Summary Report for the 2011 Design Charrette

In partnership with…
The National Parks Service Rivers Trails Conservation Assistance Program
Washington Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects
The Wilderness Society

The following is a report presented from the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to the City of Roslyn. It includes ideas developed during the October 2011 workshop/charrette. The content of this report does not represent finalized recommendations from the CAC.

Executive Summary

The Roslyn Urban Forest (RUF) Citizens Advisory Committee was awarded the National Parks Service Rivers, Trails, Conservation Assistance Program grant to help move the City of Roslyn forward in determination of a comprehensive trails and recreation plan and program. The CAC has held two previous workshops to better inform our efforts and the Charrette was a culmination of them. The first workshop was a Regional Assessment, and brought stakeholder groups from around Upper Kittitas County to determine how the RUF fits regionally for recreation and habitat. The second was a Visioning Workshop that brought together more local stakeholders to determine a community vision of the future of trails, recreation and habitat for the RUF.

The Design Charrette was a more extensive planning event that took place over the course of a Friday evening and the entire day of Saturday. Participants in this charrette were determined because of local involvement, knowledge, and willingness to participate in the entire event. There were also 10-12 landscape architects who participated. Folks were then split up into five working groups that focused on the areas of the natural environment, access and infrastructure, regional connectivity, education, and human corridors. Groups then pooled their information together to draft a comprehensive vision from the weekend’s worth of work. This was then presented to the public at an open house on Saturday evening.

Volunteers combined their expertise in a two-day workshop to explore options for non-motorized recreation and trails in Roslyn’s forest while protecting the habitat, wildlife and a working forest.

Desired Outcome:
To create visuals and specific design proposals, including an overall map and summary notations of proposals & rationales, of the future recreation and trails network and infrastructure for the Roslyn Urban Forest (RUF) that is in keeping with the following vision of the RUF Recreation and Trails Plan:

Vision Statement for the RUF Recreation and Trails Plan: A plan that has recommendations that are non-motorized, sustainable, able to adapt to new information from monitoring and unforeseen circumstances, connected and integrated into the wildlife and recreation networks in
the region, embraced by the City and the local citizen’s and users, provides educational opportunities for the community, and enhances the quality of life in Roslyn.

General Design Program

- Consider the region and local connectivity
- Identify and enhance recreational opportunities and access
- Integrate the needs of the town center, including visitor parking/services and managing stormwater
- Celebrate Roslyn’s history
- Suggest priorities and strategies for near-term, Year 1, implementation

Overview and Goals

The purpose of a charrette is to generate design ideas and alternatives. To achieve this, the focus of the group will be:

- engaging all participants
- encouraging and focusing discussion
- seeking resolution and consensus
- developing, organizing, and recording ideas as a physical manifestation of the group’s values:
The following is a summary of outreach, each working groups reports, and recommended action items.

**Natural Environment Group**

**Summary:** This group was assigned to look at natural elements of the Roslyn Urban Forest (soils, water, slope, aspect, plants, and animals, etc.). The group created one map incorporating the LSP information on many of these elements as well as information about the LSP's fifteen (A - O) site-specific timber stands.

The work of this group is essential to the overall planning efforts of the other four groups and to the final comprehensive trail and recreation plan. The various teams did so during the charrette process (to the degree possible). As each group's recommendations move forward and the trail and recreation plan is finalized, the current and recommended future information from the natural areas group must be incorporated as a sort of baseline.

This is because the natural elements mapping and information came from the LSP and provide an overview of site features that both limit and provide opportunities to balance and enhance all the functions and uses of a living forest.

(Include map of from this group)

**Next Steps:**

**MAPPING**

Incorporating both the existing natural areas map and an ability to incorporate GPS and other field verification has already moved ahead in work with CWU (Jen Lipton, faculty liaison).

**WETLAND DELINEATION**

We need to have the water in the RUF delineated (by type) to allow any work in the Blue (mesic, water-related) critical areas. We need someone with expertise to perform this work in a manner that will meet various agencies and grantors' requirements since many future projects and related grants will require this information (habitat and restoration work, trail and infrastructure, storm water).

Jen Lipton (CWU) is interested in helping to create a work description, and Courtney said she may be able to help in reviewing this. There is some possibility of using CWU students once we know what we need.

**FIELD TOURS/ FIELD VERIFICATION**
Prior to actions on the ground, field tours of potential sites are needed. There is great potential to both educate and learn from the public by flagging potential sites and incorporating this information into site planning through field tours and GPS additions to our existing mapping. (See Appendix #X for complete summary Report)

Access and Infrastructure Group

Summary: The Access and Infrastructure Group were tasked with work dealing with storm water issues, parking, trailheads, and other structures like bridges. Design of structures was taken from work that was previously completed with the City of Roslyn’s planning efforts with the University of Washington through the 2009 and 2010 Storefront Studio.

