

Future of Mount Spokane Public Comments

January 26, 2024 - November 12, 2025

Thanks for your time on Tuesday. Always interested in supporting your personal goals and professional endeavors. Your questions were good... as they stimulated another level of thoughtful consideration about possibilities for trail connectivity, purposeful planning and anticipated utilization. ¹

I received your email regarding the input meeting for Mt. Spokane that is slated for June 1st at the Wonder building in Spokane. I will not be able to make that meeting, so I was hoping I could give you my input via this email.

First off, let me say that I am very thankful to have Mt. Spokane State Park in my backyard, as it were. I am predominantly a mountain biker but also hike with my family and both alpine and cross country ski in the park.

As you may know the two main biking trails in the summer are, the 140 and the 290. They are both great and while the 290 is a "bike only" trail the 140 is not and has a lot of other users. I personally have never had a bad encounter with hikers, etc. but I know that is not the case all the time. I would love to see additional bike centered trails be built within the park. Especially if the trails required pedaling to get to them, rather than the availability to shuttle them as can be done with both the 140 and 290 trails. This would reduce the use on those two trails and improve the experience for multi user groups. It would also allow any new, predominantly downhill ridden trails, to require some level of effort to access. This would reduce vehicle traffic up and down the mountain and spread out the users which would decrease volume across more trails, reducing trail ware and at the same time allowing for more total users.

I understand that the process for constructing new trails can be difficult, but as far as build labor goes, myself and other cyclists that I know would be more than willing to provide the labor to construct additional trails.

Thanks for taking the time to listen and I hope my input will be helpful and considered.²

Hi there, I got a notice of a public meeting about the future of Mount Spokane. I can't come as I live in Seattle and won't be anywhere near Spokane that day.

But I wanted to let someone know that we "discovered" Mount Spokane last Fall. We had a camping reservation and stayed several nights in the tiny, beautiful campground. Down at the road entrance to the park, there was a "Campground Full" sign but in fact it was mostly empty. We mostly hiked on the trails. We were completely taken by surprise by the abundance and diversity of trails and wildflowers. We also happened to be there for peak huckleberry picking. No berries anywhere near the campsite, they'd been picked clean, but a couple miles out on the trails, one could gorge without limit. While temps were too hot in the lowlands, they were perfect up on the mountain. The views from our alpine perch out over the farmlands and mountains were spectacular. The combo of what is obviously a major ski area in the winter with a "wilderness" park seems a little weird, but in fact seems to work, at least it worked great for us. The x-country ski trails make great summer hikes. The stone building at the top is charming and picnicking on the felsenmeer inspired us to do a deep dive into the geology.

We were surprised that the campground is so small – seems like there would be a huge demand. But we were delighted with the tiny, relatively untrampled campground as is. I wonder if there is pressure to develop it further and how that could be done without destroying the charms of the place.

Thank you.³

Hello

I wish to catch you before you finalize the improvements that are coming for Mt. Spokane recreation area state park. Recently the state has acquired the Bear Lodge and the 153 acres associated with it. I have two ideas, the first is for the replacement of the current chair lift at Lodge one at the ski area. Currently we have an ancient two seater. It services both the front and back hills of the mountain.

Which contain the best terrain for advanced skiers but also connect novice skiers who are trying to expand their skills to a bevy of good trails for their abilities.

Mt Spokane is a jewel in the rough. Thank you for the backside addition 6 years ago. A beautiful place within an hour of the downtown area of Washington's 2nd most populated area. A real feather in the cap of our area. But the inadequacy of the first chairlift seems overlooked. I would guess it is from the late 80's.

I would also offer a suggestion to move it slightly to peak near the stone house atop the mountain which is the highest point.

That would be the dream.

The second suggestion is relating to the new acquisition near the Ranger station. Eventually we will need a parking area in the lower mountain area. With a shuttle service.

Either close the old ranger station and move into the lodge. or Create a parking area behind the Bear lodge. Things of this sort. It would need to be closely looked at for the best use of the land. I

encourage you to think in terms of several decades. This park as a whole is going to see increased visitations in the next decades as our populace expands. We are seeing a rising influx of people from the I-5 corridor to our county in search of economic relief. As they come they bring a love for hiking etc... so we should be prepared.

