails(biking) as well as the Maury Marine Preserve area. Let's try to keep the residential area just that - residential.....or possibly overflow. But not a parking lot on the corner of 79th and 260th, please. Thank you for your consideration, Pamela Courtney

### **Comment From: Roxanne Lyons**

I-12-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice! Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a quiet, residential neighborhood with many small children. Google directions for proposed location:  
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAlNc2fXQB6o>  
Bing directions for proposed location:  
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>  
Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:  
[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)  
A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location, with the trails purposely placed around it. Leave it this way! 4. Locating a parking

lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach with small children who enjoy walking and riding bikes in the neighborhood. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space on gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Too, it lead directly to the main, large open trail. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. Roxanne Lyons (Gold Beach resident)

### Comment From: Cosmo Diskan

I-13-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAlNc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. The neighborhood does not have sidewalks, nor does it have enough space in many locations to facilitate walking anywhere other than in the roadway. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet

site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

### **Comment From: Allison Trundle**

I-14-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is not a good choice at all. It will greatly affect my life and my children's and my neighbors. Years ago we had traffic from the mine (the land before it was bought by King County) and the workers and other traffic came down the road incredibly fast and around the blind corner- it's that same road that visitors will use if this parking lot plan is used- and it's dangerous. We have lots of kids on bikes and scooters on our road and many elderly use the road for walks. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>  
Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>  
Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

### **Comment From: anne gordon gordon**

I-15-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will

generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

## Comment From: Mary WALKER

I-16-1

Dear Planners: I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Please consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of

residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. 5. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 6. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood. Thank you!

### **Comment From: Diane Leigh**

I-17-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfT\\_nvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfT_nvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o) Bing directions for proposed location: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtyMBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ> Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb\\_3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb_3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0A) 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in its location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

## Comment From: bruce frey

I-18-1

I think the idea of putting a parking area in the former skeet shooting area is a poor design choice. Consider the following: 1. Positioning the parking lot at the proposed location will generate directions that route visitors through a residential neighborhood. Consider the following Google directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1GZAxL4WfXHvADYfTnvjmqRbh12KvlGyEAINc2fXQB6o>

Bing directions for proposed location:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1In47BwPBGayF9EjtymBgXyuffDv5huT-wEgjNradDuQ>

Now consider the directions you get when the parking area is located at the main entrance to the park:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP\\_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL\\_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0](https://drive.google.com/open?id=143WAP_AvPTbHA6PXpXcb3u4cL_0P1Avr7GWIY1pHR0)

A 2. Positioning the parking area at the extreme north east corner of this large park means visitors will be more than 1.5 kilometers from the southwest corner of the park. By moving the parking area to the main gravel entrance further west, visitors will have equal access to the west and east portions of the park. 3. The skeet area is already naturally isolated in it's location, with the trails purposely placed around it. 4. Locating a parking lot at the edge of residential neighborhood will invite traffic by non-residents. This is a safety problem because many families have moved to Gold Beach to enjoy walking the neighborhood and take in the view. This neighborhood has enjoyed particularly quiet traffic patterns and we want to keep it that way. Locating the lot at the main entrance and posting signage encouraging visitors to continue south on Dockton Highway, then turn east on SW 260th will pose no significant time or distance cost on visitors, and will preserve the quiet, safe streets in our residential neighborhood. Signage at the juncture of Dockton Rd SW and 75th Ave SW, and also Dockton Rd and SW 260th would be critical. 5. The main gravel entrance to the park has plenty of space east and west of the gravel road for parking. It's largely flat, has a slight slope to the north and is one of the drier areas, making it perfect for parking. Your current recommendation to cap the former skeet site is a poor use of funds, and will unnecessarily impact the traffic patterns in a residential neighborhood.

## Comment From: Ursula Dashiell

I-19-1

This concerns the proposed parking lot at the old skeet range. If it is necessary to put a parking lot there, please consider the traffic flow and direct it via Dockton Rd and NOT through the neighborhood of Upper Gold Beach!!! Also have in mind to design the lot in such a manner that it doesn't stick out like a sore thumb but blend in with nature! Thank you, Ursula Dashiell, Resident Upper Gold Beach, Vashon