Next Steps:

Possible stream treatments
- Reduce water flow speed and frequency by creating storm water ponds and snow storage areas
- Create water storage for fire suppression
- Increase water infiltration into ground water
- Increase channel roughness by adding riparian plant material on banks and in stream channel
- Reduce debris blockages of the existing storm water system by use of trash racks and catch basins
- Increase trail roughness by adding wood mulch and gravel on trails
- Increase pipe size under city streets to minimize flooding
- Map the minor drainage channels and develop a string of consecutive small drainage basins to hold or slow down the storm water

Possible trail treatments
- Use recycled rubber-tire check dam diversions
- Use crib check/diversions
- Minimum 2 ft high berms on trails to direct runoff into appropriate drainages
- Energy dissipaters to slow the velocity of the runoff
- Riprap outfalls
Parking and trailheads
- Determination of First Established Trailhead

Four types of trailheads:
- Two regional trailheads to include restrooms, ADA access, parking lots, possible horse trailer and snowmobile parking, snow storage, and storm water detention
  Locations: Coalmines Trail parking lot and Runje Park
- Local access trailheads with kiosk/signage and space for 1-2 cars (diagonal)
- Neighborhood access with informal parking (parallel) and minimal signage
- Neighborhood access with no parking and minimal signage

Trailhead signage: Kiosk design will echo design suggestions from the 2009 and 2010 Storefront Studio (use of mining timbers, large bolts, etc. to reference mine construction)

Bridges and crossings
Design will reference mining/industrial design

Local and Regional Connectivity Group

Summary: In this and other workshops before it, there is wide agreement on the need to promote recreational connectivity from “ridge to river.” This includes such local assets as the Cle Elum River, Suncadia trails, cemetery, Horse Park, RUF trail system, Ridge trails, and the Teanaway. For wildlife, the group found that the major barriers are the highway, town and private development around the RUF. This group looked at the broader regional recreation and wildlife needs within the context of the RUF. They considered local and regional connections, develop safe crossing designs at major road and highway intersections, and recommend routes from the town center to the RUF, cemetery, and other open spaces and recreational corridors. They were also to work with the Natural Environment Group to identify and recommend potential habitat and wildlife corridors. A map was to be developed with short-term and long-term options. There was also a consideration of how all various stakeholders can coordinate and fund recreational and wildlife connectivity within the region.

Short-term goals:
- Develop regional trailheads- Runje Park, Plum Creek piles, Cemetery/burn dump.
- Develop trail maps to encourage public use and further public education of available opportunities
- Begin exploration of land easements
- Involve Suncadia and exploring economic development
- WSDOT for signs at wildlife crossings
Long-term goals

- Develop urban trails through town
- Develop and build ridge connection trails
- Tie-in with Suncadia and coordinate trail systems

Some of the other ideas and concerns included:

- Acquire or secure adjacent land through land trusts or other mechanisms
- Broken wildlife travel routes
- Using edges of RUF and Suncadia as animal connectivity routes
- Encouraging adjacent corridors for snowmobiles/ORVs access to ridge e.g. No 5 rd in order to ensure non-motorized use of RUF

Education Group

Summary: This group was tasked to develop a theme around stewardship of the forest and history of the Roslyn area. Identify historic sites and determine ways to preserve and tell the story of them. Incorporate tools to help educate the public about management of the RUF and specifics determined in the LSP.
Next Steps:
The next steps include the determination of a looped trail system with a short, medium and long loop to help tell the story of the RUF regarding its natural history along with its importance on the history of the City of Roslyn. Start with the short loop and get the greatest number of folks to use the soonest. Create a destination for locals/visitors plus a primary kiosk and an opportunity for way finding through town. Start story of this area with activism of the community in preserving the forest. Develop an effective and systematic way of getting information out (bird, plant, history, etc.) in a formatted master that would combine this information in one place so that CAC RUF could it share in a variety of formats (kiosk, brochures, hand-outs, etc.), as desired.

Kiosks -- Team had some differences on the best kiosk location to start with. Kiosk #1: Would help connect ridge to river. At park/Coal Mine Trail as a hub (with bathrooms); already have events at park that attract thousands of visitors who will get the information; opportunity to create a smallish classroom space. Kiosk #2 would be closer to the short loop and allow possibly for school bus parking as well. However, it was felt that two main kiosks were essential in the long term plan to encourage user exploration.

Human Corridors Group

Summary: This group looked at trail locations within the RUF in the context of both recreational experience of specific user groups and habitat and wildlife needs. They were tasked to develop criteria to evaluate and determine trail locations to enhance those needs. Trails should conform to ecology, utilize best management and ease of maintenance, and jurisdictional boarders. Existing trails were to remain unless they were redundant, on steep slopes, create excessive runoff, impact wildlife, or were determined to create a recreational loss.

