

Sustainable Recreation Work Group

Responses to online survey conducted January 2009

Note: Answers below are verbatim as received and have not been altered or edited.

Comment Text 1. Please share your ideas for sustainable funding

1. 1. Use ALL moneys collected from ORV users to fund ORV business. 2. Contact all licenced ORV users and re interested "problem solvers" for the purpose of addressing the concerns. 3. I would be willing to participate.
2. I am willing to pay higher fees for the tags for more law enforcement, more trails, and opening up more trails.
3. Lotteries is a good idea.
4. collect from current ORV licensing, charge a "moderate" fee to access gated areas
5. Give us the money from the gas tax that we should be getting
6. I would certainly pay a fee to enter currently gated roads, provided the fee is generally affordable.
7. User access fees. Revenue from outdoor events such as off-road triathalons, mt. bike races, horse events, etc. and enforcement of lands where they are next to other public lands such as State Parks, county, or DFW.
8. There are recreational groups out there that are willing to help with or do trail maintenance for the use of motor communications between ATV, Motorcycle, and Snowmobile groups are very important to offset the costs of m areas
9. Encourage congress NOT to spend \$200,000,000 on Inaguration and spend the money on the people who ele place! Collect the \$\$\$\$ billions \$\$\$\$ loaned to other countrys that has never been payed back. Third legalize n so heavy that is is no longer profitable. Use the \$\$\$ to fund state recreation programs and State parks. Lastley idea.
10. I would think that the 40% taken from the ORV funds would be enough to maintain the minimal ORV trail system state today. If it is not then I would suggest that the entire DNR system should be overhauled and reorganized. Additional trail funds, if necessary to create or maintain new trails should be derived from horse back trail users currently pay no fees.
11. Lottery sounds interesting. A reasonable/affordable user fee. A reasonable ORV license structure.
12. Lotto sounds good to me....or a SMALL user fee.
13. I think that if the money that was collected from the NOVA fund was used for trails and access that would help VERY IMPORTANT POINT IS - The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the . Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 7 this study about \$7million of our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
14. Get the general fund money back in the correct hands, it has been misused for to long. When do you expect to needs to be done. As you see i'am not political.
15. Use additional funds from the gas tax generated from offroad vehicle gas sales
16. IT's my understanding the ORV fund is sustainable and actually has a balance. These funds should be spent o land for off-road vehicle use.
17. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
18. A DNR lotterie would be a great idea if 100% of the funds went to supporting recreation on DNR lands.
19. Involvement of private enterprise. Sponsorsip by Clubs, ATV dealers, Guides and local retail.
20. Pay for use daily fees. Example is in places in Canada, the snowmobiling world pays for use when they arrive : Some places have automated equipment that you pay and get a pass for the day, yes there is an investment, b for its self. I would not have a problem paying \$5-\$10/day/family
21. Keep costs at a minimum...solicit donations...advertise for volunteer work...different clubs and or organizations campground to maintain...keep the public involved and feeling good about the work they are doing...help OHV large trail and road systems to encourage use from outside the area...this will help bring additional dollars to th areas.
22. Tab fees
23. We need a permit system similar to the northwest forest pass. Funds from the passes should only be used for 1 user marks (4x4, quad, motorcycle, hiking , ect.
24. ORV License fees

25. Revenue through lotteries is a great idea. A certain percentage from hotel and restaurant taxes, funded largely by
26. Use monies collected from ORV tags.
27. Take money from the lotteries, yes! Also make some of the funding come from the ORV tag charges!!! That is v
28. Other types of users do not have to pay a fee to use DNR facilities and trails. No additional fees should be plac
More DNR land should be open to ORV use to eliminate the over crowding that is occurring in the small areas c
ORV use has been forced into by the DNR closures of prior ORV use areas. The DNR should not take almost 4
funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas. The additional funding should come from basing the g
the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance
135).
29. ORV gasoline paid for off road use
30. The Off Road Recreation Vehicle owner has to purchase ORV tabs, maybe hickers, bickers and horse back pe
contribute. Revenue can be through day passes or annual passes like our National Forest require.
31. All users (hikers, bikers, ORV, etc) of DNR land should pay a use fee. At present, 40% of fees collected from C
(NOVA) go directly to DNR. Hikers, bikers, and other users of the same DNR land don't currently pay a usage f
32. Pay like a Boat launch, pay as you go...or similar to purchasing a fishing or hunting license in advance.
33. Our vehicle tabs fees for off-road vehicles were increased recently. We need to make sure it goes to trails and
by off-highway vehicles and not allowed to be diluted to other uses or raided by the legislature to use for other
34. Have the DNR stop taking there % off the top of OHV Fees and put that money back to the system we are usin
systems". Open more areas to ride instead of over crowding the few we have. Possibly charge for OHV areas.
uses DNR land pay instead of just OHV users.
35. ORVs pay to use this land, tax others or drop ours!
36. Day use fees
37. The use of lottery funds is a great idea. Create a "Friends of DNR Recreation Program Fund" to which individu
can donate - perhaps provide an inexpensive window decal or something as evidence of participation, with diff
"sponsorship" for differing amounts of donations. A DNR Recreation Program auction? Assign caretaking of ap
accessible trails or sections of DNR recreational areas to groups, families, or organizations who would share re
maintenance & clean up with DNR (something along the same line as the Adopt-a-highway clean-up programs
38. User fees. Setting up at ORV's and collecting \$ for each off road vehicle entering, maybe \$5.00 on weekends a
Possible free on weekdays?
39. Motorcycle cubs would gladly share in all of these areas to help improve our facilities without a major increase in
40. Use part of the gas tax to help with funding issues
41. Off Road Motorized voluntarily taxed themselves through an OHV/ORV licensing program, this combined with
monies should be able to support sustained funding for motorized projects. However certain groups acting with
discrimination are attempting to de-fund motorized recreation by raiding this account. Steps should be taken to
funding raised by motorized users be used for motorized users, their recreational areas and trails, and of cours
associated with recreational motorized use. Thank you, John Eaton
42. I would like to see the funding already collected for motorized recreation VIA the NOVA fund used for motorized
purposes and not be pulled away and used for areas that do not allow OHV access. That is blatant missapprop
43. In this day and age all users of public lands should pay or no one should pay. If a license fee or user tax is paic
should have a major part in use. Thaking gas tax or license fees from motorized recreation to finance non motc
wrong any way you look at it.
44. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review
findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a
our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
45. provide fee for gated areas
46. The DNR has been recieving 40% of our Nova funds so a portion of the gas tax or ORV tab funds could be app
47. the lottery is a great idea but i thought it was to fund schooling and it doesnt seem be working for them, i believ
where you pay as you go such as poker runs, rally that bring groups together, encourage more of a club atm is
volunteer work will be brought in to the picture. get the dealers more involved in my case motor cycles if they w
should be involved in where there customers can ride them. shut down riding areas shuts down sales!!
48. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review
findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a
gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
49. Lotteries and special commemorative license plates

50. Get funds from timber sales for maintenance and new additions.
51. I think having everyone pay to access trails, like motorized users do through their annual ohv tabs. Hikers/biker purchase annual passes, one pass would encompass all trail access in all the DNR managed regions. And the pass is easily monitored by who has them just like the crab licenses, whereas you must have it "on you" when hiking, biking, or riding horses. Just like motorized users are required to have current tabs in which to ride on the trails, the non-motorized users would have the pass on them to use the non-motorized trails. These monies can then be put into a users fund and access fees can be improved, increased or maintained just those trails and the motorized ohv tab funds would be used to just maintain them. When the monies for either group are exhausted, then the work/improvements cease on that type of user trail and the trail builds back up again.
52. What about some of the manufacturers who manufacture products for the sole purpose of use off roading help them maintain their customer base.
53. I think charging for parking and doing a special lottery once a year would be a good start.
54. I am confused I guess, I thought that was what ORV stickers and snow park permits were for. And I am not sure they have been introduced in the eastern regions of the state, so why does it take so much money when nothing is being maintained when it comes to ATV trails.
55. What about a percentage of the gas tax like orv and snowmobile people get, and boaters. I would like to see a class of Olympia to give recreation higher priority.
56. Some should come from State and Federal gas tax. License tabs for OHV's. Maybe a fee on licensing recreational vehicles.
57. Lotteries are a good idea, what about the \$ from our license tabs? also, since hunters and hikers use these trails, maybe they should contribute \$?
58. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee.
59. I think revenue through taxation of other revenue generating activities that use the lands in question (logging, etc) would be a good start. Follow that with use taxes (ORV tags). However, since these are public access roads, the funds should come from gas taxes we pay in WA.
60. Charge for parking at what little riding areas we have left, I will be happy to pay \$5 a day to ride at an area to keep it open.
61. One area of funding we are losing out on is the thousands of illegal license plates being issued to non-street legal bikes, mostly KTM models. The "open" MSO (manufacturers statement of origin) allows owners to acquire street license plates. These open MSO bikes are not Federal clean air legal and can not be made legal. Once licensed these bikes are Street Bikes thus reducing our legitimate funding. A simple change of DNR policy to require ALL OFF ROAD UTVs and trucks to display an ORV tab would increase funding by tens of thousands of dollars per year and more at a reasonable total number of Off Road users.
62. Fees to run these trails. Maybe something similar to the NW forest pass, but for OHVs
63. Every single user of trails and public lands (hikers, horseback riders, ORV, etc) need to be required to purchase a permit throughout the state and should be ticketed if they fail to provide proof of the permit upon request of a law enforcement officer. Currently, the fees from the tabs on all my ATV's, trailer, and tow vehicle are not being used to fund my riding, while the areas I have access to on my ATV are reduced more every year. The reduction in access is creating dangerous situations with overcrowding riders into marginally maintained areas. ORV funds should be used for expansion, maintenance and enforcement of licensing and safety issues. Hikers, Horseback riders, kayakers, etc should be providing their own funding for areas I am prohibited from on my ORV. Take a look at Oregon's thriving ORV areas and the amount of revenue they generate to their local economies by providing and MAINTAINING ORV areas WITHOUT exorbitant licensing fees (currently \$10.50 for TWO year ORV Permit) and directing those fees to the ORV areas as camp hosts in exchange for a maintained site with power, water and propane. Reduces cost and provides trails benefiting the state and the volunteers.
64. a 1 or 2 year OHV tag to be able to use any/all state lands. example Oregon has a 2 year tag available for 10 cents a day. All OHV's are required to have them, vehicles typed by a class system, class I,II,III. Make sure that all licenses assessed by Washington go only to OHV use!
65. Charge a modest fee for a permit to ride behind DNR gates on state forest roads. This would be for on road use only, cutting permitted. Keep the access narrow enough so there wouldn't be a problem with illegal dumping.
66. Having a lottery based fund is a good idea, also letting riding groups volunteer, or requesting their help for site cleaning and maintenance would be a good way to minimize expenditures. I also personally wouldn't be against areas that had usage fees especially if they were quality riding areas.
67. It is acceptable to charge users additional fees to cover trail maintenance and improvement. For example a temporary ORV sticker fees for funding of ORV trail construction and maintenance is ok. It is unacceptable to charge ORV users and then disperse them (ORV money) to other users.
68. lottery, Permits, taxes.
69. gas taxes orv tabs

70. as an atv rider i have to purchase tags for my atv's which goes into a general fund but we are not the only user share our trails with 4xer's, hickers, horse back riders ext. maybe they should have to have some kind of a use
71. user fees
72. ORV tabs should be used in the funding of these projects
73. 18 Jan 2009 To: Sustainable Recreation Work Group Subject: Funding and Access Washington State recreatic complicated and difficult to comment on yet I will voice my concerns providing recommendation where possible these concerns and recommendation primarily from a individual user four wheel drive point of view and will not the importance of other types of recreation. The need for recreational funding and a substantial plan to implem methods for recreational funding was presented to the legislature by Washington State Department of Resourc recent past without being considered by that legislature for unknown reasons. I believe the solution of financial state agency and the legislative action as soon as possible. Those who fund recreation in Washington State m consider the need of the recreationalists and the needs of our states natural resources without trying to establis requiring additional funding. The Sustainable Work Group should identify the issues at hand without developing additional issues to be presented to the legislature for funding justification as I believe it is inadvertently doing. Washington State needs legislative decisions made and actions from land managers not excesses or explanati cannot be addressed. During the past couple of years I have been aware that DNR requested additional fundin legislature for projects involving Off Road Vehicle (ORV) recreation in areas which are not presently designate following paragraph is my reasoning why this type of request should not be approved. First, it's difficult to be su Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) grant process therefore I believe it is wiser to use those fi available towards established designated areas first without considering an increasing number of undesignatec attempt to perform one or two day emphasis patrols in undesignated areas in an attempt to establish additional that need to justify funding requests. I fully understand and accept that the need for additional areas is real and not believe they should receive funding until designated as official ORV sites by the respective agency includin is the area known as Burnt Hill located in Clallam County. Considerable resources including time and funds we the stated and understand DNRs wish to designate this area. It was introduced into the SEPA process and pull action. Again, considerable time and funds including NOVA Education and Enforcement (E&E) funding was us legal action. Presently DNR has not resubmitted this project into the SEPA process and has indicated they do r without additional legislative funding. A negative consequence of this recommendation is these undesignated a deserving may be located in counties geographically located where the number of recreationalist served tends from successful competiveness during NOVA grant evaluations preformed by Washington State Recreation an Office (RCO) committees. This is an issue requiring addressing from a funding standpoint. I believe the NOVA system may be flawed and should be evaluated. If any remote area which can successfully meet the needs of i reduce the impact on other areas then it should be officially designated. Second, once designated it should be funding based primarily on what it can offer , not necessarily on the number of recreationalists served. Intertwir another funding issue associated with the NOVA grant process. Distributed literature and conservation I persor ROC personnel indicate that matching funding is not required for NOVA grants yet that type of funding is requir in the applications and used during evaluations. The consequences of this is that small counties with lower pop directly proportional to the county's ability to provide matching funding this lessens the chance for a successful often ask myself why the NOVA grant process is structured in such a way and why small, low populated counti in the process. Through study and observations I suspect small counties do not participate due to the fact that available funding is from grants and since permanent recreational funding is not available, they would be deper which may not be available during their next cycle. If they were fortunate to receive a grant one year their chan another grant when needed is in question. If one would consider the fact that the ROC mandates long term lea ORV access and other mandates then they can understand why counties are very hesitant about entering into agreements without a reliable funding source. I have recently participated in an effort to form an ORV area in o and this issues was one of the primary the reasons the effort failed. It seems the NOVA grant program tends to populated and wealthier counties a huge advantage when competing for needed grants simply by using the "m according to their literature isn't required in the first place. Recommend the NOVA grant process be evaluated i for those as it was intended to when it was established and not provide for advantages or disadvantages by an most fundamental funding issues is the lack of permanent recreational funding in Washington State. Without sc permanent funding, recreational areas are in danger of being used beyond their ability to provide for a legal, sa environmentally friendly way. To what degree would this permanent funding be is difficult to determine and the even more complex issue but needs to be addressed by the legislature. Inadequate funding seems to be used more frequently for reasoning why projects are not being implemented, areas not maintained and enforcement is very obvious to me that the existing funding scheme is not The following are my ideas which may or may not be considered. 1. Four wheel drive vehicles used off road should have an ORV sticker. This issue has been dis wheel drive users and the only negative comment is the general comment, "If it was used exclusive for ORV tra in favor but if it is intended to supplement land managers budgets then we would be against it". 2. Recommend permanent funding to increase the number of DNRs law enforcement personnel whose duties include recreatio enforcement. An alternative would be to provide funding for Washington State Patrol to establish a recreational enforcement program. The program would be permanently funded, personnel would become available if neede emergencies, less training required and a consistent ORV education program may be available. 3. Recommen

