


Report for MacKenzie Trail Plan

Response Counts



Totals: 274


1. What answer below best describes you?



Value	Percent	Responses
Neighbor	19.6%	44
Trail User (Non-Neighbor)	71.6%	161
Spokane County resident (Non-Neighbor, Non-Trail User)	8.0%	18
Other	0.9%	2


Totals: 225

2. How do you primarily use MacKenzie Natural Area?



Value	Percent	Responses
Dog Walking	16.0%	36
Hiking	47.1%	106
Mountain Biking	62.7%	141
Horseback Riding	9.3%	21
Nature Viewing / Bird Watching	11.6%	26
Trail Running	21.3%	48
I don't visit MacKenzie Natural Area	11.6%	26

3. How should Spokane County Parks, Recreation & Golf modify the draft trail plan proposed for MacKenzie Natural Area? Click here to view draft trail plan.



Value	Percent	Responses
I like it as-is and wouldn't change a thing.	37.2%	73
Remove proposed new trails, except re-routes.	4.6%	9
Add more new trails to the plan above and beyond what's shown in the draft plan.	48.5%	95
Other - Write In (Required)	9.7%	19

Totals: 196

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Add what is shown, keep what is there, and add more trails beyond what is shown to prevent crowding and people forging new, illegal trails.	1
Allow e-Bikes	1
Allow for a volunteer group to establish a 9-18 hole disc golf course	1
Totals	19

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Horse trailer parking ONLY in the Parking Lot designed just for horses.	1
I trust your judgment	1
I would add a decomissioned piece that is unmarked in the NEpart of the property.	1
I would eliminate all illegally built trails and finish the bike path construction to connect the Mackenzie natural area to the county park.	1
If the optimized new trail is proposed, remove the lower trail and just connect directly from the new trail. I think having two trails essentially parallel would reduce the experience for the hiker, while would not be much different if the new trail was the only trail across the property, with egress points along the existing trials.	1
Include signage to keep users off private property	1
It would be great to see a section of this property be designated for disc golf.	1
My spouse and I are very frequent users of the MNA. We like the plan, especially the deer buffers. We do not use the area for biking, but we suspect the 0.16 mile section at the east of the map is not going to work well with bikes. We always take it as hikers, but for bikes, it is fragile and has many switchbacks. Bikes would tear it to pieces, I'd fear.	1
Need to have another trail head for horse users as this was spearheaded originally by IEBCH and at times too congested for horse trailers	1
Not sure about this. I don't see the need for more trail at this time, unless the object is to attract more users. Currently parking seems adequate for existing trail use but additional trails attracting more use would require additional amenities including but not limited to parking. .	1
Ok, third time... I like the park the way it is and am concerned development will overburden this small gem of a park with mountain bikers. I'd like it if we could keep the the steep trails because they are enjoyable to hike. As an almost daily user I am opposed to more development. Thanks	1
Put a disc golf course there.	1
Separate equine and wheeled vehicles. Establish horse trailer parking and enforce violations.	1
Should be kept as a preserve and not a mountain biking course. Hikers and bikers are not a good combination.	1
Totals	19

Other - Write In (Required)**Count**

Sorry, I had an x here and hit next too soon.

1


x





1

Totals

19

4. In the previous question, you selected an answer to reduce the amount of trail in the proposed draft trail plan. Why?



Value		Percent	Responses
Impact to wildlife.		33.3%	3
All of the above.		22.2%	2
I like it just the way it is.		22.2%	2
Concerned over more mountain bike use.		22.2%	2

Totals: 9