Next Steps:
Recommendation#1: Adopt guidelines shown below for Existing Trails, including a description of existing trails to remain as well as existing trails to be removed that no longer meet guiding principles #1 thru #5, as shown on Exhibit #1, and as clarified on Exhibit#2 site cross section.

Recommendation#2: Adopt guidelines shown below for New Trails, including a description of planned new trails to meet guiding principles#1 thru #5, as shown on Exhibit #1, and as clarified on Exhibit#2 site cross section.

Recommendation#3: Authorize and direct CAC to develop a GIS or AutoCad format map version of Figure 1 plus a more refined graphic cross section of Figure 2 to include as the LSP
compliance exhibits for meeting applicable guidance. Volunteers from CWU and WASLA are recommended for staffing these 2 mapping and graphic support tasks by professional volunteers. The CAC will report back to City Council by _____, 2012.

Recommendation#4: Authorize and direct CAC to develop a list of trail rules for regulated uses, prohibited uses and uses allowed outright without trail rules, as shown in Figure 3. The CAC will report back to City Council in ___, 2012.

Recommendation#5: Authorize and direct CAC to further study and consider potential Future Trail Loops within the RUF, within urban area of Roslyn and on adjacent private lands to provide connection to existing RUF trails, as depicted on Figure #1. The 3 Planned new loop trails are generally described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Time Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>10 minutes / 1,000 linear feet (limited mobility, short visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>30 minutes/1 mile (residents and visitors, moderate time visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>2 hours/1.5 miles (exercise and nature enthusiasts, long visit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RUF Goals and Next Steps Taken from the Design Charrette

The following are some potential actions that will help to move the City of Roslyn, the RUF CAC, and the community forward with a trails and recreation program that aligns with both the Land Stewardship Plan and with the desires of recreationalists.

- Creation of a preliminary map of popular access points to the RUF
- Establishment of a major trail head
- Riparian plantings
- Determination of trail system
- Maintenance of trails
- Creation of Kiosks for information
- Appropriate way finding through town and in the RUF
- Any others?
Appendices’
Appendix #1

Natural Environment Summary Report

Summary: This group was assigned to look at natural elements of the Roslyn Urban Forest (soils, water, slope, aspect, plants, and animals, etc.). The group created one map incorporating the LSP information on many of these elements as well as information about the LSP's fifteen (A - O) site-specific timber stands.

The work of this group is essential to the overall planning efforts of the other four groups and to the final comprehensive trail and recreation plan. The various teams did so during the charrette process (to the degree possible). As each group's recommendations move forward and the trail and recreation plan is finalized, the current and recommended future information from the natural areas group must be incorporated as a sort of baseline.

This is because the natural elements mapping and information came from the LSP and provide an overview of site features that both limit and provide opportunities to balance and enhance all the functions and uses of a living forest.

Outcome: wildlife corridors within the forest and connected to regional network, plants, water movement/stormwater issues, night sky/lighting

Problem: Increased recreation, user built trail construction, and development pressures have strained sensitive habitat areas and wildlife corridors in and around the RUF.

The team generated a map (See attached map and key). All the information on this map was generated from existing mapping and will need to be field-verified for specific actions since non of this information has been GPS'd. (See field verification below.)

The map incorporated LSP sections on Desired Future Conditions, Management Strategies and Site-Specific Recommended Prescriptions and Treatments for specific stands. The map specifically identifies the LSP's two basic management strategies: dry and mesic (wetter).

Generally, the mesic sites also fall within designated "critical areas" and are more sensitive to infrastructure and other impacts (blue). They also contain a majority of the sensitive native plant species. All site work within these areas (including trails, trail crossing for creeks, future maintenance and actions relating to the hydrology of the area, storm water mitigations, etc.) will need to be carefully planned to minimize impacts, and will need to go through the City's Critical Areas Ordinance procedures, and may require other agency review as well. (See stream delineation below.)

The LSP identifies significant portions of the dry management sites for future thinning. Slope information was then incorporated. Red indicates steep slopes (some are also critical areas) and light green is more moderate slopes within non-critical areas. Where dry management areas are
also relatively flat, this mapping makes general recommendations about patched cutting within the dry sites (light green), as a way to avoid the unnatural way of a Firewise type of thinning. Such patches would provide for more natural remaining (and future) stands. Field verification is needed to identify exactly where the slope changes as well as diversity of tree size and species, etc. to be left during thinning, to enhance and to accomplish LSP goals.

The same light green areas also have the least potential for impact from trails, providing specific habitat and native plant communities are field verified. The map identifies generally a potential stream crossing within one critical area, to address the concept of the "lower loop" trail. This crossing area would need both the stream delineation work (below) and detailed field visits to determine its specific siting.