structure of DNRs funding be evaluated and restructured. Fund DNR from the Washington State General Fund that Washington State Dept of Wildlife and Washington State Parks. This would give more permanent funding ; they presently seem to have and seem to need. Additionally, it would decrease their dependence on grant fund consequences when such grants are not successfully received. 4. Suggest those who have oversight on fundir Washington State actually study what is happening and get a handle on the obvious waste. Study the cost ass providing a new sanitary facility for a small staging area and then compare it to the cost of a modest 1,200 squ one will see an example of a wasteful funding issue. There has been a possible suggestion that recreation may a lottery. In my opinion this is a very poor idea. It seems to be an additional form of a grant, making an attempt shortfalls of inadequate funding. I do not believe the present lotto income funds were routed as presented to th do not believe recreationalists would benefit if a like lotto were established for recreation. I do not believe it can source of funding so drastically needed. Additionally, I do not believe those who promote this type of funding ac the issues involving recreation in Washington State. Access is also the subject of these comments but in my of statement is vague. I perceive your intention as the desire for comments concerning access available to recrea lands, both private and public. I look at the issue of access in many ways but believe there is simply too many (access to motorized vehicles. Gates and so called "tank traps" are seen more and more throughout the state a prohibiting motorized use and permitting non-motorized use but seen as an example of land managers inability issues at hand or deliberate prohibitions to specific user groups. It is extremely easy for land manages to see th solving issues simply by closing the gates and not allowing specific groups entry. They are only causing the iss areas hopefully outside their area of concern. Management using this technique is not solving any issue only p continuation of the problem. I do understand the number of negative issues promoting gates or barriers are nur believe land managers are adequately addressing those issues to reduce their impacts. The following is a prim concern. I must add that this example is used by DNR many times over during discussions concerning target sl aware of the issues involving target shooting at DNR's rock pits including poor choice of backstop, the percepti of targets and targets being left at site. The negative impacts are great while those positive are few. Let's take ; problem. Who target shoots at these locations, organized groups or individuals? I would say that at least 90% ; do the targets include appliances and glass? Because they make noise or discriminate when hit. Appliances ar a considerable cost of disposal. Why are targets left on site? The answer is obvious. Are those recreating in thi the consequences associated with their actions? Do the individuals who target shoot on these sites care about This is a very difficult question to answer but I believe there are those who are not aware and there are those v care of the consequences or impacts. There are those who would rather recreate at designated ranges but sinc lack of these areas then they will target shoot any place available. Is there sufficient E&E at these sites? I don't much easier to install a gate and deny access can definably be used to justify additional E&E funding. When w participated in range development issues? Does DNR work with Dept of Wildlife in an effort to address this issu agencies convey the negative impacts to individuals and the possible consequences of their action if not abate cannot be addressed by relying on visits to organized shooting groups and associations and leaving it up to the educate the individuals. Again, this is a very big issue and is one that dramatically contributes to recreational is individuals must be part of the solution and must be allowed to participate in the effort to provide recreational o believe both users must take care of public lands in a more favorable fashion than they have shown in recent p in negative impacts will only be responsible for more closure. I also believe governmental agencies must becor accountable for closures. I believe there are numerous roads and access routes blocked for unwarranted reasc access on private lands. Access us usually denied due to resources being damaged and that's a significant prc understand why private land owners are taking the actions they do with the following exceptions. Private land c experienced various legal actions by individuals hurt while recreating on the owners land. In the majority of cas unaware that this recreation was even taking place yet the legal action favored the recreationalist. Recommend Attorney General's Office evaluate public law, (I believe 102) that deals with liability and determine its worthine: those who provide for recreation for a certain amount of liability then make that fact known to all land owners a law is worthless and gives a false impression then get rid of it. I do believe there is room for responsible ORV r private land but given the issues involved it would be through agreements between land owners and users. Nei Individual Recreationalist

74. 1. Revenue through the lottery is a great idea. 2. Increase the cost of the license. But make sure that the increa directly to you.
75. Come up with some sort or "limited use" license tab or plate that would allow dirtbikes to get from trailhead to tr maintained roads.
76. Have the recreations pay for their own funding through use stickers or use taxes.
77. Use what you already have. Quit taking funds that are entitled to NOVA. Charge other users of our areas. Mtn | etc....
78. Funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee f Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" According to the study about \$7 million of our gas tax funds d legally should. ORV users paid fees for DNR facilities but other types of users do not pay any fees.
79. I honestly would like to see a bill introduced that would allow for registering and purchase of ORV tabs for older like. I believe there would be lots of people (including myself) that can't find the title for their older bikes but wou

register the bike knowing that it is not stolen. it would increase funding somewhat, and who knows? maybe rec ones at the same time. Off road use is supposed to be funded by law from the orv tabs and, and... our portion c is consumed while riding the areas and in a lot off cases closed course events on private property. It's time to s the OFF ROAD money benefits the ones who pay it out.

80. The ORV gas tax should be made available to trail maintenance All funds collected from ORV tabs should go d construction and maintenance Other trail users should pay as well besides only ORV (horseback riders, mount
81. Raise ORV tag cost slightly and commit 100% of those funds to ORV specific maintenance.
82. Lotteries
83. It seems to me that the ORV tax that is paid for licensing every year by the off road community would more tha of the DNR's funding problem if it just wasn't siphoned off for other non-DNR usage.
84. All ORV tab monies go to the DNR.
85. Use all the gas tax money for orv facilitys, thats who the tax is collected from.
86. Please keep motorbike trails open and maintained. I use them and is my number 1 source of recreation for my
87. use the ORV & NOVA funds as they were intended for!
88. 1.Charge other users an OHV tag for the use of the properties. A yearly tag equal to current OHV tags for Hors mountain bikers, and hikers. 2. Day use permits for areas or daily parking fees. 3. Overnight camping fees.
89. Actually spend all of the funds that you collect from the orv tabs,ect on what it is supposed to go to. New trails : ride.
90. Allocate all funds taken in from off-road users, to ORV areas for construction and maintenance. The system, wi properly, must be able to sustain itself, in a user - pays environment
91. gas tax rebate like the snwomobile program
92. registrations licensing lottery if it doesn't take from school funding trail access permits
93. I beleive gasoline taxes should be used to fund addition revenue streams for the DNR
94. lean more to volunteers Keep ORV money to ORV use
95. How about using the existing funding appropriately. Most of us who are active and watching know this is not beir most successful companys, they look internally first, has this been done? Maybe in the form of a audit? Where Where have they been used and by who? All we ask is some compitant information passed along to us, the en would have no problem paying for what we use. Seems simple to most of us. Just follow the money.
96. I would not mind paying more for my quad's tabs if I knew the extra money was to go to maintaining existing tra trails. A dedicated lottery would be a nice idea. How about selling advertising space on some quality trail maps having those trail maps available at the recreation sites? I would think towns near ORV facilities would be inter the activity as well. On any give weekend, Bellfair is booming with off road vehicles, quads, and dirt bikes at ga and restaurants. This money is coming in from other parts of the state and adds to the wealth of the town.
97. Use licensing fees of all ATVs and Dual Sport cycles for Off pavement maintenance ONLY. Enough diverting th
98. I would like to see the current and recently closed areas opened and maintained properly. Protect areas we ha closures.
99. Presently you are taking a share of the ORV license fees, plus gas taxes. However, the space for ORV's is shri year. How about applying these fees where they belong, and expand the ORV program, where they belong? ai fees, taxes, or assessments until the dollars are properly allocated.
100. it is hard to give my opinion without knowing how much money is needed.
101. Please use existing trails & logging roads that have not been used or maintained for years as a start should be building new ones. Create a R V road & trail pass that goes direct to that use, also see if you could get volunter groups that use R V's to help maintain the roads & trails. To much money goes to admin costs & never gets to programs & projects.
102. A legislative directive to fund the project instead of competeing in the grant pool. A portion of the gas tax. A spe like the one used to fund Safeco Field. The lottery revenue is a good good one. Part of the sales tax on orv sale Naming rights for high visibility riding areas
103. gas taxes lotteries
104. Use NOVA funds to fund the program.
105. When new ATV's are sold, many dont purchase ORV tags because they are to be ridden on private land only. I that any new ATV purchase pays for ORV tags.
106. Funding should come from one of the regularly collected taxes of the state. Notably, either the gas tax or proppe believe it should be user fees. User fees put's an unfair disadvantage to the poor by making them user discretic

- access public lands. If all of the residences help support it through the gas or sales taxes, the cost per person v
107. Sustainable funding can be obtained by charging user fees to those groups who pay no fees to use DNR recre. Currently ORV users are taxed via licensing and gas tax. Other groups should pay a similar tax to ensure susta. Currently DNR takes approximately 40% of NOVA funds right off the top before they are even used for ORV fa the "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" about \$7 million of our gas tax funds do not go where they should.
 108. If DNR used the OHV funds for OHV projects as actually required by law, then your OHV funding problems would Oregon actually does this and they have some of the best OHV facilities around.
 109. Lotteries sound good and also making hikers, mt bikers, and horse riders pay a lic. and tabs like orv users
 110. According to my sources, you are not receiving all the gas tax monies that you should. No new sources should current means are explored.
 111. lottery funding would be excellent. It is 100% voluntary funds.
 112. I know over the last few years, the fees paid to license and ORV have gone up substantially, at the same time I shutdown the last riding area in Whatcom County (North Fork). Where is all the money that is paid in licensing time gas is put in an ORV, Washington state gas tax is paid. Is any of this money going to build/maintain ORV ?
 113. 1. A portion of the gas tax could go to help with recreation funding 2. Offroad vehicle taxes 3. Trail Head permit permits could provide funding Seems one big problem is making sure that enough of the monies coming in from goes to recreation and not into a large General fund where it is siphoned off by other interests.
 114. 1. allocate 100% of the revenue from ORV tags to ORV areas and issues. 2. create a system similar to the OR Bikes, Horses, and Hikers. We all use these areas so it only makes sense that we all pitch in to support them.
 115. Increase fees for ORV tabs.
 116. Isn't the money already there? DNR has been taking approximately 40% of your Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonh Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds right off the top for over 35 years now! The additional funding should come from allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Review" According to this study about \$7million of our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
 117. We cant start by using my ORV tabs and taxes entirely toward thier intended use, I hear much of the funds are
 118. 1. Allocate 100% of the ORV tag revenue to ORV user areas. 2. Create a system similar to the ORV tags for ot hikers, horse riders, and mountain bikers. We all use these areas so we all should be willing to pitch in some e: maintain them.
 119. Continue to use revenue from off road vehicles taxation.
 120. Divert gas taxes from inappropriate uses back to ORV oriented uses.
 121. Oregon funds DNR funds from tabs and regristration of ORV vehicles. Where does WA revenue go?
 122. 100% of registration fee from Off Hiway Vehicles need to go to fund only off road projects, and grab a piece of they run on gas. Don't rely on the lottery it was to fund schooling and it can't do that, if you want good insight ta colition or Cal Four wheel. use NOVA and OHV funds as intended.
 123. I believe 100% of the exsisting funds generated by Motorized users should go to enhancing Motorized access ; current rules. By using the exsisting ORV tag revenues we could double access oppurtunities and enforcement source of revenue I would suggest is require an ORV permit for Street legal vehicles simialar to Oregon. There legal users are funding our access.
 124. WHAT PORTION OF THE ALLOCATION OF GAS TAXES GO TO THIS CAUSE? MAYBE A PORTION OF TH COULD HELP PAY.
 125. Parking passes for unload areas similar to snow park permits, as long as 100% goes to riding area developem improvements.
 126. Trail head user fee for motorcycles , perhaps work party days for clubs to maintain & police or law enforcment
 127. Given the current economic climate this is no doubt a difficult area. It would indeed be nice if voluntary contribu revenues contributed through the purchase of lottery products designated specifically for this purpose would ac that is needed. MY thinking is that it will not, but rather be a supplement to tax revenues, and user fees.
 128. You could tax all users for permits, like the ORV tag, except for bikes, hikers, and horsemen.
 129. Add a one time tax on all purchases or resale of ORV, I would gladly pay this at time of purchase
 130. Funding from the Lottery is a great idea.
 131. I think a share of the lotteries money is a fine idea, ORV licesning funds
 132. Tax Indian casinos
 133. I feel all users should pay a nominal permit fee to use DNR managed areas. User includes, horseback riders, C

snowmobilers, etc; anybody that uses the trails in the managed area. The fee should be tiered so frequent user yearly permit, and occasional users could purchase a daily or weekly permit. Permits should be available at a v locations, such as, gas stations, outdoor stores, ranger stations,etc. The permit should grant access to areas s maps, signage, user education, and enforcement should be part of the increased revenue from the permit. Enfr done at campgrounds, staging areas or trails. More areas need to be opened to public use. I feel a long term rc could be put in place and managed so heavily used areas could be given a chance to rest.