## **Comment From: Devin Branson 2066502940**

I-20-1

This plan must be implemented quickly, and I fully support almost every aspect of the plan. I am a resident of Gold Beach, adjacent to the park, and have 2 small children. Though we are careful after we hike in the park, I was not aware of contamination concerns via inhaled dust, and this new revelation is quite frightening to me. The trails must be capped, as soon as possible. Any naysayers to this idea must be written off as those who do not fully understand the human health risks associated with this contamination, and their aesthetic desires must be outweighed by the need to keep vulnerable populations safe while preserving a natural area for generations to come. The only changes I would like to see in this plan is trying to close fewer trails. Though I understand some redundant trails must be closed for cost reasons, some trails being cut would result in dead-end trails that end on property lines. For the sake of the park's usefulness, a few of the trails slated to be closed should be re-examined. Additionally, as a consolation to losing trails, the Northeast beach trail (former road that dead-ends with a fork at the beach and a spur to a eroded cliff that used to connect to the old dock and the service road) should be fixed and re-connected. This repair could go along way in appeasing those who may be upset and losing some upland trails, and most of the trail infrastructure is already existing along this path. Finally, the parking lot at the skeet range. This is actually a good idea, and it was nice to see a connecting trail to this spot. However, another trail needs to be constructed from the parking lot heading first west and then northwest to connect to the trail system on the north side of the park complex that includes Dockton forest. Since some of this trail would be on non-contaminated land, the land trust and local volunteers (and I would happily include myself as a potential volunteer) could be utilized to complete this section of the project. Thank you very much for your time.

## **Comment From: Mary O'Brien**

I-21-1

I am very concerned about adding overlay to the trails in the Natural Area. I strongly support the option of NO ACTION NECESSARY Please consider this to avoid further damage to the area from trucks hauling material and equipment spreading it. Please do not eliminate side Trail's as "redundant" as they give us more overall distance to roam, which is after all what we are doing there. Island residents are aware that we all live with the smelter residue, so if you need signage to indicate Trail's may have increased contamination, that would be preferable to hauling in material and continuously retesting it. I do support additional parking areas at the edges of the park. The two small parking areas that exist can easily be filled with cars and not leave enough space for horse trailer turnaround. The island has a large contingent of riders who trail ride regularly. There are no safe approaches to the park without trailers. I also wish that State or King County reinstitute the original community advisory committee. Members of the community have been walking, jogging, biking and horseback riding in these areas for decades and have useful knowledge of the area and its visitors.

### **Comment From: Mark VanDevanter**

I-22-1

I am concerned about the language in your posting that included planting dense vegetation to restrict access in the Glacier Park. I consider much of what you did at the Maury Marine Park a costly mistake that threatens established view corridors and the diversity of the ecosystems that include established South Sound Prairie and Madrona forests. The random planting of Doug Fir in these areas is a serious threat to the broader vistas that attract users to these rare "open spaces" with breathtaking views of both the Olympics and Mt. Rainier. They are also not required for remediation in these areas and present a maintenance issue where there was little to none before. You have repeated this approach on the Glacier property with expensive fencing, plastic fabric, plastic water tanks and irrigation lines. The Evergreens in this area threaten to choke the expansive view of the Olympic Range at the entrance to the "open space" down to a narrow corridor and totally change the character of the walk to the main overlook. Attached are 2 shots that I took today of vanishing vistas in the Marine Park. The shot of Mt. Rainier shows evergreen planting in an established, low maintenance Prairie area where there was recent scour activity that would put this as an extremely low risk for contamination.

### **Comment From: Stephanie Vandevanter**

I-23-1

As a 25 year resident of Vashon Island I have grown to love and require opportunities to enjoy open, scenic viewpoints whenever possible. There are many forested areas to enjoy on the Island but the real treasures to me are the Madrona forests, scenic vistas of the mountains and water, and the open dry areas of Maury Island. King County planning seems to have a different idea of what is desired and they have planted ( and are perhaps planting more) fast growing, rather oppressive firs that will soon change the character of our open trails and block the views. Please stop! There are plenty of native plants besides firs that can mitigate the effects of Asarco without darkness, dominance, and closing us in.

### **Comment From: Megan Minier**

I-24-1

I have two main concerns about the proposed cleanup plan: 1) The location of the proposed parking lot route visitors through residential neighborhoods rather than around on the more arterial and well-travelled Dockton Road. To reduce traffic and other impacts to the Upper Gold Beach neighborhoods, it would be preferable for the parking lot be located closer to existing Dockton Park parking lots and the trail access points toward that end of the cleanup site. 2) Because of cleanup site intersects and intersects with other trails that are not specifically included in the cleanup site, it is difficult to have a clear image of which trails are being proposed for capping and closure. It would be incredibly helpful to have an on-site walk-through with trail users in order to better understand specifically which trails are



under discussion and how that impacts use and access of adjoining trails. I love the trails as is, I wish the connecting trail that runs parallel to the beach just above the high tide line were one that could be re-opened or reinstated. It's a great option for connecting the trail system at high tide and provides some pretty spectacular views.