The area to the west along the Alaska Alley needs field verification as it is identified within the LSP as quasi-meadow. There is also further field-identification that needs to happen along the east and around the slag heaps. The historic reservoir site is another important site for all groups and was identified as a major feature requiring field verification. The Cemetery is managed by its own LSP. The little triangle (between 903 and Horvatt Road) has some wet lands and old pasture land. There is not a LSP guiding us on this land.

With the reservoir site, there is a huge potential as a wetland with related and interesting hydrology through the area. There was a line through the map to indicate the potential site for a trail crossing in the area. This is a classic example of the field verification that we need in specific site areas. Given our Critical Area Ordinance, there is a caveat to do work with in the RUF and go through the process to accomplish these tasks. There are issues and opportunities to reinforce the integrity of the RUF utilizing the potential for connectivity.

**next steps**

**MAPPING**

Incorporating both the existing natural areas map and an ability to incorporate GPS and other field verification has already moved ahead in work with CWU (Jen Lipton, faculty liaison).

**WETLAND DELINEATION**

We need to have the water in the RUF delineated (by type) to allow any work in the Blue (mesic, water-related) critical areas. We need someone with expertise to perform this work in a manner that will meet various agencies and grantors' requirements since many future projects and related grants will require this information (habitat and restoration work, trail and infrastructure, storm water).

Jen Lipton (CWU) is interested in helping to create a work description, and Courtney said she may be able to help in reviewing this. There is some possibility of using CWU students once we know what we need.

**FIELD TOURS/ FIELD VERIFICATION**

Prior to actions on the ground, field tours of potential sites are needed. There is great potential to both educate and learn from the public by flagging potential sites and incorporating this information into site planning through field tours and GPS additions to our existing mapping.
Appendix #2

Access and Infrastructure Group

Summary: The Access and Infrastructure Group were tasked with work dealing with storm water issues, parking, trailheads, and other structures like bridges. Design of structures was taken from work that was previously completed with the City of Roslyn’s planning efforts with the University of Washington through the 2009 and 2010 Storefront Studio.

Outcomes: suggestions to City and Planning/Historical Commission on access, moving through town, parking in town, signage, stormwater and drainage; engineering/design; ADA issues; aesthetics.

Storm water

Problem: Due to development and logging on the ridge above the RUF, water hits bare ground instead of the forest canopy (which would normally slow the water before it hit the ground). This water rushes down existing stream channels and trails in the RUF and picks up speed and debris as it moves down toward town. The roads along the ridge also act as a channel for the water, diverting it into stream channels and storm water intakes that are not designed to handle this volume of water -- leading to erosion, debris blockages, and flooding.

Goals: Protect watershed, protect storm sewer, and slow water flow. To accomplish this, we need a comprehensive analysis and design of storm water controls to include:

- “Soft” strategies in the RUF
- Low-impact strategies where the RUF and urban areas meet
- A combination of low-impact development technologies and more traditional engineered approaches within the urban area

Possible stream treatments

- Reduce water flow speed and frequency by creating storm water ponds and snow storage areas
- Create water storage for fire suppression
- Increase water infiltration into ground water
- Increase channel roughness by adding riparian plant material on banks and in stream channel
- Reduce debris blockages of the existing storm water system by use of trash racks and catch basins
- Increase trail roughness by adding wood mulch and gravel on trails
- Increase pipe size under city streets to minimize flooding
- Map the minor drainage channels and develop a string of consecutive small drainage basins to hold or slow down the storm water

Possible trail treatments

- Use recycled rubber-tire check dam diversions
- Use crib check/diversions
- Minimum 2 ft high berms on trails to direct runoff into appropriate drainages
- Energy dissipaters to slow the velocity of the runoff
- Riprap outfalls
- Woody debris at outfalls
- Use WTA’s Trail Work Guide as a resource for eliminating trail erosion
**Recommendation for storm water issues:**
Storm water needs to be infiltrated into the ground water and slowed before it hits the trails. Bring together a team with civil engineers, landscape architects, and natural resource ecologists to calculate and analyze the watershed and drainage needs. The team will design a storm water control system of appropriate strategies.