134. On the weekend of Jan 17, 18 2009 My wife and I spent over \$100 on fuel for off-road use. When the gas pump want a receipt, it will time out if you do not respond. It would take only a few hours for a SW Engineer to add ar THIS FUEL FOR OFF-ROAD USE". If the used ignores this question, the pump defaults to: "FOR ROAD USE" resets for next customer. Further to this, raise the cost of OHV tags
135. Orv tab go to orv Use area's only
136. A small share of the gas tax, a share from the license fees, maybe trailhead parking fees.
137. Charge a day uses fee, \$5.00? and provide a stong box at each location for deposits. Asking for donations at e also work with some literature explaining what the money will be used for.
138. allow groups or clubs to build more trails. open up camping/camp sites for OHV's.
139. admission charged at poker runs and other events. Local motorcycle shop donations. Fund raisers with donate these elected criminals out of office. lol
140. The funding the DNR reeives should only be used for projects that benifit the users that supplied the money in case of the Nova funds the ORV community has been getting the short end of the stick for many years. Also th transparent about where the money they do get from users is spent. For additional funding check out the "2007 Preference Review" (page 135) There you will find 7 million going to the wrong place. Why not charge horse ar way ORV users are licensed?
141. HAVE AUCTION`S OF GOODS FOR A DOLLAR FOR TICKETS . OR AT OUR WORK WE RAISED MONIES NEED AND WE HAD A 50/50 DRAW,WHERE 50 GOES TO THE NAME DRAWN AND 50 WENT TO THE CA RAISING IT FOR THE TICKETS WERE A DOLLAR WE RAISED ALOT IN ONE DAY,BUT YOU CAN HAVE IT THEN ONE DAY.BAKE SALES. HAVE A DONATION FROM EVERY MEMBER SO YOU CAN HAVE A GARA GOT STUFF TO DONATE FOR A GARAGE SALE.
142. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable fee. Areas that would be otherwise closed to motorized recreat license fees, much like Oregon. Even street licensed vehicles need an off road permit there. I live in Washingto use Oregon ORV areas. I would be happy to do the same here.
143. I'm insensed at the radical hiking perspective that's made a mockery of the term Non Offroad And highway Veh what part of that word says "fund hiking trails which can't be used by off road vehicles?" When former WTA sta offices of the former NOVA support, something is wrong. How can the public respect funding decisions if they c bureacrats who facilitate them? Regarding funding make sure that additional funding is based on the additional come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "20 Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study about \$7 million of our gas tax funds they legally should. C'mon Olympia, play fair ... or get out of the game. Give us back our gas taxes and let us a
144. all users of dnr lands should be finacially responsible not just the motorized users, the dnr should be accountat allocation of funds from the gas tax. not skimming off the top of it. returning the 40% would allow for less turmo cooperation from all user groups. raising or implementing more taxes is not now nor ever the proper way to do
145. I would suggest not counting on nova grants from off road vehicle fuel tax not to mention \$28 tabs for a start. It large number of projects that have nothing to do with motorized recreation are being funded with this type of gr right that ohv's have to pay to use a limited number of roads that already exist when other recreationists have t for facilities built strictly for them. With large numbers of areas being closed to motorized vehicles instead of pr recreation. This type of funding will likely decrease causing even less funding. So the answer may be user fees facilities such as hiking and biking trails. I don't believe it would be right for every tax payer to fund this type of r
146. The DNR already gets all the funding that it needs from current revenue sources. Better use of this money is al
147. Appropriate use of the ORV licenese money for ORV directly related activity.
148. fee based access for gated areas. small increas in orv permit fees
149. Charge to use a trail head parking area similar to a NW Forest Pass. Those who have already purchased ORV motorcycles should also get the DNR parking pass included with the ORV tab fee.
150. Easy. Use the proper amount of the gas tax for motorized users instead of siphoning it off for other uses. Utilize - show them respect and don't micromanage them. Do not think you need to have official DNR nannies overseer our use.
151. User funding should be a greater part of the Recreation Program. Increased enforcement could be paid for by r I write this, here in Chelan County it is only a \$150 fine for off-road driving. How bout \$1000, vehicle confiscatic

- rehab areas they have damaged?
152. Given that the money from ORV licensing already goes to the DNR I feel that the full amount of these monies should be for the purpose of enhancing ORV oriented activities. Since non-funded groups, such as bicycles, horses, etc. use the same facilities - why don't you also introduce licensing fees for them for use of the facilities.
 153. You could better utilize your staff to do campground and trail work instead of riding around in red trucks on rainy days.
 154. Well, let's see, I already pay for access fees for my uses. I pay to use boat ramps, ORV/motorcycle trails (permits), etc. Maybe we could tab mountain bikes. Have access fees for horse riders. Entrance fees for backpackers and hikers.
 155. I'm fine with user fees as long as all money is going to promote better riding.
 156. I have 2 dirt bikes and purchase tabs for them every year. Use our license tab funds for this purpose. I understand that the money I pay for my tabs actually supports limiting off road opportunities for myself and my family. We pay our way and are closed out of more and more DNR lands.
 157. It seems that most users pay nothing like us ORV users do with our ORV registration fees. Perhaps a parking fee similar to the USFS would capture some of the non-ORV traffic. But at least honor the ORV users as far as access and as payors and do not siphon the funds towards those intent on curbing our use.
 158. How about using the part of the gas tax that we pay to fuel our off-road equipment and the license tab fees that we pay on the equipment. It seems that both of these continue to increase and we don't see anything for the money that we have spent on these.
 159. Open new riding areas. For example in the Darrington area there are a lot of logging roads that loop around in the Teton Mountains. They are some roads that could be extended to be able to loop around to other roads to make ideas for scenic riding for tourism. This would bring in tourism to small towns & businesses. If you look at Michigan they have a trail that starts from southern Michigan to northern Michigan. This is open year round for dirt bikes, ATVs in the summer to snowmobiling in the winter. Utah has a great trail system now in place that's called the Paiute Trail system that now generates revenue which wasn't there before the trail system was in place. There is all kinds of logging roads in this state that could be used for recreation use. With more people riding dirt bikes, quads the more revenue you would have on ORV tabs & you could patrol these ORV parks with volunteers.... If you have any comments or questions please feel free to email me. Washington State is behind in what other states are doing now. Richard REDWOLF31722@yahoo.com
 160. As a lifelong Washington resident and a sole proprietor in the motorcycle industry, I have a great concern in the future concerning the responsible use of our public lands and especially the trails. First of all, we need accountability provided by the ORV permit fees and proper maintenance of popular areas. Enforcement of rules will be easier if they are made available to ORV permit purchasers. This pamphlet should list the open areas in general and high risk or special requirements. Unfortunately, only responsible persons will pay attention to the rules or special requirements for specific locations with this info is expensive but it is also very effective. I take pictures of all the trail heads with the way I can remember how the area was maintained. I do maintenance myself when it is obviously needed. I ride with a license plate for street use yet if I try to buy ORV tabs, it will remove the street legal status. That has to change if we have a good ORV system in place. I suggest you look there for some ideas. My foremost hope is the DNR's true responsibility to the American public is the boss. We pay your wages and expect to get our money's worth. That means ensuring that persons be appointed to the duty of decision making, planning, maintenance and auditing. Preferential treatment for special interest groups must be avoided as this will degrade the entire system.
 161. Lotteries, gas tax, tabs on off-road vehicles
 162. Keep the NOVA funds for trail maintenance and enforcement.
 163. Motorcycle usage permits: Allow dual sport motorcyclists (on road/off road) to access off road gated areas by using either daily or annual access permits through sports dealers and such. Dual sport motorcycles are road legal, follow road rules and pay taxes. Club sponsors: Allow motorcycle clubs (off road) to sponsor their favorite areas. Often such clubs have the resources that will maintain areas that DNR can't.
 164. Fund raising suggestions-- Increase the ORV tag fees and use ALL the funds from ORV tags exclusively for such areas. Have license use tags for mountain bikers. They use the same trails in the same way as ORV users. Private areas like campgrounds do at some of the higher use parking locations. Have a secure box and local enforcement agents to check vehicles for the pass. Otherwise, a modestly priced citation would be appropriate.
 165. I believe my fees and licenses and gas tax to ride my Honda 100 and the fees of other ORV users amply cover the cost of maintaining the small amount of trails that are available to us. Please use the money raised from our fees to fund trails. For hikers, perhaps a tax on hiking boots, backpacks, water bottles, etc. would generate money to cover the cost of maintaining these areas. I am not fond of user taxes at trailheads.
 166. It seems logical to that all of the ORV tab money should go solely to ORV resource development. Also, those people who use areas like motorcyclists should be contributing to the maintenance and development of ORV areas and DNR areas for ORV use. The users should include mountain bikers, horse riders, hikers and 4-wheelers or anyone else using the area.
 167. Allow Off Road groups to submit plans for new trails to be built. These trails could and would be built by the Off Road groups.

approved. This would give the Off Roaders more options for trails and to cut down on the high traffic of what fee making safer conditions.

168. Sponsored work parties.
169. Charge motorcycles, horses and hikers a fee to use DNR land, NOT just ATVs.
170. apply the existing gas tax monies to the orv trail system where they were intended to go
171. Develop some sort of fee structure for user groups who have not been tapped but traditionally utilize DNR land motorized users, access fees for hunters, etc.
172. well there rae off road forest areas we can stay overnight in and ride the trails and there are regular campgrouor rv campground ??? i have not found one yet you know one that ha sranger etc . bathrooms actual sites . it sear charge a bit more that a regular park . thats my only idea.
173. ORV Tabs ORV Classes
174. Perhaps spreading the fiscal responsibility to all those who use the facilities and trails. As someone who fits int see a more even distribution on who gets hit w/ fees.
175. Increased logging, mining, and other natural resource materials.
176. I am not opposed to additional funding through revenue lotteries. I would actually like to see the current gas tax where they legally should. I would also like the DNR to stop redirecting funds away from ORV and NOVA funds
177. Sales tax on outdoor gear, lottery, use fee for bicycles, horses, etc (non-orv).
178. DNR already gets 40% of the ORV and NOVA funds; no additional funds should be taken from these programs should come from other users of DNR land. Additional funding should also come from basing the gas tax alloc Legislative Audit and Review Committe findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review"
179. Please use all Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds for the use they were collected. Stop t other projects not intended to provide improvement of ORV areas. Anyone that pays ORV fees already pays fe rig they use to get to the few remaining ares we have left. If ORV fees were increased somewhat,(like pay to pl work IF all the NOVA funds were used for ORV projects.
180. I believe that gas taxes should be used to provide facilities for those who cannot afford RVs and motels. Off-ro: pay gasoline taxes like everyone else, but do no damage to roads. Therefore, their share should be used to prc Paying taxes with no benefit it is not fair. Also, the land that is used is often public land. By offering more of this more taxes can be collected. It is not fair to tax the public for schools, roads and other needs and then not allow lands which pay no taxes.
181. Lottery is not bad you could also do poker run or? Stumpjumpers , pantra are examples
182. I do agree that a lottery would be a great way of gaining funds. You already have the volunteer worker base so employees. I don't have any further Ideas
183. Membership programs- use annual membership fees to keep the areas opened/ maintained.
184. Put a toll booth at every staging area with envelopes that have window tags and charge a small fee like campir this money for our dnr lands only.
185. I do not mind paying a nominal fee each time I access DNR land.
186. From gas tax
187. Revenue from lotteries sounds fair, I can not think of any other at this time.
188. DNR has been taking approximately 40% of our Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Acti right off the top for over 35 years now! Other types of users do not have to pay a fee to use DNR facilities and t fees should be placed on ORV users. More DNR land should be open to ORV use to eliminate the over crowdii in the small areas of DNR land that ORV use has been forced into by the DNR closures of prior ORV use areas not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas. Funding should con gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Pre Performance Review" According to this study about \$7million of our gas tax funds do not go where they legally
189. I think lotteries is a very good idea.
190. License fee donation like the Organ donor program. Capture all the funds already raised and keep them in the
191. 1. The WA sales tax already collected from the sales of ORV sales should have a portion marked for trail supp amount of GAS usage by Off-Road-Vehicles & the tax already collected at the point of gasoline sales should h: for trail support. 3. The total amount of revenue collected from the sale of ORV Stickers should be used to only of ORV infrastrucor. 4.
192. A large portion of the funding comes from sale of ORV tags. Similar fees should be placed on other users such BMX bikes, etc. A daily use fee or annual fee in proportion to the amount of use. ORV tag fees from the NOVA

redirected to serve the ORV community or license fees should be reduced.

193. There should be no further fees imposed on off-road vehicles due to the fact that you are already getting 40% of NOVA funds that are paid by owners of off-road vehicles. If funding is needed, there should be fees collected from user groups (hikers, horsemen, mountain bikers). The off-road permits that we are required to run vehicles off the highway should continue to allow passage onto DNR lands. As it is now, the funding is not equally shared by all users, you are the ORV and NOVA funds. Have the other users pay their share. If it means kiosks at various trails, then do it.
194. As a dirt bike rider, I already contribute to the funding of these great programs primarily through my gas taxes on off-road vehicles. I am, however, concerned that motorcyclists and ORV people are discriminated against since they have to place to get funds from us but not other groups such as mountain bike groups, hikers, hunters, horse people or perhaps if there were some equality among user groups in getting monies then funding through grants would not be a bad thought about how to go about it but it seems that since ORV people are just easy pickings other groups get recreation areas at ORV people's expense. (people often critical of ORV users)
195. DNR has been taking approximately 40% of your Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Account funds right off the top for over 35 years now! Other types of users do not have to pay a fee to use DNR facilities; additional fees should be placed on ORV users. The DNR should not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and use it into ever smaller areas.
196. The DNR should not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas. This should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study about \$7 million of our money should not go where they legally should.
197. Keep funding from ORV tabs and State Licensing allotments going towards their intended uses, ORV areas are not cut.
198. Cut salaries of top level managers
199. How about partnering with off-road sellers within the state to promote the sport and increase use? More permits should equal more money, right? I do have to mention, though: I usually ride in Capitol Forest and, whenever I see a new trail open and most of the maintenance I've seen done has been by volunteers. 15 years ago I did some maintenance done by a convict crew, which should be cheap. What happens to the funds that DNR lands generate money from timber sales as well as from permits to pick Sillough (sp) and other plants right? I do agree your revenue should be regular, such as a line item in the State budget. Actually, that's probably the best area for the money for revenue to come from. Then things like developing new areas (off-road riding areas, please!) can come from grants and other sources.
200. Set amount of money from the lottery. All monies collected from ATV/Dirt Bikes/Horse trailers/Snowmobiles/Boats should go for DNR programs. Increase fees for wood cutting permits, especially Christmas Trees. This is a tough time for DNR for money.
201. Allow vendors to purchase permits to sell goods and services on DNR trails. Money from the permits and trail items would go directly to the fund. Designate a percent of existing tax dollars/gas to be placed in this fund.
202. Use the gas tax that we pay for our ATV. ORV for more places to ride in the state on the east and west side
203. Utilize the NOVA fund for motorized trails and then develop a fund that hikers and horsemen pay into. Have the state pass to utilize the non-motorized trails since they don't have a machine that they pay yearly tabs for like the ORV monies taken from the OHV tabs is placed into the NOVA fund and should be used for those users who paid in throughout all the trail systems. Thereby using the monies from each of these funds would go towards the trails generated for and only those trails. It would work like any other household fund: If there isn't enough money in the fund for motorized trail users improvements or new facilities so be it and the same with the non-motorized user trails. If all states or across the nation are required to live within their budget of income, we need to hold all states and agencies accountable.
204. Use what is already allocated correctly. Construction of new areas. Do not bother pending anything on any other trails would be a upstream battle against a VERY biased ignorant public. Those that ride and are involved already are not the problem.
205. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
206. Form/involve local volunteer groups to help maintain trails. Advertise "work days" in local newspapers.
207. Fundraisers such as riding adventures (fun runs). Lotteries also sounds good. Work parties to maintain or restore trails can be fun way to get things done by trail users. Also if this does already take place the word needs to get out to the public for help.
208. Since our state takes money from the lotteries for programs other than education, it might as well take it for DNR
209. We as off roaders already fund the uses of these lands through the fees we pay for our machines and it is the state's job to make sure we get to use these lands fully that we are paying for through these fees and taxes we pay, maybe away from the governor's plane and government car and cut her salary!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
210. In our state, revenue from the lottery was supposed to go to education. We already pay an ORV fee, so why isn't it

used?