Lastly the road itself has been upgraded over the last ten years but again as use swells it too needs improvement as well as the yearly pothole repairs on the top of the mountain.

It is a great place and has been since the infancy of the Washington State Parks Department was created, being the oldest state park area in Washington. It is a huge area and is underutilized because of access issues. Perhaps an additional route on another side of the area.

Thinking further on, we could use more water reserves, so a reservoir somewhere would be a win win for recreation and water for the expanding housing. Just down the road outside of the border there are several small canyons which have potential. Some farmland would be lost unfortunately, and the locals may object to the increase in traffic, but the high desert area we live in can always use more water resources. But that is outside your aegis.

Good luck and thanks for all you do.⁴

Melinda,

I just wanted to send a quick note to introduce myself. I work closely with Gen Dial and Paul Knowles on other projects because of my role here as a land protection specialist with the Inland Northwest Land Conservancy, but I do not believe we have ever had the chance to meet or work together.

I was pleased to see the front page article about MSSP in the Spokesman-Review this morning and it reminded me that I will not be able to attend the June 1st event because I will be out of town.

I am personally very interested in being able to participate in the July charrette that is being planned as part of this vision casting for the park. As the past executive director of Spokane Nordic Ski Association as well as a volunteer WTA Crew Leader I have spend an enormous amount of time working and recreating on the mountain and have become very familiar with the positives and negatives present within the park.

Good luck with your big event on June 1st, I wish I could be there.⁵

I heard you were seeking input for park improvements.

I would like to backpack on trails in the park. Please let me know if there is something I could fill out.⁶

is there a place to leave comments if you cannot go to meeting?

there was once talk of a bobsled luge run.

someone stationed at fairchild was on olympic luge team.⁷

Hi there-

While on my trail run over the top of. Mt. Spokane today I reconsidered some of the questions listed in the public survey.

Ultimately, it all comes down to questions of recreation and resource management.

Here are some further thoughts:

I visit Mt. Spokane some 70+ days per year. That's not an exaggeration as I log all of my training activities. The bulk of days is for xc skiing but there are many days of hiking, biking, xc trail maintenance and downhill skiing. In past summers I often carried a small folding saw to trim brush or cut small fallen logs, and removed rocks that have found their way onto the trails. But I don't do that any more.

Why? Because I am tired of being nearly run over by people on ever larger and faster "downhill" mountain bikes designed for downhill racing and now E-bikes. (which are really just re branded motorcycles.) My thinking is that a few more obstacles might slow people down a bit. (I was out on Ragged ridge recently, and some folks on dirt bikes have clearly been there. So much for a natural preserve.) By the way, why have so many trees been girdled? What kind of forest management objective is that? I have a forestry background and I'm really curious.

A friend that helps out with early season grooming on the nordic trails was once very involved with Evergreen East. No longer. He pointed out that pretty much all they want to build are double black diamond expert only trails for the very small percentage of riders that have the downhill race bikes and the skills to use them. At the event held at the old bread building downtown recently I asked the Evergreen representative about that. He of course denied it. But all you need to do is look at what they have built around the region over the last ten years. After further questioning he admitted that "they like to build trails that they find challenging to ride". That means big drops, big berms, steep turns and as much exposed rock as possible. So where do people with a normal level of skill go? Trail 110. On a big day with multiple trucks yo-yoing up to the top, the trail off of the back of the top and 110 are luge runs for those guys. The trail off of the top used to be quite nice and rideable in both directions, but now with all of the people shuttling to the top, the increased erosion has turned much of it into a long skinny talus slope. The bike people already "own" trails 140 and 270 "the goods". Would it be too much to restrict trail 110 to horse and foot traffic? And restrict ebike use from all single track trails?

Optimally, all users should be able to use the same resource. But that's often unrealistic. Can you imagine dirt bikes and ATVs having the run of Riverside State park? I feel that the time has come to look seriously at some restrictions on Mt. Spokane. I have had plenty of "user conflicts" with drunk snowmobilers racing their sleds on the xc ski trails, and in the parking lot full of kids on Saturday mornings and even trying to drive into the Selkirk Lodge! I can only imagine that there will be increasing user conflicts with the increase in user visits, the increase in Ebike use by new riders on single track trails by folks who know nothing and care nothing of outdoor etiquette. I have seen them on the very top of Mt. Kit Carson, spinning little circles, throwing dirt and making a mess. Some people.

