

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/31/2024 4:18:00 AM

First name: Jill

Last name: Cartwright

Organization: LO TAHOMA

Title:

Comments: It is hard to know where to start, just when you formulate an opinion, another obstacle appears.

A new weight restriction was imposed, July 24, 2024, for the Fairfax Bridge (SR 165) due to structural concerns found by WSDOT during a recent inspection. The weight restriction went from 40T to 8T.

The Carbon Glacier Corridor is currently posted as an area of limited EMS Services beyond the Fairfax Bridge.

We are up against Mother Nature, climate change and our deteriorating infrastructure. The Fairfax Bridge could end up making the decision for all of us, without it, the entire Carbon Canyon would be cut off.

The 3 options given in the Analysis are all related to FSR 78 and the concrete bridge. Having been involved in the 1990's, when Mt Rainier National Park was doing a similar analysis regarding the Carbon River entrance and the future of the motorized road to Ipsut campground, it was fairly obvious at that time, that the Carbon River itself was going to decide the future of the road, and it did.

I am grateful that the decision was made to convert the decommissioned road to a non-motorized trail, because 2 decades later, although not equitable access, there is still access to this area.

With that said, I would support Options 2 or 3. Option 1 seems unrealistic, a creative one, but a 'Hail Mary Pass' none the less, with an exceptionally small chance of achieving completion.

As a 20-year resident of the Carbon Canyon, I've seen the impact the lack of USFS staffing/boots on the ground/lack of enforcement with an increased dependency on volunteers has had, it is palpable.

I was currently involved in a one-year campaign fighting to keep the US Forest Service office in Enumclaw instead of relocating to North Bend. We were successful in postponing their departure for the next 5 years, but what if we had not? Where would we be now? We need to be honest and realistic.

I like the idea of maintaining FSR 78 until a catastrophic event removes the road or funds to maintain it are depleted, because access would still exist for as long as possible, not only to FS & Wilderness lands but to the Carbon River entrance of Mt. Rainier National Park.

I see the benefit of Option 2, decommissioning FSR 78 and restoring the natural boundaries of the floodplain while converting the decommissioned road to a non-motorized trail while we still have time. This may be the best option to survive future flooding while providing continued access. Although cooperation would greatly depend with Mt. Rainier National Park, as this would severely impact public access to the Carbon River entrance.

May the force be with us,

Jill Cartwright