211. Ensure NOVA funds aren't diverted to non ORV uses.
212. Many riders would like to have a plated dirt bike so that they can ride on roads that connect trails. Without a plate a ticket. What if there was a special category of tab that would allow limited distance rides on roads without having a plate? This "temporary road tab" would allow riders without street plates ride limited distances on roads in between for these tabs could go to DNR. I realize this is a long shot and would be difficult to get through all of the agencies to touch something like this, but I think the off road community would embrace this idea, even if it was somewhat these temporary road tabs.
213. I think I have also felt that a trailhead fee is one way to "pay as you go"
214. Log some timber, mine some minerals, graze some livestock. We can use our land without abusing it. Currently producing a fraction of the money from state land that could be realized on a sustainable basis.
215. How about tobacco or alcohol taxes?
216. We need more trails for riding orv
217. DNR already gets 40% of the NOVA funds.
218. Make other users of the trail system pay like we do with our tabs. Bicycles, horses they use the trail system too whole system, and yet we are the ones that are closed out first. Does that make sense? Gas funds should go to the survey several years ago was flawed. They failed to take in account the tow vehicles we use to get to the riding over taxing one group of people - we don't need more taxes on our orv's. Taking our funds and using them elsewhere cramming more orv users into smaller areas is asking for trouble. Keep the tax money received from the taxes use them properly.
219. Gas tax, lottery money, higher user fees
220. Ensure the accountability of slated funds from ORV tabs actually go where they are supposed to.
221. Why do you need more funding? ORV use is the only user group that is required to pay for access of this type. funded for this program for almost as long as I have been riding. Funding for ORV use should be equivalent to that of and horseback riders. In fact if you combine those funding sources with the specific ORV/NOVA funds we should be riding areas and not reducing them correct?
222. Charge a fee. Campers pay a fee. ATV users have to buy a tag. So hikers and day users should pay also
223. Allocate more money from the NOVA Fund as it should be. Money from the lottery would be a good idea
224. Since you already collect fees from motorized users, add a permit type process to all other users.
225. some states besides orv lic. charge for a lic to pay for access fees
226. Funding for special interest projects or continuation of special interest endeavors from outside sources will not administration or political subdivision in this economic climate. Therefore I would propose that ORV areas be funded that are or should be collected from ALL ORV AREA users. People will willingly fund things they use and when ALL users are funding the area they will use it respectfully. The problem comes when people feel that they something that they enjoy and others are using the designated area but have no respect for how it was created and maintained. I see this situation continually when hikers carry water and food into ORV riding areas and discard and wrappers rather than carry them out. Collection of users fees from ALL users by DNR and then spending that on designated areas will be a logical means of continuing and expanding ORV area and use. There is no reason that paid for by ORV funds couldn't be used to enforce use fees on individuals as well as orv vehicles. Just ask people like the WDFW does on their designated areas.
227. Try to get help/donations from the tribal casinos. The exposure looks good for them, and helps the recreational
228. Trailhead access parking passes. License Canoes
229. NOVA funds are provided for ORV use and these funds should be used to provide ORV program. Other users should have funding for their non motorized activity such as an annual pass or permit, camping fee and etc.
230. You already collect money thru ORV tabs and gas allocations. Enough is enough.
231. Vehicle registration fees specifically designated for improvements relative to off-highway vehicle trails, parks and
232. I would be willing to pay an annual fee of \$30-\$50 if I knew it meant trails for off-road motorcycles would be made from the program.
233. I have seen in Ca that they use recycling bins and use all the funds from this as a way to fund some areas like which at the camp site areas they have bins designated for recycling and it really did help fund that area.
234. why should orv have to pay others don't
235. Funding should come from every individual who uses the facilities.....Maybe certain state lotteries could be used for funding also.

236. Funding should be based on individual usage. The funds collected for specific fees should be used to benefit them into a general fund and used for other non-related costs. Let the users take more of the responsibility for planning new facilities and trails, maintenance, rule enforcement, and education public outreach. There should be less on maintaining a top heavy government agency, and more money spent at the actual sites. I feel that individual State areas into smaller zones where a zone Director could oversee volunteer workforce.
237. I feel that the key here is effective spending of the nova and orv tab funds you already receive. we do not need taxes at all. utilize a larger volunteer force by just putting the word out and we will be there.
238. require usage fee's for hikers and backpackers
239. lottery, percentage of vehicle registration
240. lotteries
241. Have more riding areas available and charge a daily use fee or allow families to purchase an annual pass. And have work parties to (Police the areas) and maintain the trails and riding areas.
242. Charge usage fees. Daily pass for people who don't use it much or annual fee for obviously more money but then they go a lot.
243. Manage current funding better. Expand riding areas to encourage more users, more off road permits.
244. We are required to register our ORVs. Could part of this cost be put toward funding DNR's Recreation Program
245. The funding should continue from state gasoline, oil, and green energy tax revenues. State lotteries would be as well.
246. Volunteerism could defray many costs. Volunteer patrols, Volunteer work parties, and the like could be much more managed and organized in concert with the DNR.
247. A portion of funds from lottery sales would be a good idea, too
248. I'm game to pay directly for the use of public lands. Sort of like using the hiking trails.
249. raise the orv tag fees and devote all funds to orv projects and trails + law enforcement and write large tickets for helmets, no tags and wreckless riding.
250. the lotteries sound very good and don't take money from the orv tabs. that should go to our us..
- Comment Text
251. well since i already fund this with my orv sticker and gas taxes why are my areas being reduced yearly and cost couldn't be because users like horse riders demand so much more area then the larger and more mobile group dont have to pay for usage like the orv riders do. so why not make the horse riders pay for a sticker to put on their 4 wheeler, dirt bike, or snowmobile rider have to have. then stopp reduceing the orv riders area and giving it to riders.
252. Lease trust land that is currently closed to public use, to private entities such as OHV clubs / organizations, equ clubs, etc... let the clubs be responsible for securing the land and maintaining it. DNR can periodically monitor the land. This would create funding, help lessen the use or over concentration of use at public parks on state trails likely encourage more people to join the various clubs or organizations and that will only help in educating the public properly use state trust land.
253. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE ALL OF THE REVENUE RAISED FROM ORV LICENSES, GAS TAXES AND NOVA INTENDED FOR ORV USE TO GO TO ORV TRAILS, FACILITIES AND ENFORCEMENT AT THOSE FACILITIES NEED NEW ORV TRAILS OPENED IN WHATCOM COUNTY TO RELIEVE OVERUSE IN COUNTIES WHERE PERMITTED. ROADS AND TRAILS NEED TO BE OPENED FOR HUNTERS AND FISHERMAN ALSO.
254. I am actual sport motorcyclist. I ride many forest service roads and legal trails. I would not mind paying a daily sort. \$5 maybe? Lottery would be ok too
255. parking fees
256. Use the portion of gas tax supposed to be used as funding for funding. Make sure our tabs tax gets used properly
257. Off road permits for bicycles using DNR trails and forest trails. Substantial fines for 4X4 trucks and Jeeps, so-called when they are caught tearing up areas designated for trail use. Larger fines for dumped garbage and possible illegal raising events.
258. Have meetings with local recreation clubs to listen to ideas. If possible enlist the help of motorized clubs to police others since there is not enough other law enforcement to be able to be everywhere to watch all the roads and trails could also help with maintenance of trails with the help of the forestry. They could somehow make reports back what trails they worked on and or where more effort was needed. If we could work together and show the environment aren't all bad would be nice.
259. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a

- gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
260. All of the fuel tax money should be used for motorised recreation - that is what it was created for. In addition TR Audit and Review Comiittee finding titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" found about tax money did not go where legally required. Stop the 40% diversion of gas tax money for other DNR activities finding mentioned above and you will have enough funds for motorized trails.
 261. by using more of the ohv funds for there intended purpose
 262. Charge fees for all users, not just ORV users. Gas tax money should be used just for ORV's not other program no charge for hiking, bicycling, camping etc. Every one wants to eliminate motor vehicles, yet they are the only
 263. lottery sounds good raise tags if needed do hikers or horse riders pay anything ?
 264. If we are going to pay taxes for recreational areas then I believe the money should be placed 100% back into tl program not used in other areas. Could use the money to improve the condition and safety of the trails.
 265. Lotteries
 266. Have ALL FUNDS collected from off-road user fees STAY in use for OFF ROAD RECREATION PROGRAMS.
 267. Direct fees from dedicated users to those activities, not elsewhere. Take 10% of fees and invest in endowment lifetime recreation fee pass and invest funds in endowment.
 268. Lotteries are a good idea. Raise the ORV sticker registration fees.
 269. As an atv rider we are all ready paying for DNR land use through our Nova funds. Any additional funds should funding which is already being collected but not legally going to the proper places.
 270. I believe in paying my fair share for services and recreational opportunities but I think the ORV users seem to a asked to pony up when funds are scarce. A couple of years back I was in support of fee increases for ORV tag funds whould be channeled into ORV opportunity. I don't see the results. Do the horsemen, hikers, etc. really p Additional funding should come from the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings "2007 Expedited Tax Prefr Review." According to this study our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should. I think that when one c of funds generated from ORV licensing in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties vs. the ORV opportunities avai counties the only conclusion that can be drawn is that too many people (agencies) are tapping these funds for I think other use groups should fund themselves and stop depleting the ORV intended funds.
 271. ORV tabs, daily use fees, annual use fee
 272. Use NOVA funds were they are suppost to be used not for other projects.
 273. get rid of the general fund, use revenue from orv license and sportman access permits, gas tax and to fund the people use.
 274. Our ORVs use gas that is taxed, You should get some of that tax money.
 275. use ORV funds for ORV stuff, do not divert the funds to the general fund or other non-ORV projects
 276. General Fund so that all residents share in the cost.
 277. additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Cc titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study about \$7r funds do not go where they legally should.
 278. Use the gas tax funds that are supposed to be used for Orv uses.instead of spending them on other uses.
 279. If the funds that were already being collected weren't being wasted on non related issues there wouldn't be a fu
 280. tax all types of user groups equally,don't forget that many different groups may utilize the same areas. Hikers a example) may be using the same areas as ORV and can contribute also.
 281. User Trail Fees, Gas Tax, Lotteries, License Fees
 282. ORV users are paying thier fair share. If additional funding is needed other users should pony up. More land sh to ORV use to relieve over crowding, which has been caused in a large part by DNR closures of ORV use. The take approximately 40% of our NOVA funds and crowd ORV users into smaller areas. Another area for funding allocate our gas tax fund that do not go where they are legally suppose to. See 2007 Expedited Tax Preference Review, page 135.
 283. Route currently collected taxes properly...Specifically NOVA funds. If there is going to be a tax on ORV users s
 284. I believe that we need to open up more ORV areas. The closing of ORV areas has caused significant crowding remaining ares. Which I believe causes more damage to the environment and increases the chance of crashes should be no new ORV fee since we already pay to use DNR facilities and Trails while the other users do not.
 285. Use the money that OHV users pay in for what it is needed.
 286. Put all of the administrative people in the field to actually work

287. Most of the 4 wheel drive "club" "groups" that are organized are more than able and willing to contribute time at the DNR in keeping costs down. The "clubs" "groups" would like to have projects that get them out into the unit areas to enjoy their sport. By having these people help with maintenance, trail building and etc. these people in "clubs","groups" will build pride in the area and will want to help maintain it's condition for ongoing use and enjoy goes out and does the above stuff it is hard for people to respect it, like if they had a part in it. Law enforcement be reduced by the mere fact that the areas would be visited by more 4 wheel drive people that have respect for worked on and would police the areas on their own as if it was their back yard. Planning, all the DNR would help is talk to the "clubs", "groups".
288. Use ORV and NOVA funds for their intended purpose, do not take this money and use it elsewhere. ORV users fair share for using trails and riding areas, other users should pay for their use as well.
289. Lottery or Casino's
290. Maybe you should sell permits to recreation groups that don't already help support DNR lands. Off-road vehicle forced to buy ORV stickers for years which you get funding from. It is time for the other groups to step up and c
291. I am a firm believer in "user fees" wherein those that use DNR lands should pay something for that use. Having the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds should be a major source recreational uses.
292. Additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study about \$7r funds do not go where they legally should.
293. take a % of lotteries and taxes
294. If the problem of funding is funding for ORV use,leave all ORV funds for ORV related expenses instead of steal other uses.That would help ORV related issues quite a bit.
295. Please don't take money from OHV groups and then shrink their riding areas.
296. The funds provided to the state/DNR budgets by things such as ORV tabs and gas tax should be 100% allocated maintenance of existing trails and develop new trail systems. The ORV community feels as though a good percentage contributed funds are used for programs which do not have any benefit for enhancing trail use and/or trail safety
297. Use all ORV funds and NOVA funds collected by the DNR for ORV funding. Stop using 40% of this money for fighting the state for a portion of the gas taxes collected. ORV users buy gas too. We already pay enough taxes and are misused by the state.
298. ORV license tab fees should go to DNR programs
299. From gas tax
300. Put a tax on new vehicles that are sold for off road use only. raise the price of ORV tags. Sell vehicle parking P areas, like the way its done at State Parks. Give more citations for non compliance of current tags, spark arrest limits.
301. We have the money for ORV's. If the state would quit taking ORV and NOVA money and giving it to other use pay into the funds we would have plenty of money. For instance from the gas taxes we pay. According to the Joint and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" about \$7 million (do not go where they legally should and the DNR should not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then create ever smaller areas. Other types of users do not have to pay a fee to use DNR facilities and trails. No additional placed on ORV users. More DNR land should be open to ORV use to eliminate the over crowding that is occurring areas of DNR land that ORV use has been forced into by the DNR closures of prior ORV use areas. When they to ORV's, why are they not closed to horses, mountain bikes, and other user groups? The ORV users are the cause of the trails we use. I have never seen any mountain bikers or horse people out there helping maintain the trail system DNR, I never see them out there either. As for the budget being spent on new facilities and trails, and Maintenance facilities and trails. Where are these new trail systems? I have not heard of any being built in many years. All I see is shutting them down and crowding us into smaller places. Quite stealing our (ORV and NOVA) money and giving groups to use for what ever they want. With all the moneys from ORV's that are wasted on non-ORV projects, why not someone (that is an ORV enthusiast) to over see the ORV, NOVA and gas tax moneys, to make sure it is spent attended for. But then the state would not like us really knowing where the moneys are being spent that we pay
302. State lotteries, and proper use of user fees.
303. Off Road Motorcycling already pays their own way in the form of ORV tabs. Other trail users, such as hikers, do think they should have to buy a license like we do.
304. Fees for ALL users of DNR land. Lease land to private interests for agriculture or recreation.
305. The DNR has been taking approximately 40% of Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Act right off the top for over 35 years now! Other types of users do not have to pay a fee to use DNR facilities and trail fees should be placed on ORV users. More DNR land should be open to ORV use to eliminate the over crowding

the small areas of DNR land that ORV use has been forced into by the DNR closures of prior ORV use areas. I be taking the almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas. The additional from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Ex Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study about \$7million of our gas tax funds legally should.