Sorry if I sound like I am whining, but I would hate to see any more degradation of such a wonderful community resource, and must share my opinions.⁸

I unfortunately missed the survey dates but would like to add my comments if that's still possible.

Things I like and improvements I hope to see:

Mountain biking: There need to be more and better designed mountain bike trails. Trails that are steep get torn up very quickly regardless of the skill level of the riders. Less steep trails can still be fun for advanced riders, they just need to have good berms and rollers that make good use of the elevation drop without going fall-line.

Nordic skiing: Please pave the nordic ski parking lot and please allow nordic skiers to use the trails earlier in the morning.

Downhill ski/snowboard: Keep up the great access.

Thank you!⁹

To whom it may concern:

I have recently learned that management plans are being drafted for Mount Spokane State Park. I have not found any means of submitting public comment but am hoping I can make one suggestion for the committee's consideration as they work on this plan. This suggestion is for a solution to the increasing and dangerous conflicts between bicyclists and all other trail users.

I spend a lot of time hiking, snowshoeing, and cross-country skiing on Mt Spokane (and occasionally skinning up and skiing down at the downhill resort). As a professor at Whitworth University, I also often introduce students and colleagues to the ecology and natural history of Mount Spokane on walks and snowshoes outings.

There are many challenges that have come with the increased use of the park in recent years, but there is one issue that I find most difficult and damaging to the ability of most people to enjoy the state park. This is the explosion in popularity of mountain bicycling, which has become so hazardous for walkers that many of the best trails in the park are becoming unpleasant or terrifying for the majority of people who want to just walk or snowshoe and enjoy nature. Nearly every month I or my walking partners experience a near-miss from a bicyclist who comes crashing down the trail and expects anyone on the path to leap out of their way or be hit. On a recent visit, I encountered an elderly lady leaving the trail who was visibly shaken by her experience of being nearly run over on the trail, and it sounded as though she will never hike in the park again. I myself used to do the Kit Carson loop walk all the time (and would tell newcomers that it's one of the best local walks) but increasingly I avoid it, especially if I have students or children along, as it's become so dangerous for walkers.

This seems manifestly unfair to me and the majority of people who are not so well-organized and funded as the mountain-bike lobby but who have legitimate expectations of being able to enjoy their local state park. There are endless places for mountain biking in Spokane County, but vanishingly few quiet natural areas designated to walkers, birders, snowshoers, and those who love studying and enjoying nature.

I have mountain biked myself and know how fun it can be, but I just don't think it has a place on most of the existing trails on Mount Spokane. But there's a simple solution that I think could please everyone. Why not build mountain bike trails on the existing ski slopes of the resort? Leave the existing trail network in more natural areas for hikers (and please keep at least one trail designated for hikers up to the top of Mt Spokane), but then build as many trails as bikers want on the clearcut ski slopes, with the range of gentle to steep grades that can please a range of bicyclists. Eventually the resort operators might even make money by running a lift for lazier bicyclists who don't want to bicycle uphill. Between that and the existing cross-country ski trails (where walkers and bicyclists easily share the wide tracks, and I rarely have dangerous encounters with bicyclists), there is plenty of space for bicyclists.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best wishes,¹⁰

Parks Planners,

The WA Natural Heritage Program has reviewed the Mount Spokane Master Plan Alternatives Report, comments from our vegetation ecologist lead, Tynan Ramm-Granberg follow.