**Parking and trailheads**

**Four types of trailheads:**
- Two regional trailheads to include restrooms, ADA access, parking lots, possible horse trailer and snowmobile parking, snow storage, and storm water detention
  - Locations: Coalmines Trail parking lot and Runje Park
- Local access trailheads with kiosk/signage and space for 1-2 cars (diagonal)
- Neighborhood access with informal parking (parallel) and minimal signage
- Neighborhood access with no parking and minimal signage

**Trailhead signage:** Kiosk design will echo design suggestions from the 2009 and 2010 Storefront Studio (use of mining timbers, large bolts, etc. to reference mine construction)

**Bridges and crossings**
Design will reference mining/industrial design

Appendix #3

**Local and Regional Connectivity Group**

**Summary:** In this and other workshops before it, there is wide agreement on the need to promote recreational connectivity from “ridge to river.” This includes such local assets as the Cle Elum River, Suncadia trails, cemetery, Horse Park, RUF trail system, Ridge trails and the Teanaway. For wildlife, the group found that the major barriers are the highway, town and private development around the RUF. This group looked at the broader regional recreation and wildlife needs within the context of the RUF. They considered local and regional connections, develop safe crossing designs at major road and highway intersections, and recommend routes from the town center to the RUF, cemetery and other open spaces and recreational corridors. They were also to work with the Natural Environment Group to identify and recommend potential habitat and wildlife corridors. A map was to be developed with short-term and long-term options. There was also a consideration of how all various stakeholders can coordinate and fund recreational and wildlife connectivity within the region.

**Outcome:** Develop a concept of connectivity with regional recreation and wildlife needs; focus on the context of the RUF and work with a broad vision to create “Ridge to River” connections.

**Problem:** Balance the recreational and habitat/wildlife connections within the region. Increased pressure from development has created pinch points where wildlife and recreational users are utilizing smaller areas for freedom of movement. These cause potential conflicts between the goals of the LSP and managing the RUF for habitat and forest health concerns and providing a recreational experience desired.
Short-term goals:
- Develop regional trailheads- Runje Park, Plum Creek piles, Cemetery/burn dump.
- Develop trail maps to encourage public use and further public education of available opportunities
- Begin exploration of land easements
- Involve Suncadia and exploring economic development
- WSDOT for signs at wildlife crossings

Long-term goals
- Develop urban trails through town
- Develop and build ridge connection trails
- Tie-in with Suncadia and coordinate trail systems

Some of the other ideas and concerns included:
- Acquire or secure adjacent land through land trusts or other mechanisms
- Broken wildlife travel routes
- Using edges of RUF and Suncadia as animal connectivity routes
- Encouraging adjacent corridors for snowmobiles/ORVs access to ridge e.g. No 5 rd in order to ensure non-motorized use of RUF

Appendix #4

Education Group

Summary: This group was tasked to develop a theme around stewardship of the forest and history of the Roslyn area. Identify historic sites and determine ways to preserve and tell the story of them. Incorporate tools to help educate the public about management of the RUF and specifics determined in the LSP.

Outcome: community and visitor education, story zoning, community outreach (youth, natural and cultural history, art, natural resource management, stewardship/sense of place

Problem: The City of Roslyn has limited resources to preserve historic and sensitive habitat areas located in the forest. With increased pressures from outside development and increased pressures of recreational users, education is a tool to create awareness about preservation to ensure that our management efforts will enhance our preservation efforts.

Educational Opportunities:
- Roslyn’s History (including artifacts both identified and unidentified)
- Geology/Hydrology
- Sacred versus Public Space
- The Natural World
  - Conservation
  - Wildlife
  - Identification
  - Cosmic/Celestial/Outer Space/Night Sky
- Ecotones/Habitat & Vegetation Management/Firewise
- Ethnobotany
- Hunting/Wildlife Management

- Sustainability
  - Economic
  - Social
  - Environmental

- Students
- Trail Etiquette (Awareness/Stewardship)
- Spiritual Experience (a variety of)
- Forest History (RUF)
- Native American Heritage (Crossroads)

**Educational Constraints:**
- Human Experience (Try not to impede/Balance)
- Signage (obtrusiveness versus exploration)
- Dog Policy
- Accessibility (Topography) (ADA)
- Parking
- Dumping/Garbage/Debris/Artifact versus Junk
- Buffers for Outdoor Classrooms
- Adjacency of Conflicting Activities

**Revelations i.e., the need for a:**
- Variety of “signing” and interpretive tools (markers, technology, landscape typologies)
- Central kiosk/interpretive center

**Stories to Tell = A Priority**
- Historical activism of community in preserving the forest
- Roslyn Formation (geology)
- RUF History (How it came to be)

Our intent was to enable opportunities for clear wayfinding (interpretive markers which would correlate with kiosk information and symbols) and create a hierarchy of signage to match the level and intensity of usage designed to fit the scale of trail/number of users. This concept would guide the amount, location, and size of signage which would be keyed for education yet not overwhelm the forest. It was felt that more signage was appropriate on the short loop with the least amount and smallest on the “long loop”. In order to keep signage small, low to the ground, and limited it would be supplemented with other ways of obtaining information: brochures/smart phone app/quick response codes, etc.