306. charge ALL users, not just the OHV community. Reserve OHV gas tax revenues for OHV/only projects.
307. I would not be opposed to paying daily fees on top of ORV tags. Kind of like a ski hill.. Daily tags to where. This for sure..
308. I think that the existing funding source if used like it was set up would work fine. Too much is spent where it do road riding people have stepped up to the plate and other users have a benefited from areas that have been impr
309. Fix this issue The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Au Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to \$7million of our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
310. I personally think the Lottery funding is a farce, from what I have seen, moneys seem to be moved to pet projec as it was originally slated for (WA state)..and as it was originally slated for.
311. Use the ORV tab fees for what they were originally intended. To fund ORV riding areas on state land.
312. ORV tabs for all vehicles. Plated/unplated. Additional .01 salex tax for non-dot legal vehicles.
313. I think just like fishing licenses and hunting licenses have an off road drivers license with a reasonable fee each
314. I believe that the funds that are currently collected from OHV's should be used for the recreation program. Anol license all users of the program, such as the hikers, bicyclists and equestrians that use the facilities. It would ap the OHV users to use the money from their licensing fees and use them for other purposes, so the burden for t construction, law enforcement, education and public outreach, as well as parking and general facilities should t among all users of the Recreation Program. Equal representation demands equal taxation, so if an individual w land in a manner that the land is designed or defined for, then it should be borne upon the user to bear the burr the general upkeep and maintenance of the facilities. Unless it is public land, then the public needs to bear the use facilities.
315. reward for reporting dumping, capture ALL ohv fees now being diverted
316. I would like to see more of the NOVA funds directed to support the upkeep and more importantly expansion of
317. Please make sure that the funds that are supposed to go to this do. Does 100% of the ORV funds get used for supposed to?
318. Using the lottery to aid funding is a good idea. Why do ORV's have to pay licensing fees but horses and mount do not pay? I am very much for usage fees but it should be spread out amongst all users. If I'm in a multiple us or Little Naches I must have an ORV license and current tabs but the person next to me on their horse or moun not need this yet we are sharing the same trail head, parking area and trails, its time to collect from all users. I robbing of ORV funds for non ORV projects that has been going on for several years. How is it that a waste wa <http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd/Construction/North/Brightwater.aspx> (Brightwater new under const million for art sculpture and the DNR has to compete for grants just to pay the salary of enforcement officers? W
319. I would buy ORV tags for my jeep if the money went to maintain the system
320. Users simply need to pay more via tabs or such, but I believe repairs required due to rogue vandalism should t as city graffiti removal. ORV users are not dumping/ ripping / painting any more than homeowners defiling their problem with increased tabs or other user fees will be trust, as I suspect people would not trust the fund would other purposes, particularly with the history involved in this subject.
321. Off highway vehicles users, as far as I know, are the only group that is required to pay for the use of DNR land. be required to do their fair share. Off highway vehicles use fuel that is taxed by the state and the funds used for primarily for road maintenance. This tax should be diverted to DNR.
322. Use some of the gas tax, use more of the license fees for what it is intended for.
323. Use the money from the logging. Actually get and use the money from orv tags. Set up parking passes like the make other people pay besides just orv users. Get volunteers from groups using the lands and give encentives in time.
324. A very wrong thing has been going on in our state and others in as much that the money from honest tax payin illegally stolen from the tax payer by taking funds like orv fees and having them go for things not related to orv i funds collected be untouched by dishonest politicians and state government for unrelated programs then these prosecuted!! I hate the thieves in our government! You should be caned if you are one of them!!!
325. Continue to allow access for off road vehicles. Use the funds paid for by us to go to sustaining the current trails who would have our areas shut down to have these funds. Better trail markings and trail grooming where appr

- appreciated. See the systems they use in Colorado as an example.
326. Small addition to the Licensing fees for ORV's as well as fees charged on the sale of Off road bicycles, the bicy our ORV trails and facilities without charge
 327. I would pay a small daily fee for trail use.
 328. All ORV funds collected should be spent for DNR programs.
 329. I don't think raising the ORV renewal fee \$5 would hurt anybody.
 330. existing gas tax funds are not going to where they legally should... try that for one thing. Also, our tab fees for c to OUR needs (ie: off road trails, upkeep, etc.), and not be used for other purposes. Why don't other users have the trails? Try charging every user, not just ORV folks.
 331. Volunteers can save the DNR lots of money and resources. Raffle tickets from donated prizes that come from u businesses that utilize and or benefit from DNR lands. Volunteer fund raising. Get a group of DNR land users (to collect donations and such for specific use on DNR lands at large events.
 332. Utilize 100% of our Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds. Please from it and using the funds elsewhere. Additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on th Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page ')
 333. I feel that ORV tabs should be the basis for funding. If enough revenue is not generated from ORV tabs, then th raised. Though, I'd like to see that our ORV tabs are actually being used to manage/plan/maintain/create/enfor I have heard rumors that our ORV tab money is being funneled to other, non ORV areas.
 334. revenue from lottery ticket sales and perhaps raising the registration amount for new vehicles and renewals (O
 335. How about using a portion of the gas tax paid. Our ORV vehicles burn fuel that has been taxed for hiway usage should be diverted to the preservation of our riding areas.
 336. I believe in funding (taxing?) directed at users. Part and partial to this is the protection and use of those funds b who is taxed. For example - ORV funds should be used "only" for ORV programs and not raided to support oth general purposes. I think every type of user should pay their fair share via taxing, licensing or other forms of dir fees, user fees, etc. A form of indirect funding could come from taxes on hiking boots, cross country skiis, off-rc trailers, etc. - similar to what ORV users pay.
 337. Increase ORV/use permits
 338. Collect income for fishing and hunting licenses and firewood and brush picking permit sold.
 339. Funding: Allocate a portion ORV liscence tax/fees towards your budget. Raise fines associated with abusing re Create incentives for groups and organizations willing to monitor and maintain said facilities/areas. Control acc and fines for not having permits.
 340. ORV users already pay for ORV tabs and should not be charged again - for example having to pay a daily use areas. ORV users also already contribute countless hours of work to maintain and construct new trails voluntar people (hikers, mountain bikers, etc) who use lands for recreation should also contribute monetarily in some w:
 341. The motorized community have been paying through reistration fees and gas tax for their trails systems. As mu NOVA funds go directly to DNR for recreation that is not necessarily motorized. Having watched the process ov seems a lack of balance in the funding system. There is a portion of our society that want lands saved for their and yet do not contribute for acquisition or support of those properties. these are the same group of people wh abundance of support dollars for litigation against motorized use. The first step in sustainable recreation is to d specific use (equitable balance) and stop litigation. Then allow the user groups to support there own recreation function of government but needs to be regulated for the benefit of all users on public lands. The users need to
 342. Stop the diverting of funds from OHC registration and sales tax
 343. Reasonable Fee
 344. Sponcer fund raising rides- ie Poker runs. Lobby for the entire tab fee to do directly to the orv parks and trails. I boxes at trail heads and camping sites. look at ideas from other states and see hoe they fund thier programs.
 345. how about a small fee for camping at Tahuyla? \$5 a night?
 346. Charge hikers a fee. Reallocate the gas tax that has been collected for DNR trails and pu tit where it belongs
 347. Law Enforcement or E&E Officers can NOT be funded by grants. These must be gauranteed funding for these
 348. Anual Fee's paid via like hunting or fishing for ORV use on public lands. Keep it simple & inexpensive to show documentation & payment of fee's.
 349. A small increase in orv tabs, with the caveat that they remain open year round, such as Capitol Forest.
 350. How about a small fee paid to be able to ride motorcycles behind gated areas. I find most riders actually pick u non rider users leave. How about a reward system for turning in trash dumpers on DNR land.

351. make a ride fund raser?
352. require mountain bikes to purchase an ohv tag similar to motorcycles for trail use.
353. Gas Tax
354. Sustainability of ORV trails in WA
355. Use the money from the orv tabs for this, instead of using it other places, you could also find a way to have stic other users as well, so horse ,bike hiker, etc could all have a pass simular to having a orv sticker.
356. I would like to be able to purchase one permit that covers all the types of recreational parking I need to do in W Currently I purchase a Sno-Park pass, a NW Forest pass, and a WDFW pass. I say add on a DNR pass & com one fee/one pass.
357. By opening areas that have been gated, the user base will be expanded leading to more permits being sold. Ev for access to gated areas via a combination lock, like marinas would help keep those committing illegal dumpin
358. Motorized users already pay more than their fair share, lets have a special tax on non-motized users. Could be specfic items or permit system for non-motorized uses, or a full funding of gas taxes for recreational uses, inste capped amount.
359. fees that are collected from users..site fees, parking, licenses, orv tags should be earmarked only for use to su area that generated the fee. Grants should be sought citing providing more and better access to the public, wtl economy via visitor increases. and..to allow for increases in visitor uses, without impacting the natural ecology the visitors go there for.
360. Revenues from camping, donations, events of different kinds, timber sales, fire wood permitts and the likes. NC available but that is a bigger disscussion than we have time here.
361. I would like to see some sort of fee charged to all users not just the motorized group. I realize the the dnr does orv tab nmoney but they should and the other users need to step up to the plate and pay their fair share as wel
362. % of Lotteries is a great idea. Also part of the gas tax could be used for DNR.
363. Funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee 1 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study annual about \$7m of got where they legally should
364. I believe that users should help pay for the public access and enjoyment of Washington State's unique and sce of that support from users can take a variety of possible programs. The annual Parks Pass concept has gained national level, and could be made part of the funding for recreation(Trails/Maintenance/new Facilities) and edu readily available for classroom or individual appreciation(i.e. Books for purchase, Seminars around the state hi resources, and outdoor education curriculum materials that would be used in statewide classrooms. The levels c organizations and businesses can be recognized in a respectful manner for funding new facilities.
365. Allocate more, preferably all, funds derived from ORV licensing towards OHV use projects. Such as: Trail main establishment of new trails, trail repairs. New fees, new taxes, new revenue streams are not necessary, use th current revenue generation as it was intended to be used.
366. Use a great percent of ORV tabs for funding, or create a specialty license plate where the extra fee goes 100%
367. The state of Washington and Oregon fund their recreational programs for off-road trails through the gas tax col states.
368. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee. Consider a reward system for reporting abuse: which will reduce illegal activities while encouraging more legal use and volunteers for sustainability/maintenan willing to pay the access fee for gated areas will be provided a usage sticker or other easily identified credentia encourage participation while reducing illegal use when coupled with a small "bounty" for turning in illegal users: collected through OHV registration and sales taxes to other non-OHV developments and state coffers.
369. I like the idea of taking a little piece of the lottery revenues.Not a lot but just enough to help.My wife and I use [about 2-3 times a month.We pay off-road vehicle tabs for our dirt bikes.I dont see any fees put on the horse,hik and mountain biking groups.We are also part of the hiking group using the Blanchard Mt. area regularly so we : different viewpoints.I dont wish to try to get funds from these groups that enjoy for free except for the few that a camping.I know getting land for ORVs in getting harder in this age of urban spawl and development but I hope find ways of keeping what we have and hopefully aquire more land.As more of our area becomes more city-like back-to-nature places increases.
370. Public lands are just that, the public's, for the public to have access to (with reasonable controls that is). Why is fully spent on what is intended for? It seems as though ORV users pay for everything else that is asked for (tax also pay extra for ORV use. Again we are paying more than anyone else and not even getting the full benefit o tax dollar. Everyone should pay for public recreation areas to be maintained and for new areas to be opened, n
371. Use the gas tax revenue ALREADY generated, MORE EFFICIENTLY, and more importantly - where it legally s

372. ORV users have been paying fee's for over 30 years. Where has that money gone?? What about other use groups mountain bikers, cross country skiing, snow shoeing, horse back riders, bird watchers??
373. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review". I am also a avid snowmobile rider and enjoy the atmosphere of this sport. If the gas tax lid would be lifted as it should have been long ago we would not always need grooming funds.
374. I THINK USING SOME OF THE LOTTERY MONEY WOULD BE A GREAT IDEA. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE MONEY GOES RIGHT NOW BESIDES IN THE GOVERNMENT'S POCKET.
375. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
376. Stop using ORV funds for other uses.
377. You should use the money you receive from ORV users to adequately fund and support new trails while maintaining existing trails.
378. \$5.00 for each ORV
379. I would think that with the huge sums wasted in most branches of Government you should be able to find a funding budget some place. The lotteries may be a good idea, however something like 90% of its income goes to Administration and doesn't leave much to work with.
380. Adopt a program like the Federal Government's Northwest Trail Parking Permit for DNR trailheads. Sell tags that attach to trail user's vehicles at DNR trailheads. Use the proceeds from the sale of tags to fund trail head and trail improvement projects.
381. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee
382. 1) Additional "Access Tax" on ALL motorcycles/ATV's sold to fund and maintain trails. 2) Pay access for areas behind gates. Installation of electronic keyboxes (as used by Realtors) would allow tracking and use of these areas. New key would eliminate the old trick of just making a copy. Technology would service many uses! Electronic keyboxes from Supra/General Electric are already available on the market. Key would have an yearly or monthly cost to user. 3) Use fees from trail/road users for reporting dumping. 4) Like the idea funding through lotteries. 5) Use fees to commercial advertising in closed areas. Thanks for allowing input!
383. The DNR has been taking approximately 40% of our Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle / Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds right off the top for over 35 years now, use this money!
384. Perhaps instead of more funding you need less spending. Relying on volunteer work from local clubs i.e. Stumptown and outdoor related businesses such as Mountain Gear could help eliminate expense.
385. Please remember that the DNR has been taking approximately 40% of our Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Nonhighway Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds right off the top for over 35 years now! Other types of users do not have to pay for facilities and trails. No additional fees should be placed on ORV users. More DNR land should be open to ORV use over crowding that is occurring in the small areas of DNR land that ORV use has been forced into by the DNR closed use areas. The DNR should not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas. VERY IMPORTANT POINT IS - The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135) of this study about \$7million of our gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
386. Use 100% of ORV license fees for ORV area funding. Don't use our ORV license fees for any other purpose.
387. Another example of "The People" paying the Government to keep "The People" out of Public Land!
388. I think that would be a good idea to have a special lottery for the funds
389. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee
390. 100 Percent of gas tax funds and licenses from OHV use should be used ONLY for improving OHV recreation or trails and not diverting to Non-OHV programs.
391. First things first - use ALL ORV-related funds currently received to fund ORV-specific projects. Fight hard to get those that steal them from us. Secondly, fight for additional funding, as above - lotteries, etc.
392. Special license plates All users pay a fee, not just motorized users current fees collected used specifically to develop areas for specific users, i.e., atv funds develop atv riding areas
393. The DNR should not take almost 40% of our NOVA funds and then crowd ORV use into ever smaller areas.
394. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable fee
395. At this time, I don't have any real ideas on obtaining or maintaining a sustainable funding. I would advise that a lottery be raised, that the money not go through the Washington state general fund.
396. you should base gas tax allocation on the on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study annual about \$7m of gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.

legally should.

397. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable fee to ORV users. A paying customer is more likely to tread lig materials. Let responsible users help bring much needed funds to your agency. I would be more than willing to get access to more areas to travel and photograph.
398. There are lots of gated areas that are off limits to motorcycles. I would be willing to pay a fee to access some o there are many dual sport street legal motorcycle riders who would be willing to do so as well as many ORV / A
399. Well, I used to pay \$8.00/bike for my ORV tabs anually. Now I pay more than \$20.00/bike for these same tabs land, have more restirctions imposed, and encounter more conflicts. The dirt/sand are the same (in the few are legally ride in). Why not demand the existing money already collected from ORV users... go to actually fund OF (rather than stealing this \$\$ and diverting it elsewhere). The shortfall should come from those user groups who resources, but currently dont write any checks.
400. I would suggest a user fee for hiking and climbing on public lands. Instituted along with hunting and fishing licei be included with your hunting and fishing license, and a hiking and climbing only license should be available at fishing license, less a couple dollars. Since motor vehicles already pay through gas tax, they should be exempt
401. Additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Cc titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review"
402. additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Cc titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135).
403. User fees. I am not adverse to user fees as long as there is a direct connection between what I pay and what I motorcycles with a licence plate and I am not required to have ORV tags. I would not mind paying for ORV tags plate if it would help open access to gated DNR lands. My understanding is that ORV tab funds are not now 10 develop and maintain ORV access. This situation should be corrected before you ask for more funds.
404. Additional fee on license or ORV tag at renewal. Special Access tag is issued. Make this similar to the snow pa
405. Take some lottery money and have a special lottery ticket specialil designed just for the funding for ORV parks license tab prices for orv tags
406. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee
407. Make all users pay not just the ATV users
408. A small fee for using trails would help build resources, and also deter some users from abusing what has been enthusiasts.
409. Stop diverting fees collected through OHV registration and sales taxes to other non-OHV developments and st: areas that have been gated and closed off by wilderness fanatics, which have neither visited or plan to visit are importance to Washington's recreational users. Thereby, increasing the number of users who actually pay tax in a responsible manner. Recreational users are not your number one abuser of the lands in Washington State public is not the solution to the pollution and trash dumping that requires more LEO to oversee limited access l: dumpers go to these locations because they have a high probability of no one else being there. This cost us all resources, and limits self-policing and reporting of felony dumping. Reduce the waste in spending on collateral money goes farther for other projects.
410. Leased use; orv club,event use ; user group rental use; Also look to local user groups/club to take on maintain: design and enforcement
411. When organized events are held on DNR lands perhaps each participant could pay a small fee,say \$1.00 per p
412. Stop diverting fees collected through OHV registration and sales taxes to other non-OHV developments and st: areas that have been gated and closed off by wilderness fanatics, which have neither visited or plan to visit are importance to Washington's recreational users. Thereby, increasing the number of users who actually pay tax in a responsible manner. Recreational users are not your number one abuser of the lands in Washington State public is not the solution to the pollution and trash dumping that requires more LEO to oversee limited access l: dumpers go to these locations because they have a high probability of no one else being there. This cost us all resources, and limits self-policing and reporting of felony dumping. Reduce the waste in spending on collateral money goes farther for other projects.
413. Lotteries are evil, like drugs and alcohol, I do not support this from of Government Funding! It is unethical!!! The funds coming in from the ORV community, the problem is that the money is not being used to support the sport finanace scam and use ORV funds for ORV programs!
414. Day Use Permits seem to me to be the most logical route.
415. Revenuen from state lotteries would be fine. So would fines obtained from those that violated the laws in the re there isn't enough funding to have the necessary law enforcement out there.
416. Fines for offenders, which means we need more enforcement. Access fees would be acceptable if WE were all

costs and how the funds were to be used.

417. lottery Bake sales! Offroad organizations (volunteer labor, grant writers etc)
418. - Take a hard look at the E&E grading criteria for the NOVA committee. Correct any discrepancies that put fiscal public safety. Regardless of the sponsors percentage match for the grant. - The NOVA Board and yourselves s various landscapes and attend some of the local meetings to see first hand to witness the public involvement in of relying on a power point presentation for your information. - Pursue the legislature to line item hard fund E&E recreation sites in the State of Washington - Support the uncapping of the ORV fuel tax.
419. how about using monies from our offroad license
420. Making maps and selling them.
421. Collect user fees at the more popular sites - collecting fees at all sites would surely cost more than the amount portion of "off road" license fees allocated for maintenance of public facilities on DNR properties.
422. charge mountain bikers for tabs
423. Lottery funds, Gas tax funds (we pay highway tax for the gas to use in our ORV's why not a small percentage t (we pay to license the ORV's is all of the revenues dedicated to ORV recreation?)
424. Get sponsorship, support events like RallyMoto.
425. The additional funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review findings titled "2007 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review" (see page 135). According to this study a gas tax funds do not go where they legally should.
426. Get rid of the "GENERAL FUND"! With every penny collected and placed in that fund for every other group can money collected for trails/camping and highways or other pay raises etc.
427. 1- Cut excessive Gov't. overhead (that means YOU tighten YOUR belt). 2- Let user groups maintain existing facilities have done this forever, let other groups do the same (bet they won't). 3- Let responsible users (motorcyclists) to construct new facilities while restricting abusers (4x4 mudders, car thieves/wreckers, garbage dumpers, mobile squatters). This would have to be managed by Permit/gate keycard. 4- Quit listening to the Vocal Minority that is problem. One hiker does not trump twenty motorcyclists. Just given the difference of money garnered from license tax alone should make this abundently clear: Vehicle, hiking boots, hiking stick, Gor-tex jacket (25000) vs Vehicle motorcycle, ORV sticker, protective riding gear (50000). 5- Start Logging again, the "Green Group" has cried to want all the attention focused on their agenda without a way to fund it. Their way didn't work as is evidenced by Get logging again and fund OUR schools, YOUR Dept. and MY dirtbiking !! WE ARE THE MAJORITY
428. provide access to gated areas to responsible individuals for a fee.
429. Stop diverting fees collected through OHV registration and sales taxes to other non-OHV developments and sites areas that have been gated and closed off by wilderness fanatics, which have neither visited or plan to visit are importance to Washington's recreational users. Thereby, increasing the number of users who actually pay taxes in a responsible manner. Recreational users are not your number one abuser of the lands in Washington State public is not the solution to the pollution and trash dumping that requires more LEO to oversee limited access to dumpers go to these locations because they have a high probability of no one else being there. This cost us all resources, and limits self-policing and reporting of felony dumping. Reduce the waste in spending on collateral money goes farther for other projects.
430. Request the legislature to provide DNR a small % of their budget for teaching "about DNR" in the schools.
431. Sticker and fees for gated road access
432. The only trail user's that are paying their share is the OHV groups. If you're going to take money from the OHV also find a way to "tax" the other users.
433. People who use/and or want to use the recreational areas could be encouraged via lunch or dinner rides/hikes. activities,i.e. \$15 lunch, \$20 -\$25 dinner.
434. user fees or tabs for all who use the facilities, bikes, hikers, riders.. all.
435. I would hope that all funds from the (tabs) registration and the use taxes for all ORV vehicles, as well as a portion on fuel sales (as the fuel is being consumed on the trails). These areas would be a good start.
436. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee.
437. If the funds that are already being collected would go to the legal and proper areas that they were intended and appropriately, there would be a lot less issue with needing more. Be accountable. I have to be in my personal life government officials?????
438. If the DNR managed lands were available to the public for recreation, the management should come from the off-road vehicle user, I appreciate the limited access I have but object to being in the ONLY recreational user group through taxes AND then pay again through our ORV funds for facilities used by the non-ORV public. Until The treat all the management beneficiaries equally, it is unlikely to get our support for any "Special funding source".

439. Use the money collected from orv licensing fees on recreation instead of non related general budget programs. be enough to support a wonderful outdoor rec program. Let NOVA money go to off highway activities the way it
440. Provide ORV access to gated areas for a reasonable fee. A portion of lottery funds to support ORV trails/faciliti Work with ORV groups/clubs to provide fund-raisers, as well as volunteer work crews.
441. Make sure ALL the taxes on ATVs, snowmobiles, ORVs, (license fees) and fuel taxes are appropriated for the intended for and not stollen by the legislature for general purposes! I'm originally from MO and MO has a 1/8th levied for conservation. That money goes to the MO Conservation Department MCD. The tax was passed 30 s the MCD didn't have two nickles to rub together. The MO Conservation Department now has more money than do with. They own more land than you can imagine, some parcels over 3000 acres. You can buy a MCD Atlas what I mean, or view it on-line. They have built state of the art facilities all over the state, shooting ranges, visit ramps, trails, etc. They have hunting and fishing access and wildlife areas in almost every one of the 115 coun farms and property and are constantly adding to the MDCs holdings. Their programs are top notch. You should MDC magazine, it tells their story and it's one of the finest in the country. All because of a little sales tax for cor needs this for conservation and recreation. <http://mdc.mo.gov/>
<http://mdc4.mdc.mo.gov/applications/moatlas/AreaList.aspx?txtUserID=guest&txtAreaNm=s> <http://www.mdc.m>
442. Provide access to gated areas for a reasonable / affordable fee
443. Sell passes for recreation area similar to a lift pass at a ski resort or a paking passfor a trail head
444. I would propose that regions be available for corporate sponsorship funding. This would service as an incentive the region to contribute directly DNR for recognition within the community. Similar to adopting a highway or bra would allow companies to be associated with recreational facilities. Premium locations would likely bring higher because of the increased visibility.
445. Funding should come from basing the gas tax allocation on the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee 1 Expedited Tax Preference Performance Review". According to this study about \$7 million of our gas tax funds (legally should. No additional fees should be placed on ORV users.
446. I like the idea of user fees. For example, I ride a dual sport motorcycle and frequently access forrest service an be happy to buy a yearly renewable permit (sticker for bike or card) in order to ride in these areas. There are fe motorcycle accessible areas each year with many roads gated. Open some of these roads back up and I'll pay my street legal dual sport motorcycle. Possible a fee attached to the licensing of "off road" capable vehicles.
447. Interesting that you only listed the source of funding that is not reliable. What are the other sources of funding? large portion of NonHighway Offroad Vehicle Activities [NOVA]funds for other than supporting Offroad Vehicle . Use NOVA funds to suport NOVA activities. Make other users pay for their use as well. If other users cannot ec or at least support their use, then excluded them. Meanwhile let the users who pay, use.
448. For ORV use we have a funding mechanism through the ORV/Gas tax. Quit using our ORV dollars for non-orv the law was written.
449. 1. A once a year one time fee by all users of DNR public lands. 2. DNR purchase or dedicate some land to mar funding to manage the recreation programs. I think Doug Sutherland had a plan for this, resurrect it and push it the legislature. 3. Put together a state wide greenways recreation fund voted on by the people to tax themsel amount on their property or on sales. This can be done locally can it be done state wide?? 4. Ask the people fo not necessarily sustainable, but if you send out a written request for dedicated funding for specific projects and of 20 or more dollars and allow the use of credit cards you might be suprired how many folks would help. We v convinced however that the money was going to go to the ground and not the pockets of the administration.
450. Make gated areas accessible for a reasonable / affordable fee
451. I think you sould lobby for some tax dollers tag on to something related to outdoor recreation. The users groups areas and facilities should have a pay to play plan tied to them.
452. license revenue's, trail fee's, events (poker runs etc), maps that we can purchase that show riding area's that ar
453. I believe that a access fee of \$12.00 a year would make a great impact on funding for DNR. I would think that t achieved via a sticker or a card issued to a user for the period of 1 year. The sticker could be applied to a vehic carried by the person while being on DNR land.
454. I know this is a very controversial idea but like a lot of parks there is now reason we shouldnt pay a day use fee know that we pay for the trail system through our ORV tags but I would not object to a day use fee.
455. I thought that the funding for DNR land came from the ORV tabs that we purchase every year. Funding could c tabs, taxes from the sale of dirt bikes and ATV's, and another option is to allow clubs to have more events on C the a rental fee for those events.
456. Keep the NOVA funds where they belong, for off-road programs and out of the general fund.
457. Hold 'official' ORV events, and seek advertising dollars. Offer tax incentives to ORV dealers to hold raffles with to the DNR for ORV recreation. This helps promote the ORV dealer, the products, and gains funds.

458. Seems to me the first step toward sustainable funding would be to use 100% of the NOVA funds for its intended purpose.
459. I would be willing to pay a day use fee for each off road vehicle we use on any day we choose to ride there. The money went to providing more areas to ride in. I think every county in Washington state should have an area dedicated to off road use.
460. 1) 100% of gas tax refunds provided to NOVA and administered by the Recreation and Conservation Funding I used exclusively for ORV/ATV riding areas. Fuel is used by ORVs in ORV riding areas that are maintained by the fuel tax was to fund governmental highway projects. This fundamental idea was also applied to other fuel on highway recreational activities, such as ORV/ATV recreation. Funds should not be allocated to non-motorized recreation because fuel is not used while engaged in non-motorized recreational activities. 2) Apply 100% of ORV registration fees to riding areas. 3) Divert ORV/ATV non-DOT approved tire taxes to be used exclusively for ORV/ATV recreational areas. Lottery where ticket sales and prizes are available only at off-highway motorized recreation retailers. The remainder directed exclusively to NOVA for use only in off-highway motorized recreational areas. Work directly with the Washington Highway Vehicle Alliance (wohva.org) in developing the lottery.
461. Much like the hotel/motel tax generated by the state and then distributed, small portions of it, back to the communities generating the income perhaps a portion of the tax generated by the sale of products and services to the equine industry to the state. Based on the amount of money the average equestrian puts out for feed, equipment, stabling, vet care, etc. seem a rather sizeable amount of revenue could be generated annually.
462. Develop an on line website where folks can view your news letter, check on areas needing volunteer help, when, and a map to get there. On the site as well you could have a button to click for pay pal donations on line for freedom we experience camping and recreating on DNR land. We love that the use is without cost and feel it as many families cannot afford any other type of recreation. Children need to be exposed to nature and learn a lot. Perhaps those that can contribute would do it on line. You could have links to user groups familiar with the area such as RV riders, hikers, bikers, and equine groups.
463. Funding for DNR projects, management, law enforcement, recreational improvements, and other related should come from a number of sources. The State Legislature should provide a large portion of the necessary monies from the general fund. The figure needs to be supplemented through timber sales and possibly user fees. By better management of funds a significant amount of financial costs can be brought into balance more easily.
464. Income from any fees, licenses, and taxes must be returned to support the recreation area that it is drawn from in a proportional manner to the income received; whether it's motorized, non motorized, land based or marine, sport fishing funding should be obtained through vanity license plates, taxes on large-scale sporting event arenas (instead of new stadiums for billionaires), taxes on sofas and televisions (get outside!), and taxes on lawyers.
465. ORV users are required to purchase registration to operate on public lands. These funds are to be used for expenses. I propose 2 solutions; actually use all of the revenue generated from ORV registration for its intended purpose as ORV users to obtain a pass.
466. I say get the money from the Casino's
467. Reduce funding to HSDS
468. The DNR already receives over a million dollars a year from the NOVA fund. Why are those dollars not being spent on non-motorized facilities and trails?
469. Charge a trail use fee...available in the form of a yearly pass
470. Why don't you ask the tribes to donate funds toward law enforcement? It would help W.D.F.W. a lot if we could have that.
471. Columbia Hills Partners has a cash account of about \$6,000 and an endowment fund at Oregon Community Foundation for \$10,000. We also get some funds from selling brochures and books and take donations at our annual Wagons and Waffles event. As needed we will raise money or match with in-kind for specific projects. Members and organizations also offer services to supplement Washington Parks or DNR staff.
472. There needs to be a way to charge non hunters and fishermen to pay their fair share of the states outdoor facilities. A form of access pass can be sold for state rec sites.
473. Direct funding from the legislature for recreation on DNR lands. In this economy, may be bleak. What about more management/selective harvest on site going back into the site for public access etc.? Timber harvest revenue for law enforcement: What agreements can be worked out with local jurisdictions, WDFW enforcement, etc. Educate and outreach? Have a really good website that is user friendly and makes it easy to locate public access sites, camps, etc. throughout the state.
474. Some ideas that I have are as follows: 1 - Increase timber harvest. Well managed timber is a sustainable form of recreation with most Government agencies that I work with, there is too much money going into administration and not on the ground. Reducing the amount spent on management/administration could free up dollars that could be spent in other areas.
475. Every time I launch my boat at state or county sites I pay a launch fee or buy a yearly pass. Riding spots could have at least a secure donation box.