- Mount Spokane State Park contains 60 element occurrences (EOs) of rare and/or high-quality ecosystems
- These ecosystems are diverse, representing 33 different US National Vegetation Classification plant associations in 13 different groups. They include not only the subalpine meadows, but also seeps/springs and numerous rocky mountain forest types. The subalpine meadows are particularly rare in this portion of the state, but it is also uncommon to find large acreages of these forest types that are naturally regenerated and/or unlogged in this region.
- In our database, 21 of those 33 associations are represented nowhere else in the state at this time.
- Expansion of the long-term boundary at Mount Spokane would likely have the following significant ecological benefits:
 - Increasing the ratio of “core” to “edge”
 - Reducing windthrow from clearcuts adjacent to the park
 - Improving connectivity
 - Reducing exotic plant introductions from neighboring logging disturbance.
 - Improving resiliency of ecosystem EOs by increasing the degree to which natural ecological processes can play out.
- The following proposed actions would likely benefit the long-term integrity of the ecosystem EOs:
 - Changing land use designations from Recreation to Resource Recreation or Natural Forest Areas within forested EOs
 - Changing land use designations to Natural Area for meadows
 - Any trail re-routing that avoids the EOs (particularly important for the meadow EOs)
 - For trails that will remain within EOs, any efforts to reduce social trail proliferation
- The “**community mountain**” alternative contains many of these beneficial actions and would likely have the greatest benefit to the long-term integrity of the ecosystem EOs.
- Additional management actions that may be beneficial to the long-term integrity of the ecosystem EOs:
 - Exotic plant surveillance and treatment within subalpine meadows (particularly along the road and summit parking area that is imbedded in the largest meadows).
 - Continued monitoring of tree encroachment within subalpine meadows.
- The following actions would likely reduce the long-term integrity of the ecosystem EOs:
 - Development of new trails that increase fragmentation
 - Development of backcountry camping areas in or near subalpine meadows

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Best,¹¹

Please do the right thing and actually listen to the public. The majority of people actually voted to keep bear creek lodge so why not listen to the people and do the right thing and save it? I want to know who is coming up with these insanely high figures to restore the lodge? I am a general contractor and I know it's not going to cost up to 8 million to repair something seems fishy with these crazy high numbers. Also the tube hill at bear creek needs to remain in place. The tube hill at lodge 1 needs demolished it will ease the pressure off the parking lot at lodge 1. Lastly put the vista cruiser chair 1 on the historic register it is a true historic icon and needs to remain in place. Taking down the vista cruiser will gut the heart and soul of the ski hill. There is nothing wrong with riblet chair lifts. They were built here in Spokane and we need to retain the riblet family legacy. Chair 1 vista cruiser is actually 50 fpm faster and safer than the modern chair 6. Don't let mt. Spokane 2000 destroy a piece of Spokane ski history. Save the vista cruiser!!!¹²

Having read the draft preferred alternative "Master Plan" I have a few concerns and questions that I hope you will address at the next public meeting.

What is lacking most at MSSP is not its facilities but its management of user conflict and resource degradation. The original Limits of Acceptable Change program did not work, and neither did its replacement in the current trail plan. There is a serious need for better tracking of user conflict, especially as the recreation technology continues to advance with eBikes, mountain bikes, snow bikes, fat bikes, and snow machines. Largely because of this unregulated new technology, MSSP is becoming more of an amusement park for thrill seekers than a "family" centered natural refuge for hikers, snowshoers, and equestrians. Unleashed dogs is also a growing concern. Admittedly the hardest part is deciding what to do about the conflicts once they are documented, but that "can" continues to be pushed down the road and is glaringly absent from the draft plan.

Overall I would say that existing facilities need to be improved or expanded before any new projects are considered. The top priority should be doing something with Bear Creek Lodge. I think a 4000 sq feet replacement is probably too small and \$4M is a significant underestimate for a new facility. I would like to see a more detailed analysis of the options before a decision is made. The Selkirk Lodge and parking lot expansion has been a high priority for many years and deserves to be in Phase One. Additional road improvements are also needed for the alpine area despite the \$938,000 devoted to them in the last capital budget. Closing and revegetating or rerouting upper Trail 290 is a very high priority. Rerouting lower Trail 140 and connecting it to lower Trail 110, and rerouting Trail 100 east are also very high priorities that have been planned and needed for a long time and should be in Phase 1. I would also caution against an overly ambitious planning effort. We don't need to repeat the MREC or CAMP experiences where people got all excited about unrealistic possibilities only to find out later that their energies and time were largely wasted. The current federal and state funding fiasco makes that scenario even more likely.

