

Trail Advocates

of the Clackamas River Ranger District of the Mount Hood National Forest

Editors Only: [News](#) [Stories](#) [Pictures](#) [Files](#) [Shortcuts](#) [Discuss](#) [Logoff](#) [Help](#)

Lost road access?

Topic: Lost road access?

Author: Robert Koscik

Topic Started: 6/4/2007; 12:01:03 PM

Last Posted: 6/5/2007; 7:05:45 PM

Lost road access?

Robert Koscik : 6/4/2007; 11:01:03 AM

Reads: 152, Responses: 6 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

"It is possible that we may lose the roads leading to our more obscure trails. An environmental organization of attorneys is pushing hard to close roads and restrict access. They want us to walk miles of ripped up roads to get to our trails. Trail lovers need to pay attention and have their voices heard."

Can you please provide more information on this subject?

[Discuss this message.](#)

Navigation

[Home](#)
[About](#)
[Trail Index](#)
[Get Involved](#)
[Hikes](#)

Discussion

[Chronological](#)

[By Topic](#)

Membership

[Sign Out](#)

Re: Lost road access?**Donovan** : 6/4/2007; 6:16:03 PMReads: 158, Responses: 5 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

Mount Hood National Forest Transportation Plan. The Plan is at an input stage, tentative implementation next year.

The usual polarities are charged, of course, with few voices presenting proactive solutions. As usual, the Forest Service is caught in the middle.

[Discuss this message.](#)**Re: Lost road access?**[Edit this Page](#)**Rob Williams** : 6/5/2007; 6:35:58 AMReads: 153, Responses: 0 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

How do we provide input?

[Discuss this message.](#)**Re: Lost road access?****Robert Kosciak** : 6/5/2007; 6:40:57 AMReads: 148, Responses: 3 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

Here's what I found: (pretty vague)

SEC. 402. TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

(a) In General- The Secretary shall participate with the State, local governments, and other Federal agencies in the development of an integrated, multimodal transportation plan for the Mount Hood region to achieve comprehensive solutions to transportation challenges in the Mount Hood region--

- (1) to promote appropriate economic development;
- (2) to preserve the landscape of the Mount Hood region;
and
- (3) to enhance public safety.

(b) Planning Process- The transportation plan under subsection (a) shall--

- (1) conform with Federal and Oregon transportation planning requirements; and
- (2) be developed through a collaborative process,

preferably through the use of a commission composed of interested persons appointed by the State, with representation from the Forest Service and local governments in the Mount Hood region.

(c) Scope of Plan- The transportation plan under subsection (a) shall address issues relating to--

(1) the transportation of individuals to and from areas outside the Mount Hood region on major corridors traversing that region; and

(2) the transportation of individuals to and from locations that are located within the Mount Hood region.

(d) Contents of Plan- At a minimum, the transportation plan under subsection (a) shall consider--

(1) transportation alternatives between and among recreation areas and gateway communities that are located within the Mount Hood region;

(2) establishing park-and-ride facilities that shall be located at gateway communities;

(3) establishing intermodal transportation centers to link public transportation, parking, and recreation destinations;

(4) creating a new interchange on Oregon State Highway 26 that shall be located adjacent to or within Government Camp;

(5) designating, maintaining, and improving alternative routes using Forest Service or State roads for--

(A) providing emergency routes; or

(B) improving access to, and travel within, the Mount Hood region;

(6) reconstructing the segment of Oregon State Highway 35 that is located between Mineral Creek and Baseline Road to address ongoing debris flow locations; and

(7) creating mechanisms for funding the implementation of the transportation plan under subsection (a), including--

(A) funds provided by the Federal Government;

(B) public-private partnerships;

(C) incremental tax financing; and

(D) other financing tools that link transportation infrastructure improvements with development.

(e) Completion of Plan- Not later than 2 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall complete the transportation plan under subsection (a).

(f) Authorization of Appropriations- There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000.

[Discuss this message.](#)

Re: Lost road access?

Donovan : 6/5/2007; 7:20:26 AM

Reads: 166, Responses: 2 ([view responses to this item](#))

This morning I heard on the radio what I had heard also from people who attended last weeks event at Sandy that BARK's goal is to close all roads that do not lead to the most popular hiking areas. What a great incredibly stupid idea!