**Three types of interpretive trail loops proposed. Each could tell a different story:**

“**Short Loop**” (10 to 15 minute walk). Shortest/flattest for children/seniors/physically challenged = least amount of slope = most possibility for ADA access. More open/night sky viewing. This loops starts at park going in/around town to the slag pile area and back. It would connect to downtown and reinforce one’s ability to pick up the trail and start the loop from downtown and not only from the park with clear signage (consider having a contest) for the eye to follow. A kiosk (#1) here would also enable a clear ridge to river connection. Here we would tell the story of the historic activism of the community to save the ridge and encourage visitors to know more about Roslyn. This could be a small
classroom (examples: Bradner Gardens/Cal Anderson Park) that would reinforce the concept of sustainability and allow for a sheltered/enclosed space with adjoining bathrooms (already in existence) for community use. This could connect with the Roslyn Museum to share the coal mining history as well.

“Medium Loop” (30 minute walk): Greatest number of historic sites (Picnic Rock, #6 Incline, #8 Incline, Sliding Rock, Chimney Rock, Electric Star, Slag Piles) and interpretive points (Roslyn Foundry, Old Ball Field). Focus more on night sky/celestial and elements that would draw a classroom to that area including the exposed Roslyn Formation (connected to the regional geology and relationship to the larger landscape of the state), ethnobotany/native soils, firewise management, riparian education, celebration of Roslyn’s history, Native American influences (creation story of beaver and coyote fighting and creating the landscape/place names/plant names, etc.), artifacts. This could also be a potential site for a story circle/campfire.

“Long Loop” (30 minute plus walk): Longest/steepest = cardio loop with the most topographic variety and the least signage. This loop would include the Original Roslyn Reservoir, viewpoint(s), and hydraulic interpretation.

Priorities:

Start with the short loop and get the greatest number of folks to use the soonest. Create a destination for locals/visitors plus a primary kiosk and an opportunity for way finding through town. Start story of this area with activism of the community in preserving the forest. Develop an effective and systematic way of getting information out (bird, plant, history, etc.) in a formatted master that would combine this information in one place so that CAC RUF could it share in a variety of formats (kiosk, brochures, handouts, etc.), as desired.

Kiosks -- Team had some differences on the best kiosk location to start with. Kiosk #1: Would help connect ridge to river. At park/Coal Mine Trail as a hub (with bathrooms); already have events at park that attract thousands of visitors who will get the information; opportunity to create a smallish classroom space. Kiosk #2 would be closer to the short loop and allow possibly for school bus parking as well. However, it was felt that two main kiosks were essential in the long term plan to encourage user exploration.

Coyote and Wishpoosh: from the Chinook tribe. Retold by S.E. Schlosser

Now Wishpoosh the monster beaver lived in the beautiful Lake Cle-el-lum which was full of fish. Every day, the animal people would come to the lake, wanting to catch some fish, but Wishpoosh the giant beaver drove them away with many threats and great splashing. If they refused to leave, Wishpoosh would kill the animal people by dragging them deep into the lake so that they drowned.

Coyote was very upset at Wishpoosh for the way he treated the animal people. Coyote decided that he would kill the monster beaver and so he went to Lake Cle-el-lum with his spear tied to his wrist and started to fish. As soon as Wishpoosh saw this upstart person invading his territory, the giant beaver attacked. Coyote threw the spear and it pierced the beaver. Immediately, Wishpoosh dove to the bottom of the lake, dragging Coyote with him.

Well, Coyote and Wishpoosh wrestled and tugged and fought each other at the bottom of the lake until the sides gave way and all the water rushed out, pouring out over the mountains and through the canyons until it collected in Kittitas Valley and formed another, larger lake. Coyote and Wishpoosh burst forth into the new lake, shouting and wrestling and fighting each other with renewed vigor until the second lake gave way and the water rushed out, joining in with the waters of several rivers to form a massive lake at Toppenish.
Wishpoosh the monster beaver would not give up the fight. He bit and clawed at Coyote and tried to drown him in the massive lake. Coyote fought back fiercely, and at last the massive lake gave way, the water roared down into the meeting place of the Columbia, the Yakima, and the Snake, where it dammed up into a lake so huge none has ever seen its like before or since.

Coyote and Wishpoosh dragged at each other, pulling and tugging and ripping and biting until the dam gave way and a huge wave of water swept down the Columbia River towards the sea. Coyote and Wishpoosh were tumbled over and over again as they were swept down river in the mighty wave of water. Coyote grabbed bushes and rocks and trees, trying to pull himself out of the massive wave. By these efforts was the Columbia Gorge was formed. But Coyote could not pull himself out of the great wave and so he tumbled after Wishpoosh, all the way to the bitter waters at the mouth of the river.