476. For funding I suggested that EVERYONE using DNR land should have to be licensed just like we are required licensed. Every hiker, mountain biker, horseback rider, kayaker, etc..... They should have to pay the same amount every year and if they don't get a license (permit) they should receive a ticket just like we would if we had no tax. I also said that our money for ATV tabs should not be used on trails we cannot access and use. Offer a vehicle license that represents the ORV community and the extra charge for it put into the ORV funding.
477. trails and facilities dedicated to horses.
478. rths
479. As an ORV user I would not mind if the annual fees for licensing were raised as long as the money was used for recreation.
480. Funding from Recreational Vehicle Licensing should go directly to funding recreational programs, not other budget items. The government since those of use using things like ORV's, Snowmobiles, Horse Trailers, Campers, Motor homes are the ones out recreating, our license fees for rec vehicles should go to rec purposes directly.
481. DNR needs to work with State Parks and WDFW to enact a modest property tax that would fund M&O. Packaging properly, recreation and parks bonds and levies have been successful. Capital projects should continue to be funded through WWRP.
482. User Fees The majority of the public already pays fees at State Parks and Federal Forests
483. none at this time
484. poker runs have good turn outs and can generate revenue
485. I believe that a portion of the gas tax is reserved for off-road and trail-based recreation. I think that DNR should also think that DNR could sell a parking pass (like WDFW, USFS).
486. Tax on recreation equipment similar to the Robertson Pitmann Act. An access pass similar to WDFW. And DNR their liability under the Recreation Immunity Act and decide if not charging for recreation is actually reducing the reducing their funding.
487. Make DNR ORV riding areas a pay as you go. Charge persons using the land the same way as a hiker uses the state. A person can pay per day (\$5.00), or buy a yearly pass (\$30.00). We pay for all kinds of permits, or license things we do from hiking to hunting to fishing.
488. OHV scratch tickets! OHV vanity license plates! Poker run w/ entry fee? Auction? ...Trail maintenance and conservation achieved through volunteer work. There are lots of groups and clubs that could help.
489. I don't know where to find funding. Sorry.
490. mountain bike license fee's.
491. State lotteries sounds like a great source of additional funding. If not happening already, some of the money from lotteries be used to pay for the recreation program.
492. Ask for more volunteer work for trail maintenance from such groups as the Back Country Horsemen of Washington a LOT of volunteer work. BCH could also help with education of the general public (by using their Leave No Trace program)
493. I feel the funding that the DNR is taking from ORV and NOVA funds are disproportionate in relation to the users. Other user groups do not have to pay fees to use DNR land, this is not fair. ORV users are being pushed into a corner as the number of ORV users is steadily increasing.
494. Funding is essential in any business or governmental organization. One of them has to be openly accountable, they should be. If the Department of Natural Resources had to work as hard and take as many risks as the private organization, reportability, and accountability would be much more out-front; it's ranks would be leaner, and it would be more decisive and less politically correct. In conclusion, if you want to have consistent funding, become accountable for the authority you are given through funding; this will allow renewals.
495. 1. a percentage of revenues derived from DNR's commercial holdings and timber sales 2. a recreation pass that covers all owned/managed recreation sites (DNR, State Parks, and Fish and Wildlife) and each agency receives a pro-rata revenue.
496. Collect a fee from all users @ trail heads
497. DNR may need to sell land use permits to recreate on ALL or SPECIFIC DNR managed land, especially those areas with trails. DNR could write a lease contract with user groups to maintain facilities in campgrounds and to maintain areas in exchange for free usage of the campgrounds & trails. Revenue generated from other sources.
498. We already pay with our ORV tags..How much more do you need?
499. 1. Use more of the monies generated from ORV tabs to directly support that activity. 2. Grants usually take a number of work hours generated on a voluntary basis, need to support clubs that are overseeing the area and give extra help to clubs to generate more volunteers. 3. Have campsites at each location that has a charge somewhat like the national parks.
500. Lottery and Gambling monies seem to be the most logical and reliable source of funding.

Comment Text

501. I own 4 licensed ATV,s. I believe that I do my share in helping keep riding areas open and funded. Please do n Riding Trails a better place to ride (ie: Walker Valley, Tahuya, Capitol Forest...)
502. Being an ORV enthusiast, I feel we already pay into the system. That being said, I'm not averse to paying for a if I knew that the majority of those monies would be used for trail maintenance, patrolling the given area for pec privilege of riding on public lands, and promoting responsible use programs. Some off-road vehicles (large ATV Sides) have a bigger impact on trails and take more resources for maintaining trails they use. They should pay instance. People bringing large "toy-haulers" should pay a parking fee in addition to a trail usage fee. These ide wouldn't be well received initially, but the reality is, we have more people vying for the same space which creat conditions on the trails at certain times of the year. Paying for your individual impact seems fair.
503. Everyone who uses DNR land should have to pay the same amount as ATV users. Every hiker, mountain biker kayaker, etc..... If they do not have an up to date DNR license they should get ticketed just like ATV riders do if tags. ATV license money should not be spent on trails we cannot use.
504. Offer a vehicle license plate that represents the ORV community and the extra charge for it put into the ORV fu
505. enumclaw has acquired the county fairgrounds with the intent of turning it into a profitable horse venue year ro are no options for trail riding . since horse campgrounds with trail access turn a profit in other areas , why not c an extension of the new enumclaw expo grounds ?
506. Access fees for all users of DNR lands. If you want to play, you have to pay. If every user paid a \$2-\$5 how mu that add up to? I think most users would be willing to pay an affordable "entry fee".
507. As much as it will affect me, I've always thought some kind of direct user fee is the most appropriate. (i.e. lift tic If you are using the resource, you should have to pay something for it. My only issue is often the money I persc end up helping the usage for which it is intended. The DNR has been taking approximately 40% of Off Road Ve Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Activities (NOVA) funds right off the top for over 35 years now. I think every u pay.
508. Use/parking permits, lottery revenue.
509. cant you sell special recreation and hunting permits. It's my understanding that DNR's mission is primarily to m generating revenue through resource management. Can you treat recreational activities as a resource? Find al "slash" left over from timber sales. Instead of burning the "left overs" find other cleaner uses (pulp, hog fuel, chi compost,etc). Create more passive recreational opportunities such as ski trails, cabins, etc which could have a
510. 1) It does not seem right that bikes that are obviously not street legal are not required to have ORV tabs if they plate. 2) DNR Parking passes should be required since ORV parks are generally multi-use. 3) Instead of provid post more signs about user's responsibility to pack-it-out.
511. Lotteries, Any form of Gambling would be good
512. tighten your belt. concentrate on maintenance. Keep your grant applications fresh and noticable.
513. User fees at staging areas
514. lotteries, user fees, volunteers
515. day use charge for rv parks like tahuya--i would pay a nominal amount to keep it open and clean, the place is a parks charge \$10 a car load for visitors.
516. i think it should be a license tab type support for everyone that wants to ride on DNR's land so that riders that u being able to use it
517. Dedicated fee/tax like the Federal DJ or PR taxes on sporting fishing / hunting equipment and supplies like the service passes on to WA state Fish and Wildlife agencies. Do it at a state level, a small percentage of the camp equipment and types of users at DNR sites. Do not tax the ATV users as they already pay enough in fees and
518. Would be awsome if BCHW and Dept of Ntl' Res. teamed up together on a prize ride to benefit the trail system: these rides are the ones who use the trails and benefit from the work the dept and BCHW does! Horse people l appreciation for the outdoors. Many of us collect garbage and educate others on how to preserve it through LN
519. Off road vehicle tabs for ALL off road vehicles. This should include dirt bikes, quads, Jeep vehicles and perhap road. Also, a parking fee at trailhead parking lots could be used for upkeep of the lots.
520. State income tax and modification of the DNR mission to provide permanent hard dollar support for recreation, habitat values is the key to this whole thing. DNR is forced into a revenue generation role because our state ha simple as that.
521. My understanding was that a portion of OHV fees collected was set aside for OHV activities, such as trail maini construction and enforcement. I feel that in this new economy that creating new fees to sustain a group that sh already collected fees will be quite difficult.
522. REI fund- taxing: camping/hiking/climbing/mt.bike/horse backriding-hunting/bird watching/photo journalist

523. Privately sponsored sites Transfer the management of the campgrounds to state parks Implement a small tax on items such as clothing, bicycles, camping gear, etc.
524. As it relates to motorized use, I don't understand why you are concerned about planning or construction becoming locking us out of areas we've used for years because the leaf lovers and bunny huggers want the whole damn their private forest - usually payed for by the OHV groups. As it relates to maintenance, you usually get a group all the labor. What are you doing with our tax money we pay for Forest Passes, ORV tabs and all the other money us towards OHV trails? If you'd just make things far less complicated - like it used to be 20 or 30 years ago - are expensive requirements and regulations, it would cost you next to nothing. Like it was 20 or 30 years ago. Just woods. A big step in the right direction would be to start making the non-motorized users pay up - more than just
525. If the value of a Trail passes were increased, then perhaps more would be purchased. I'd like to see some trails have been closed to ORV's re-opened. Maintenance costs can be reduced with a greater alignment between the clubs.
526. I am a ORV rider and we pay taxes that help support your funding. It seems that other groups are not paying to the level that we are. I believe that the people paying the bill should have more use of the resources. Please More land should be opened to ORV riders.
527. Keep land business leases affordable, so you'll have a reliable revenue resource. Be sure and business leases so again, you'll have a reliable revenue resource.
528. Is there not enough funding given to DNR now through the NOVA program??? Considering that motorized users and pay license fees for their off-road atv's, then maybe shouldn't hiker, bikers & horseback riders need to pay Trails are closed to motorized recreation & horseback riding in the winter months, but hikers & bikers are allowed trails the whole year round. Maybe charging a users fee is the way to go.
529. Use fees.
530. There already is sustainable funding in place, ORV TABS and NOVA funds!!! This money should be exclusively! Offroad vehicle DNR use ONLY...Period. If this money was properly focused to a specific area (offroad use), then issue for funding this area of use. As far as other areas of use, allow those groups to fund it through user fees. self sustainable, I support PASS fees or user fees in the offroad DNR areas as well. Do we NOT realize the hurt of dollars we are turning away by NOT having the recreation areas areas available to the ORV'ers? They are giving and spending their tourism money elsewhere, but not in WA.
531. ORV tabs on all types of transportation that use the areas. Horses, Jeeps, hikers, etc. Everybody that uses the pay. Maybe a personal use tag instead of an ORV tag.
532. Overcrowding is my biggest concern at this time as I see the results each and every time I ride. The consequence
533. How about not using NOVA funds for Non-recreational activities. I would support user fees (beyond ORV tabs)
534. I don't think you need to spend money on any of the items listed. Everything but law enforcement is willingly done and has been from the beginning. Law enforcement is already funded and additional staffing is unnecessary. The more involved, the better we like it!
535. Partner with local schools on trail and park clean up. These are great student projects.
536. 1. User Fees 2. Third Party Program Operators 3. Naming Rights and Sponsorships 4. A small statewide recreation
537. a permit similar to the federal trail park pass
538. Lotteries, and yearly DNR passes to use areas, and those areas that cost the most amount to use have higher
539. ask for funding the gaming commission
540. If you focus on the natural resources available on the land: Use timber in designated areas to generate an income and package a determined amount of game per year for sale. Open a bottled water plant using filtered, sterilized
541. ORV fees, parking passes, and other sources that directly correspond to usage.
542. Lay off over half of your staff. Then focus on hiring people that actually are willing to work and understand the job you enough money to alleviate most of your budget shortfalls. Quit closing trails or requiring costly repairs. Let the trails. Since you have never listened in the past, I am sure this will go unnoticed as well.
543. I think you are going to have to start charging the users. I know this is really unpopular, and it makes people nervous a general admission pass is going to be required. You could make the pill go down easier with a regional pass pick up for a reasonable price, say \$50 for a particular region. Or say \$75 for every bit of DNR land in the state
544. There shouldn't be much need for funding. The idea that the state needs to do all of the work and prevent the user maintaining, improving, or creating trails is the reason that there needs to be funding in the first place. Open up public use and then get out of the way. Build a few camp sites, take care of them and let the rest go on as natural part of nature too. How can one "ruin" a mountain that was created by the world's most destructive forces in the amount of man made recreational erosion is going to knock down a mountain or hurt fish in a stream. The danger (which we now prevent), flood, avalanche etc. is far more than hikers, horsemen, motorbikes or 4x4s could ever

545. User fees are one fair way to collect funds. keep them fair and use them in the spirit they were collected and I disent.
546. I may have my facts wrong, but I understand that all orv monies collected do not go directly to the orv budget. The money collected from off road vehicle tabs and gas tax should go to that fund only, and all users of the dnr trail required to have tabs to use the trails--bicycles included
547. User's fees
548. Use our orv/nova funds for orv's instead of your other expenses. If hikers, mtn. bikers, horse riders, etc. want s their uses, tax them instead!
549. Fees, licenisng, lotteries
550. Lotteries are a good source when the money is appropriated correctly.
551. Have the legislature provide funds from general revenue to support recreation by Washington residents on Wa lands. In the introductory statement it is indicated that nearly 1/3 of the DNR funds come from but there is not in wehere more than 2/3 of the DNR funds come from. Another suggestion is to increase the efficiency and effect expenditure currently available funding. This could likely be done by decreasing administrative costs and putting available funding in new facilities and trails, and maintaining existing facilities and trails.
552. government should budget for it even if it comes from the lottery system. It's what keeps the state attractive to c
553. I would be in favor and support generating revenue streams (funding) through Lotteries, Cigarette tax, and also support and encourage user pay funding. In addition to buying a ORV tag one should have to purchase a DNR land.
554. Grants and volunteer participation.
555. ORV fees are already a large funding source for the DNR. However, much of it does not go for ORV related fur tell from the DNR limited information on where the funding is allocated. Please make the ORV fees apply to OF pilfered away on non-ORV projects.
556. Non regulated (taxed) activities such as hiking, bicycle riding, and horseback riding are not easily tapped into for revenue for the facilities and trails we use. Motorized use already has some level of revenue generation built in areas they use. With over 132,000 orv tags sold each year in the state, some of those funds are earmarked for and improvement. DNR should have access to some of those funds in proportion to the number of relative mile section of DNR land. Similar for road tax portion of fuel sales for ORV vehicles that cannot use the roads. The lottery funds to contribute to recreation programs seems reasonable but this seems like diversion of existing re than new sources of revenue so it may depend on what the funds are being diverted from.
557. Look at ways to partner - rather than competing, cooperate in funding approaches. A Natural Recreation fee cc licensing or taxing (real estate, sales, hotel/motel, etc.) that would provide funding to State Parks, Fish and Wil
558. A) Start with some of the funds that are collected through ORV tabs. B) Fairly collect and utilize the portion of t that is used by ORVs c) Collect user fees on premium riding area such as those close to population centers. (It for me to pay \$10 - \$20 to ride in King County than travel to Manson County)
559. Washington must have a law that releases it from liability when charging a land use fee. I've seen this law mak times, but it never passes. Getting this into law must be the primary focus of the DNR if it is serious about provi program. Oregon managed to do it!
560. 1) Offer classes or special events. 2) Allow groups to purchase the named sponsorship of a trail or trail head. (an ORV trail, Purina to sponsor an equestrian trail, TREK a mountain bike trail) 3) rent, raffle or auction the use weekend or special events. (lookout tower, beach, etc) 4) create specialty groups with annual dues that assure designated usage preference and not just to a general fund. (ie: I'd pay to sustain for ORV trails.)
561. Parking permits? But only if all the \$\$ goes directly back to the DNR. Use it, pay for it. May help keep out the ri derelicts, scum buckets, whatever you want to call them) that way too.
562. The gas tax allocation that goes to NOVA should be increased to be more reflective of the same percentage of that it was when the program started. I do have other ideas and will bring them out in the SRWG (of which I am
563. It's a tough question in present economic circumstances, but the best answer is taxation, and with the widespre outdoor recreation in Washington, a dedicated tax might not be that difficult. Spread across the entire tax base, be reasonable, and in present circumstances, there would be a cadre of volunteers ready to campaign for it. Th be clearly represented as dedicated solely for outdoor recreation on DNR lands, and the range of applications : (would it, for example, allow tax funds to be used for acquisition of recreation lands? If so, how about land trade lands?) An alternative would be an independent 501(c)3 that could solicit funds directly from users, advocate for legislature, and apply for grant funding. (A model I have in mind is the Washington Wildlife & Recreation Coaliti of application of the funds would have to be clearly defined, and some method of limiting the administrative cha overhead associated with putting the money to work. My own experience with public-agency- administered proj overhead for maintenance and improvement projects often runs to 40% of direct costs - an unreasonable amou