### **Comment From: Matthew Bradrick**

I-25-1

I live about as close to the park as you can be. I have numerous cars parking in front of my house and leaving their cars there( sometimes for more than a day). Without a proper " parking lot" it is haphazard where cars park. Most of the cars arrive by driving through my neighborhood instead of staying on dockton road and coming up to the park from the main highway . This includes a lot of late night " guests" who are very loud and often leave their beer cans/bottles on the ground that I pick up later. I think a parking lot by the MAIN gate near the mountain bike park would be fair to the residents of Gold Beach as when I bought my house this was not a problem or something we could have prepared for. Visitors being urged to park on the East/West street instead of 79th Ave sw would be a welcome change. Thank you Matt Bradrick ( 14 yr resident with young children)

### **Comment From: Bri Bradrick**

I-26-1

I live by the corner of 79th Ave SW & 260th. Many people park by the trail head. People are loud, drive fast and dogs are unleashed. Teenagers party here and very late.

### **Comment From: Sapphire Blue**

I-27-1

I was unable to attend the Vashon meeting recently but a friend who did, informed me that he did not hear phytoremediation discussed. I believe that sword ferns as well as other plants are capable of removing contamination from soil. Are you considering the role that plants could play in the cleanup? Thank you, Sapphire Blue. Vashon Island

**Comment From: Blythe Bartlett**

I-28-1

Don't do anything!

No parking lot.

Don't bring anything onto the property.

Don't take anything away from the property.

Keep all the trails!

Thanks for letting me voice my opinion.

Blythe Bartlett

**Comment From: Lise Ellner**

I-29-1

I have lived in Dockton for 27 years. I am dismayed by the proposed cleanup plan for the Dockton trains area. The plan to cap trails and discontinue others falls far from the mark. First there are no redundant trails call are used by runners bicyclists horses and walkers. Second capping will turn the trails into the eroded mud pits examples at the top of 260th. How about planting in areas where there is loose dirt? Almost all of the existing trails are well packed and the only time dangerous material will be released into the atmosphere is if you dig up these trails. Lise

**Comment From: Craig Harmeling**

I-30-1

If nobody is going to use an area does it have to be rehabilitated to meet Dept of Ecology rules or is this something that KC wants to remove blackberries, scotch broom, etc., like the proposed parking lot.

*Response to Comments: Maury Island Open Space*

If the trails do not have enough arsenic on them to cause health problems, do they have to be covered? Which ones do not have to be covered? How are the trails that are covered going to be monitored?

I would like to make a recommendation that KC activate the Planning Advisory Group per the 2013 document:

page #8 paragraph 5

page #10 paragraph 1 item 3

page #10 objection #7

page #11 restore scenic values page #12 maintain the existing soft surface trail system and all items under this page #13 last item

page #14 first item create a Friends of Maury Island Natural Area Advisory Group

A lot of the ill feelings toward the work that was done at the site could have been taken care of if KC had worked with a group and got feedback. There are a lot of things that could have been done better. This should be done before the planning for the site, there may be some major changes.

With the growing sites on Vashon Maury Island, it would make sense that one person be in charge of all of them to work better in coordinating them and work to be done.

## **Comment From: Lee Roger Deaver**

I-31-1

1) As taxpayers we encourage you to spend out money wisely and only the minimum to achieve the objective.

2) Based on information offered, you only need to "cap" selected roads & trails with 3" of gravel - no mineral soil.\*

3) Use minimum invasive/impact gravel trucks like those used by Forest Service & Park Service trail builders.

4) Do not construct "hygiene stations." Use signage to instruct trail users to their own hygiene.

5) Do not construct the 20 to 25 stall parking stalls. Widen and gravel existing parking area.

\* I am an experience road & trail builder & maintainer.

\*\* Adding soil surfacing to a rock base is to "spoil" the load bearing properties of a rock sub-surface. Consult your engineer or road maintenance people on this matter. To achieve your objective to significantly reduce human (&pets) exposure to the existing toxic soil, capping the selected road and trails will be the best method. Adding a "topping" layer of soil will only

diminish the load bearing properties of the rock, add risk of invasive species, and increase the complexity and cost of road and trail maintenance. Eliminate the topping of soil.

**Comment From: France O'Reilly**

I-32-1

I really think that the "redundant trails" are very useful and needed and should not be closed. I do like the parking lot (with a few double stalls for horse trailers) so we can park off the traveled road. I am dubious about the trail capping - it may require a lot of maintenance.