Wishpoosh was furious. He was determined to beat this upstart Coyote who had driven him from his beautiful lake. The giant beaver swept all the salmon before him and ate them in one gulp to increase his strength. Then he swam out to sea with Coyote in pursuit. The monster beaver threw his great arms around a whale and swallowed it whole.

Coyote was frightened by this demonstration of the monster beaver's strength. But he was the most cunning of all the animals, and he came up with a plan. Turning himself into a tree branch, Coyote drifted among the fish until Wishpoosh swallowed him. Returning to his natural form, Coyote took a knife and cut the sinews inside the giant beaver. Wishpoosh gave a great cry and then perished.

Coyote was tired after his long fight with the monster beaver. He called to his friend Muskrat, who helped drag the body of Wishpoosh to shore. Coyote and Muskrat cut up the giant beaver and threw the pieces up over the land, thus creating the tribes of men. The Nez Perce were created from the head of the giant beaver, to make them great in council. The Cayuses were created from the massive arms of Wishpoosh, in order that they might be strong and powerful with the war club and the bow. From the beaver's ribs, Coyote made the Yakimas and from the belly the Chinooks. To make the Klickitats, Coyote used the beaver's legs, so that they would become famous for their skill in running. With the leftover skin and blood, he made the Snake River Indians who thrived on war and blood.

Thus were the tribes created, and Coyote returned up the mighty Columbia River to rest from his efforts. But in his weariness, Coyote did not notice that the coastal tribes had been created without mouths. The god Ecahni happened along just then and fixed the problem by assembling all of the coastal tribes and cutting mouths for them. Some he made too large and some he made crooked, just as a joke. This is why the mouths of the coastal tribes are not quite perfect. POTENTIAL APPENDIX?

http://americanfolklore.net/folklore/2010/08/coyote_and_wishpoosh.html

Appendix #5

Human Corridors Group

Summary: This group looked at trail locations within the RUF in the context of both recreational experience of specific user groups and habitat and wildlife needs. They were tasked to develop criteria to evaluate and determine trail locations to enhance those needs. Trails should conform to ecology, utilize best management and ease of maintenance, and jurisdictional boarders. Existing trails were to remain unless they were redundant, on steep slopes, create excessive runoff, impact wildlife, or were determined to create a recreational loss.

Outcome: desired trail experiences, locations and length, connectivity, trailheads, dog poop collection receptacles, gates.

Problem: The RUF was historically a place where the citizens and visitors of Roslyn could enjoy by various modes of transportation. Presently there is a dense network of trails that do not
support the goals in the LSP in terms of wildlife and recreation management. This impacts not only the habitat concerns, but the experience and potential safety desired by the different recreational groups.

Guiding Principles #1 thru #4: Trail Decision Criteria

In accordance with the Management Recommendations of the LSP, the HC team identified four guiding principles to consider in development of new trails. The new trails are acceptable if a new trail creates:

1) no significant wildlife impact
2) significant recreational benefit
3) feasible
4) expands access (ADA/special populations/limited mobility)

Existing trail issues of concern have historically been created by several different activities, falling into 2 basic groups of human activities:

Origins: mining, logging, social, dirt bike, mountain bike, hiking, horseback, cross-country skiing, showshoeing

Water: water bars, flash floods, reverse grades on logging roads
For specific existing and proposed trail recommendations, refer to the map (Figure 1) labeled “Guiding Policy”. It identifies environmentally sensitive areas, existing trails considered acceptable, suggested trail connections, suggested trail removals, and preferred trailheads.

Guiding Principle #5: Decision Criteria for Existing Trail Removals

The HC team advises CAC to adopt a principle that any new trails be sited or developed (primarily in the north-south direction) at least 200 meters away from stream channels, as shown and illustrated in the site cross section. Existing trails within or crossing the stream channels should be closed where not needed. The overall trail network of looped and interconnecting trails should be limited to minimize the total number of trails crossing the channel areas transverse to the stream flow direction (east to west direction). The guidelines of 200 meters from stream channel flow line were developed based on various applicable codes and best available science applicable to wildlife habitat, plant distribution, soils and water management. (Refer to Figure 2)
During the course of the discussions, three new loop trails are suggested, to be formed by a combination of existing trails and new trails were needed. In some cases, the loop trail would be implemented by sign, via electronic device for download of information about the loop or via a printed trail map route.

**Guiding Principle #6: Decision Criteria for Trail Planning for RUF, Town and Adjacent Sites**

The 3 major trail routes are based on providing a variety of trails (time required to walk and distance) to meet the varied needs and physical abilities of residents and visitors, as follows:
Route 1  10 minutes/1,000 lf (limited mobility, short visit)
Route 2  30 minutes/1 mile
Route 3  2 hours/1.5 miles

The main gaps in the current trail system were identified as follows:

1. Nevada to Coal Mines Trail
2. Whitehead to A St / California (through 23 acre Suncadia parcel)
3. RUF to triangle (RUF to Coal Mines Trail)
   The triangle at 903 presents an opportunity for connection
   Constraint: it is privately owned but not developed, land acquisition needed
4. Connection of the trails within the RUF to the publicly-accessed trails in Suncadia
5. The connecting east/west trail across the top of Section 17 is mostly out of the RUF, onto private property. Either it needs to be relocated or easements need to be acquired. In addition, it needs further study, as it crosses riparian areas.