So here are a few questions:

1. Are you intending to completely replace the existing Comprehensive Trail Plan or preserve parts of it? Will the IMBA trail standards still be used? How will you ensure that trail sustainability guidelines are understood and followed by future trail builders, be they professional or volunteer? How will you manage user conflict and resource degradation more effectively?
2. Why is there no mention of Ragged Ridge? Why was it closed this summer? Has its management plan been changed?
3. Why is there no mention of Trail 290? Will it be closed or rerouted and who will maintain it to what standards?
4. Why is Riverside the "other half" of Mt. Spokane when it's an hour's drive away? Aren't both parks day use trails parks? I don't believe that plans this extensive will be effectively implemented with the

current management system out of Riverside. As the two largest state parks (and arguably the most complicated), why don't they have separate managers?

5. On page 5, what is a "passive" snow play area? On page 9, the same area is called an "active" snow play area. What sort of winter recreation is actually planned for the visitor center? Will a snowmobile trail still go through the visitor center lot to connect to other side of road? What happens to the existing park office? Will it become a trail head? Could the house become a vacation rental?

6. How are overnight accommodations at "Jerry's House" consistent with a day use park? How will overnight security be provided for guests since the park gate can't be locked? Why do you think visitors will want to spend the night there when Bear Creek Lodge always struggled?

7. Will the Selkirk Lodge expansion include a separate equipment/firewood shed and race timing shack? Will it include a larger ski patrol office and concession area with expanded storage capacity for volunteer groups? What is "enhanced" and expanded parking? What happened to the horse camp plan?

8. Why build another trail up Quartz Mtn? What are the access and functionality issues that would justify it? Likewise, why is a 5000' trail needed? How are you dealing with the previous Commission prohibition and WDFW's objections to the 5000' trail?

9. Will lengthy trail names be included at every junction? How are you justifying the considerable expense, maintenance, and routine replacement of larger signs with names? Will "you are here" maps be improved and maintained at all major junctions?

10. How large of a parking area is planned for the Day Rd entry? Will road access improvements be included?

11. With regard to the Projects Eliminated list, why are skijoring, upper 110 remaining multi-use, the connecting trail between the Lower Selkirk lot and Lodge 1, and the Warner property all on it?

Am looking forward to the meeting on the 22nd.¹³

I have been skiing up at Me Spokane since 1967. I have taught skiing up there for 24years.Brush cutting for 20 or more years. We used a cabin for Boy Scouts for winter camping. I will attend the meeting 10/22 at shadle library. Would like to to kept posted on the meeting. Thanks base camp¹⁴

Additional Comments

I see no reason to build and maintain a new bike trail that parallels the paved road just because a few bikers don't want to push their bikes up a few steep hills. We already have two good trails (110/100 and 120) that go from the park entrance to the Lower Selkirk lot, so there is no need for a third. Once the rerouting is done on 100E, the steepest sections in that route will be removed. Including this new trail in Phase 1, before other much higher priority and long standing projects are addressed just adds insult to injury, especially since we have accommodated mountain bikers in many ways already that have led to increased trail erosion, added expense, and conflict with other users.

I would also very much like to see a detailed deficiency report published on the Bear Creek Lodge with estimates on mitigation efforts. We definitely need to take advantage of Sam Deal's knowledge of the building, as well as those with experience restoring old buildings, such as Brad McQuarrie and George Bryant.

There is one more trail project that needs to be on the list and has actually been approved for many years. That is rerouting the junction of Trail 130 and the KC Loop Road below the CCC cabin. It is currently very steep, badly eroded, and difficult to negotiate.

I've attached my alternative Selkirk Lodge expansion proposal since it seems to have been lost. It's a proposal that has very broad support among Nordic Club members. It also has a number of separate parts that could be done as individual smaller projects, the highest priority of which is the equipment garage and woodshed. I would encourage you to work with the Friends Group and Nordic Club and make this a joint project with them. It could be initiated immediately.

And finally, I would encourage you to review Chapter 2 in my MSSP guidebook on the history of our master planning project. It covers over 20 years and will give you a better perspective on how long it takes to get things done at Parks.

Thanks for a good meeting!