We will need to fight hard to preserve access to every District trail. Lets all remember that we actually have relatively few trails for a District of our size. If we do lose a trailhead, we need to have the trail built or rebuilt down to the next available road. This would also be the kiss of death for a future increase in available hiking trails.

From what I understand, they are upset about culverts. My suggestion would be that they do as we do with the trails: go out and fix or clean themselves. Like, labor, for instance, action.

I must admit I am sick of BARK, ONRC (Oregon Wild), and the Mazamas and their careless attitude about preserving trails. I fail to perceive the problems in our District that require such draconian closures of land and access to users. I wish they would turn their attention to real problems like the privately held woodlands.

[Discuss this message.](#)

Re: Lost road access?**Robert Koscik** : 6/5/2007; 7:44:24 AMReads: 189, Responses: 1 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

Yeah Donovan I'm sick of the politics too. But hell you can't swing a dead cat and NOT hit politics, it seems to have something to do with self preservation of the ego..."look at ME!!" People are very easily blinded by self-centered immediate interests. It takes a very clear head to see the big picture, and even then it can become clouded with time and cultural changes.

I can see the FS dilemma, it does cost \$\$ to maintain these roads, especially to points without revenue. However, there also needs to be fire and administrative access unless we go back to pack trains. Culverts ARE bad for returning salmon...and there are far too many roads tearing apart our lovely Clackamas. I agree that some roads have to go. They also help to deliver broken bottles and burned out cars to pristine places. But I would be surprised to see a vast reduction, too many people are out there using the primary and most secondary routes, including the Forest Service. Also consider the many thinning projects out there, and the areas still being actively logged. Roads like the Abbot would probably be in danger of being closed. I read that ONRC will be leading a guided "hike" up the Abbot to explore the "ridge between the wildernesses" in June. I think that's veiled politics, and I've really lost interest in that group because of their political bent. They seem more concerned with legislation than the meat n' potatoes of the issue.

We DO have few trails, but think of how many gems await out there....after studying maps for some time, I'm very interested to see how many of the oldest and most historic routes can be preserved. I think that should be a priority - old Indian routes and the earliest Forest Service trails. To me these are the cream of the crop and it would be great to restore and identify as much of this treasure as a network instead of fragmented bits and lost paths. I would like to try to make that a priority somehow, but am a bit overwhelmed with the concept! But that is indeed our living history in the woods like you stated previously.

[Discuss this message.](#)

Re: Lost road access?**Tom Kloster** : 6/5/2007; 6:05:45 PMReads: 217, Responses: 0 ([↩](#) view responses to this item)

I think a lot of them are going to have to be closed, or deteriorate into oblivion, simply for lack of money. There is no money in salvage/thinning work (though it surely needs to be done in the plantations), and Congress will increasingly be focusing federal dollars on social services for many decades to come. Urban transportation (my day job) is under the same squeeze, with each reauthorization over the past couple of decades being smaller than the last, when you adjust for inflation.

The good news for trails is that public interest in outdoor recreation is growing in response to a bunch of factors, and in our area, we're also going to be adding at least 1 million residents to the Portland region over the next 30 years or so. That combines to create a lot of user demand for trails -- though I would point to Donovan's comment in the previous post, and suggest that trailheads might be moved to lower road access, or even re-routed to nearby paved roads and highways. My thinking on this is that, when compared to building and maintaining roads, trails are a drop in the bucket. So it would be more cost-effective to extend a trail and abandon a road in almost any circumstance.

I'm pretty optimistic that trail funding can head back into a renaissance period again -- mostly because the money required is a pittance in the federal budget and because of growing demand for outdoor recreation -- especially in our region. Funding roads (of any type) is a different problem, and I see the erosion of funding continuing on this front for years to come.

Tom

[Discuss this message.](#)

Response text:

Normal Font Size

B *I* U

View HTML Source Use CSS

Post Response

This Page was last updated: Tuesday, June 5, 2007 at 7:32:33 PM
Copyright 2009 [Trail Advocates](#)

[XML](#)