In formulating the recommended long term policy for RUF existing and planned trails, the HC team considered several questions for policy needs to manage trails. The table below (Figure 3) is intended to provide 3 types actions for the City staff to administer, as day-to-day guidelines consistent with the LSP guidelines. The 3 actions categories for trail use are:

OK – allow the activities shown to co-exist without a formal rule or regulation within RUF limits.
Rule – develop and adopt a trail rule to eliminate or minimize trail conflict between 2 activities on a trail within the RUF limits.
X – adopt a list of prohibited trail activity within the RUF limits.

In formulating Table 3, the HC team considered the following policy questions:

1) How much logging is needed for sustainable forest ecology, and also necessary for fire prevention and fire protection?
2) How much machine and vehicle access should be allowed? For recreation (including meeting ADA requirements), logging, other support activity (cross-country ski trail grooming, as one example), emergency access and trail use enforcement
3) Is a type zoning needed for trails for regulating trail use as well as protecting environmental areas and regulating other activities within the RUF? (the degree to which City should formally regulate the RUF)

However, the above 3 questions were not fully researched or fully resolved during the October, 2012 workshop event, due to time limitations. So, these 3 questions will require further study by CAC, for possible next action by Roslyn about trails and uses within the RUF, to meet all applicable LSP guidelines. Activities can be added to expand table 3 as each topic is studied and a path forward is decided. The map (Figure #1) can reflect the designation of trail type for determining what trail rules apply.

Guiding Principle #7: Trail Regulations for Uses and Activities
Table 3: RUF Activities – Regulated Uses, Allowed Uses and Prohibited Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>w/dog</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Xcountry Skiing</th>
<th>Snowshoe</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td>rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/dog</td>
<td></td>
<td>rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xcountry Skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature watching</td>
<td></td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OK – Allowed Use: 2 activities to co-exist without a formal rule or regulation within RUF limits.
Rule – Regulated Use: see trail rule that applies to eliminate or minimize trail conflict between 2 activities on a trail within the RUF limits.
X – Prohibited Use: the 2 uses are a prohibited trail activity within the RUF limits. See applicable trail rules for the 2 uses.
Blank – compatible uses without any need for trail regulations.

POTENTIAL APPENDIX

The CAC considered the activity of a wide range of trail uses and activities. Here is a summary of trail users, trail uses and activities considered and discussed by the CAC in making the 5 recommendations in April, 2012, based 7 Guiding Principles to meet LSP guidelines:

- How best to plan for and also include mountain bikes
- Multi-use focus
- Trail maintenance
- Connect wildlife corridors
- Living forests: flora and fauna, diverse, perpetual over time
- Exercise dogs
- Connections for recreation
- Perpetual access
- ADA access

Recommendation#1: Adopt guidelines shown below for Existing Trails, including a description of existing trails to remain as well as existing trails to be removed that no longer meet guiding principles #1 thru #5, as shown on Exhibit #1, and as clarified on Exhibit#2 site cross section.

Recommendation#2: Adopt guidelines shown below for New Trails, including a description of planned new trails to meet guiding principles#1 thru #5, as shown on Exhibit #1, and as clarified on Exhibit#2 site cross section.

Recommendation#3: Authorize and direct CAC to develop a GIS or AutoCad format map version of Figure 1 plus a more refined graphic cross section of Figure 2 to include as the LSP
compliance exhibits for meeting applicable guidance. Volunteers from CWU and WASLA are recommended for staffing these 2 mapping and graphic support tasks by professional volunteers. The CAC will report back to City Council by _____, 2012.

Recommendation#4: Authorize and direct CAC to develop a list of trail rules for regulated uses, prohibited uses and uses allowed outright without trail rules, as shown in Figure 3. The CAC will report back to City Council in ___, 2012.

Recommendation#5: Authorize and direct CAC to further study and consider potential Future Trail Loops within the RUF, within urban area of Roslyn and on adjacent private lands to provide connection to existing RUF trails, as depicted on Figure #1. The 3 Planned new loop trails are generally described as follows:

- **Route 1**: 10 minutes / 1,000 linear feet (limited mobility, short visit)
- **Route 2**: 30 minutes / 1 mile (residents and visitors, moderate time visit)
- **Route 3**: 2 hours / 1.5 miles (exercise and nature enthusiasts, long visit)