Alternative Development Proposal for the Selkirk Lodge Area

by [x] and the Friends of Mt. Spokane State Park February 2020

1. Build new parking lot as conceptually approved in the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and add horse camp as in 2019 development plan. This should be the top priority.
2. Connect new parking lot to Valley View trail by a new Nordic trail. Expand the Nordic learning area as a race start and spectator area.
3. Construct a 30' X 40' addition to the west end of the Selkirk Lodge. Ten feet of the width will consist of an exterior covered ADA ramp on the north side of the addition. ADA entry to lodge will be through existing main entry. Consider enclosing and insulating existing outside walkway for a possibly heated ski waxing area with exterior windows for light. Main covered entrance with double doors and vestibule would be on south side of new addition. Use half round log siding for interior. Consider metal exterior siding to snow line and green concrete siding (with additional coat of primer paint) for exterior, including over existing logs (see photo of Lodge 1). Add insulation to exterior between siding and logs. New addition interior should have vaulted ceiling with windows in the gable. Existing roofing to be replaced with standing seam metal roofing. Electrical service should be extended to new addition. New west addition will likely be left mainly as open space for events with benches and clothing storage spaces around the walls. Consider a small stage at west end. This project will be one of the easiest and should be the next top priority.
4. Reconfigure the trail from Mountain View Trail down to lodge to join groomed track encircling lodge. Ensure plenty of flat trail near lodge for safety. See photo.
5. Build a new separate garage to the SE of existing half culvert structure. Install a garage door on each end for easy pull through of equipment and access to Mountain View. Build with concrete floor with drain and consider heating so that snow melts off equipment. Consider using strips of *cutting board* from Laird Plastics to drive snowmobile on. Construct an attached, locking woodshed for lodge firewood. Building size to be approximately 24' X 24' with 8' X 24' of this space being separated as the woodshed. Woodshed part to have a locking door for summer use and walls of 1" X 8" boards spaced 1" apart for air circulation. Remove garage from east end of existing lodge.
6. Assess capacity and location of existing Selkirk Lodge septic tank.
7. Remove concrete floors and walls from existing ski patrol room and restrooms and expand the restrooms by 4 feet with one additional toilet and sink in the women's and an additional urinal and sink in the men's. Replace concrete floor and walls after upgrading and rearranging the plumbing system in both restrooms. Add double entry doors to restrooms for added privacy for changing clothes. Maintain a smaller janitor/plumbing closet between restrooms and keep east door for access to ski patrol office as well as west door for access to water supply for food prep. during events. Add more electrical outlets to existing lodge area at east end for food prep.
8. Construct a 30' X 40' addition to the west end of Selkirk Lodge with a second story of same size. Use approximately 20' X 40' plus a 10' X 10' work space for the rental shop. Use the remaining 10' X 30' space on the east end for the ski patrol, including a private room with 2 beds in the back. Extend plumbing to ski patrol room and work shop for sinks. Construct an exterior fully enclosed locked stairway on the far end of the addition to the second floor to be used as a general storage area for ski patrol, rental shop, Nordic Kids, Langlauf, adaptive, etc. Main entry doors for the rental shop, ski

patrol, and covered stairway would be on the south side with separate vestibules to keep snow away. This project can't be done until the garage is built. Enough space will be left between the end of the building and the garage for driving vehicles and the groomer around the lodge and up to the garage. 9. Build a separate race timing shack near the learning area with underground power. Shack needs to be 5-6 feet off the ground, heated, and be big enough for 4 race officials to have a clear view of finish line area. ¹⁵

Washington State Parks bought the building and did due diligence after the fact. We the people now own a piece of history that needs maintained for future generations. Find the funding and fix the building. Having a huge expensive park entrance does not serve the people. A public-private partnership could be just the route for this project. Thanks, ¹⁶

Is paving the road from 1st lodge to 2nd lodge included in new plans? Went there last winter and the ruts were huge. Or maybe it's been taken care of since then. It definitely could deter me from going there again. Thank you. ¹⁷

My opinion:

I'm leaning more towards the first option and away from go big because concerned about wildlife habitats and with adding in more people, more bicycling (any thru forest, big cats will chase faster moving people and they do live there, that wild Animals such as deer, moose, elk, bears, and mountain lions will be forced out of their homes and that more animals will be killed simply for being in the same area as people. I also do not think making it a huge tourist destination is a good idea because keeping it mostly natural and not very busy is what makes it nice and enjoyable for all. More hiking trails and the biking trail mostly along the roadside sounds good.

Other suggestions & feedback

A gift shop at entrance to Mountain could be a nice addition with bathrooms with flushing toilets should be very important! No one wants flying insects landing on them while trying to use the restroom, especially not women who have to sit down!!! The ski lift for summer use to view nature scenery is good idea. I think you could use existing ski areas for skiing and snowboarding, even for "tubing" which would be nice!

I'm worried too much development at and near the park may ruin the natural beauty and wild animals' homes that are important and what makes Mt Spokane special in the first place. Worried other parties may buy land to build hotels etc contesting the mountain, ruining it for local people and animals who live there and or drive up there all the time. So I'm hoping you'll keep the wild animals and forest preservation in mind when making all decisions.

Sincerely, ¹⁸

I would like to suggest a gift shop and bathrooms with flushing toilets which are especially important to women who are often overlooked when it comes to our State Parks. Unlike men, women must sit down and do not want flying insects landing on them while they try to use the restroom. It's unsanitary and gross! I would like to also suggest some type of restaurant open year-round with scenic view! Then people could drive up for lunch and eat there! With signs telling people there's food there. I support more hiking trails, biking along roadway idea, and the scenic nature ski lift.

Sincerely, ¹⁹

To Whom It May Concern,
[State Parks Department / Specific Park Name]

Subject: Request for Improved Restroom Facilities in State Parks to Support Public Health, Sanitation, and Visitor Comfort

Dear [Director/Manager/Department of State Parks],

I am writing as a concerned visitor and supporter of our state parks to request the installation of flushing toilets or other sanitary restroom alternatives in place of, or in addition to, existing vault or pit toilets. While I deeply appreciate the effort to maintain our natural spaces, the current restroom conditions pose significant public health, sanitation, and accessibility challenges—particularly for women and anyone who must sit to use the restroom.

Vault toilets, though inexpensive to maintain, often harbor strong odors and attract flying insects that land on users during use, creating an unhygienic and unpleasant experience. These unsanitary conditions not only discourage park visitation but also risk bacterial exposure and reduced compliance with proper hygiene practices. For many visitors—especially women, families with children, and individuals with mobility or health concerns including veterans and people who are immune-compromised—this is a major deterrent to using the trails and enjoying our parks fully.

Installing flushing toilets or improved sanitary facilities would demonstrate a commitment to public health, inclusivity, and environmental stewardship. It would also likely increase park attendance, as cleaner, more user-friendly restrooms greatly enhance overall visitor satisfaction.

I respectfully urge the State Parks Department to consider allocating resources or pursuing grants to modernize restroom facilities in high-use areas. This would be a meaningful step toward ensuring that all visitors—regardless of gender, age, or physical ability—can experience our beautiful parks safely and comfortably.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important issue. I deeply appreciate your continued dedication to preserving and improving our parks for all who enjoy them.

Sincerely,²⁰

MS 2000 BOD had the following comments on the draft being circulated. In Project Description-Phase 1-3

- Move- Parking from Phase 2 to Phase 1-coincides with State Parks Linder Ridge Road improvements. Design could be incorporated into planning phase and pre-approved.
- Phase 2-Change-Remove Non-Summer from Parkway Express and Beginners Luck. When chairs are replaced, Parkway Express and Beginners Luck would be used to support “Summer Camps” not “public.” Summers Camps could be more focused in concession area, reducing traffic on parks roads and trails. We would propose one intermediate bike trail from Top of Parkway Express to Lodge 2 to support Summer Camps.

In Appendix:

Reword- Expanded Lift Capacity (why is this one bold)

- Replace Vista Cruiser-Summer Operations-Remove already in Phase 1
- Replace Parkway Express, Beginners Luck-Summer Camp Operation (Campers Only)

- Replace Hidden Treasure-No summer Operations

Remove Summit to Base Cat Track/Fire Road. Or Add in our priorities/phases access road to Parkway Express/Hidden Treasure-Currently 20% plus grade not feasible to service mid mountain. As well this road would be necessary to install water system. No concrete vehicle can make it to mid mountain with existing road infrastructure.

This is in follow up to our phone conversation.