564. 1. Charge a parking fee to use DNR trailheads and return the money directly to the area it was collected from. : money for ORV/Multiple Use trail systems only! In general, let each user of DNR lands pay for the maintenance upkeep of the lands they use.
565. First, I'd like to make it clear that I hate suggesting this, but there is always pay to play. The Forest Service has with the parking passes. They have gone further though by giving out parking passes on a yearly basis on hour
566. timber harvest and replanting user fees
567. What about 4X4 ORV Tabs/Tags/Stickers I would not mind paying 20-30-40-\$50 Per rig per year to recreate or about Swag! do you have stores or Gift shops that sell Hats, patches, stickers, and things with your Logo on th raiser? it might not work but then again if your telling people that the money they Spend goes to fund our Lands
568. Motorized off road users have been required to purchase a sticker to user DNR lands for many years in additio nearly 40% of their gas tax refund to the DNR. Make non-motorized users do the same but do not apply that ac with an ORV sticker.
569. It is way past time to have non-motorized users contribute in a manner similar to how motorized off road users over 30 years. Make the non-motorized users purchase a sticker to access the trails and facilities. Honor the O people have already paid their dues.
570. Implement a program similar to the Nonhighway and Offroad Vehicle Activities (NOVA) for the non-motorized u have to purchase a similar sticker to use those lands. They have had a free ride long enough on the backs of th
571. A lottery program would be good, if proceeds would go to DNR, and perhaps the forest service to maintain trail Also, user fees, similar to the forest service pass, would be acceptable if they were modest, and tied into the th pass.
572. Ordinarily, the legislature should adequately fund recreational programs on DNR land. Failure of the legislature to meet their responsibilities, user-type taxes may have to be considered. A number of years ago, some outdoc suggested a tax on outdoor equipment, such as backpacks, tents, even hiking boots. This would analogous to and fishers pay on guns, ammuniton, and fishing equipment. I would support such a tax, with the exception of because of free speech considerations. (The previous effort died because of opposition, not from the users the outdoor equipment retailers.) The type of equipment that causes more damage should be taxed more heavily. road vehicles and mountain bikes. Not sure how to handle horses.
573. well we have to have atv tabs on our quads and motor bikes (why not moutain bikes also)
574. parking passes or day use fees.
575. Fee parking pass Fee ORV pass
576. permits and fees
577. Personalized license plate option; a one mill tax on outdoor recreation equipment dedicated to recreation activi lands;
578. You might check on grants. That some of your Volunteer groups Might be able to apply for with your Support. § Rattlesnake Ridge Riders Chapter of the BCHW Recieved a grant to Improve the Badger Mountain Trail System rapids Park Through a Grant from REI. Planting Native vegetation and Trail Improvements.
579. User fees or subscriptions (annual passes, etc.) could pay for a portion. A small allocation from taxes (gas, sale Fundraising efforts with revenues gained from organized recreational events.
580. let the interested parties voluntier to build the trails. Maybe have a \$5 access or users fee to help with garbage just wasted our lotterie money because they constantly cry for more taxes all the time like they did before. It wa the school funding, but they took in all the money and still say they don't have enough. We don't want to pay m something for what we already paid. DNR is the only state agency that actually gives us something for our tax camping. Every other state agency is fee crazy, so I hope you don't get like them.
581. I like the idea of tapping into revenue through lotteries. That sounds great!
582. 1. Add a % recreation fee to timber sales 2. Have a portion of sales tax on guns,bullets, motorcycles, ATV, Mot road vehicles go to DNR for recreation. (people would not be buying these things if there was not a place to us commercial recreation site or sites in the forest and lease land for: Bike concessions, ATV motrocycle concessi food service, etc. Allow a commercial co to lease rights to build trail and chairlifts for mt biking 3. start building t last a long time. 4. Start designating steep grades that flood and avalanche and adjacent areas as no cut zones and drainage features so that huge expensive washouts due to not maintaining them don't happen.
583. Create more partnerships with school programs, outreach programs, to get kids biking, hiking, exposed to the c healthy lifestyle. In the same way hopefully the "great outdoors" can be appreciated by the upcoming youth. W local sheriff work crews to clear blowdown on roads, pick up litter associated with recreation (shell casings, tras more local volunteer groups, user specific groups (bikers,hikers,equestrians), to take on responsibilities that fur Like maintenance of trails, signs, education of volunteers, basically making it a more community oriented appr current sense that the DNR owes it to us, the people. Create a mountain bike tax, orv tax, to take a small perce

- reinvest in the local budget for DNR. If these goods are going to be used to enjoy specific activities in specific areas all for the small tax.
584. There is the funds generated from the sale of tabs for Off Road vehicles that could be used in all of these programs. Users of the enjoy much more than just going off road, and that is to enjoy nature and what our state has to offer. Funds would be a way to generation fund that many of us would gladly use. Raising the fees on Tabs would mean many of the people are hard pressed now for funds and the only play they get is going to the ORV parks or the groups of people that use the system is a way to cut down the cost of labor. I know that the PNW members in several areas, but to keep areas open they would do more. There are so many user groups that it would open up a base.
 585. Recreation has a frivolous connotation, especially in this economic climate. It SHOULD be thought of more as Wellness. The benefits of encouraging people to get outdoors and walk around, be active, are revealed in health care, less demand on the healthcare system. Funding for Law Enforcement, Education and public outreach as a component general revenue as part of the healthcare funding. Construction of new facilities, as well as maintaining existing facilities and trails, should be from DNR budget along with a significant emphasis on volunteer coordination for these tasks. Public/private funding agreements and benefits should be considered as well.
 586. Fees/taxes from developers that build in areas that reduce recreational opportunities (residential/business square foot).
 587. User fees based on impact to recreational area. Highest impact group would pay the highest fees. Impact would be number of people and impact of their use; damage to trails, human waste and trash left behind and parking space. User groups do not pay for the impact their activities cause... mountain bikers, motorcycles and snowmobiles cause.
 588. Start a non-green tax which taxes businesses for conducting themselves in a non-sustainable manner - like making styrofoam are taxed, and corporate users of styrofoam are taxed, this makes the product more expensive and gives a financial motivation to find another packaging material. Use the tax revenues to fund DNR Sustainable Recreation as other environmental friendly state endeavors.
 589. the lottery is a great way to sustain funding
 590. I do not believe grant funding or any other temporary funding should be used for personnel salaries. Right now grants for Enforcement and Education. That means that when the funding goes away, so do the employees. That is not a worker trying to support themselves and a family. Grant funding should be used for construction and material that is stable money available from the General State and DNR funds should be used to pay for wages.
 591. I think a small user fee would be appropriate or a yearly pass type program.
 592. Taxes on unhealthy things like alcohol and tobacco seem like logical revenue for something that promotes good recreation.
 593. General funding should be dispersed across the states projects. Local (county) funding should contribute to special projects. Volunteers/workers should be sought locally via local groups such as the Back Country Horsemen.
 594. yearly passes to certain camp areas like Tahuya Forrest but not all camp areas only the most widely used one
 595. Continue logging areas where high value timber is. After contributing to the funding of our schools, which is one of our highest priorities, then work on lower priority projects like trails. No new facilities should be built unless already existing or maintained.
 596. Lotteries are a good way to fund recreation programs
 597. A lottery is not a bad idea. I would not be opposed to a special tab or add on to an existing license as long as it is used for motorized access now and in the future to areas where the revenue generated from this license was spent.
 598. First you need to stop building expensive gates that have to be maintained to try to keep the citizens out of their own land. Then, fund recreation by selling cards that the people can enjoy their own land.
 599. fees from licensing off road motorcycles and atv's should be dedicated to maintaining areas where they can be used. I think a portion of the timber revenues generated on DNR land should be used to fund DNR and support recreation lands.
 600. I think the vast majority of people who use the trails could afford to pay more for their upkeep. Especially along the coast practically all the hikers are yuppies with all the new gear. And for those who couldn't afford it or who preferred to hike, there could be a points system for doing trail maintenance as a volunteer. Users who destroy trails more than hikers, so that hikers pay the least, then hikers with dogs, then mountain bikers, then horses/livestock, etc., with more than hikers. ...In fact, people could volunteer in all sorts of ways to help with State functions to earn points. Then whatever organization was helped would have to give the money they were going to pay someone to do it from the budget instead. I suppose there's no way to verify hiking activities, but if there were, I think health insurance could donate some percentage of the premiums they extract from hikers and mountain bikers (people who get exercised in the wilderness) to trail maintenance. I know they won't lower our rates, but people who pursue relatively safe activities in the outdoors have got to be much healthier and cost a lot less on average than people who sit around instead. Maybe company wellness programs could contribute to trail maintenance budgets. Certainly state employees

and so forth) could use some of their wellness budgets to support trails budgets. Get companies, especially the environmental affiliations (such as environmental consulting firms) to give their employees a paid day for trail work then reward those companies by posting their names somewhere, giving them commendations to use in press general, find ways to make people help more. If everyone did a little bit, there would be a lot less maintenance pay for. Also, help people help. For instance, arrange childcare volunteers for trail maintenance volunteers (I'll have more physically restricted people would watch kids for younger people who can still do heavy work). Okay, you volunteering. Well...establish an endowment for trails. Maybe people would like to donate to make trail maintenance sustaining, to make a long-term difference, instead of just donating a little bit that will be used up now.

601. Identify key legislators who will ensure that the the primary source of funding will come from the legislature even economic times. Encourage user groups to work with those legislators to protect the funding.
602. Partnerships with local access groups and the companies that benefit from their customers use of DNR lands is flexible and project specific. Unfortunately your wording sounds like a questions of fees, taxes, or some other fee would cost people who don't benefit from the increased expenditure. With the large number of people who take opportunity to use our public lands getting those most financial involved seems the most effective way. Our club currently to promote this type of local action.
603. Well we have an ORV tax for our off road vehicles, how about a tab fee for mountain bikes and a tab fee for hikers this state had to pay the same amount we pay for an orv tab you would have a lot of money!
604. I would highly recommend an annual access decal for all vehicles that travel on DNR roads, similar to WDFW's would apply to all types of users; four wheelers, snowmobiles, mountain bicyclists and dirt type motorcycles. THE ADDITION to the current ORV decal required for four-wheelers and dirt-type motorcycles. The major problem is where would they be sold and lack of enforcement.
605. Taxes generated by off road gas as determined by use surveys.
606. I think a return to the previous level of gas tax sharing would be a good start!
607. A lot of companies get a break from taxes because they say provide recreation. But there is no way anyone can of distance and gates. That property or parts should be put back on the tax rolls and that \$ should be used for DNR, or US forest Service. Also people from out of State should be charged a fee.
608. ??????????????beyond the almost \$40 per ATV we pay for tabs (with no place to legally play in my county & willing to pay a REASONABLE admittance fee.
609. use volunteers to build and maintain facilities. Don't build high maintenance facilities, I just want access not civic woods.
610. I'm all for funding for recreation programs through revenue from lotteries, state taxes, donations, and work groups.
611. 1.) I would ask the Hikers and other non-motorized use groups to use their money they spend on keeping motorized areas, to help relocate and build new areas for the motorized use. I say this because they seem to be so aggressive funds to stop people from using land. 2.) The lottery is a good one to. 3.) % of alcohol and cigarette taxes 4.) % of monies 5.) What about orv tab monies being used for orv uses.
612. Charge vehicle access fees via daily or annual passes, enforce stiff penalties, allow private ATV, 4x4, motorcycle other clubs/organizations to assist in promoting Tread Lightly principles to uninformed or reckless users, i.e. ex disadvantages of not Treading Lightly and/or taking photographs of offenders similar to "ORV Trail Watch." All spend a day or weekend at specific locations, with a minimum of two vehicles parked at strategic meadows, intersection crossings, etc, and each vehicle marked with a flag, sign or other indication that they are volunteers in alliance Responsible clubs and organizations want to help!
613. 1. Some funds from state lottery should go to these areas. 2. Events held at the recreation sites which could help attain funds from those that attend. 3. Raise pass fees by a dollar or two a year for parking passes, camp site stickers
614. 1. Permits, whether they be daily, monthly or annual usage. 2. Donations
615. User fees could be instituted at some of the more popular DNR destinations in the form of parking fees at trailheads. Donations could be asked for when attending sportsmen's shows or when giving presentations. These could be projects.
616. User fees for the more developed sites (campgrounds, heavily used trails). Percentage of hotel/motel taxes from serve DNR recreation sites. Percentage of ORV taxes/licenses.
617. charge a user fee for using land, camp fees timber sales
618. Dirt bike tags that allow limited road access for short distances to connect trails or on forest service roads.
619. Re-write the WAC that diverts part of OHV tab dollars to the dept of licensing and general fund. how about get pointed in the direction it was originally intended(and we were led to believe).....to you, the DNR, so you can not actually create some new areas. Our sport is not going away. More riders participate in OHV recreation than ever existing trails are deteriorating becoming dangerously overcrowded. More OHV tab dollars could only help you

Lottery dollars are an attractive idea too.

620. Support Representative Condotta, his bill to increase the NOVA fuel tax is going to be dropped this session. if original percentages are used in stead of the reduced funding passed by the legislature
621. portion of ATV & snowmobile tab fees
622. I think that DNR and USFS should automatically get a percentage of the NOVA FUNDS for trail maintenance if compete with others for the funds. A Washington State trail access permit that allows recreation on Washington USFS Washington state lands. Rent out the DNR facilities for public or private meetings in the evenings. Current Horsemen chapter rents a VFW hall for our meetings. There is a DNR meeting place in Enumclaw, would rather monthly money instead of the VFW hall.
623. Lotteries are a good source.
624. I think more cooperation between local entities (counties and cities) can leverage existing funds and provide a revenue. For example hotel taxes can be used to fund projects that bring in visitors, and can be used to provide for other needs. In order for this to be a political reality, more effort needs to be made by DNR and local recreation idea of recreation infrastructure paying for itself. Outdoorindustry.org is a good resource for rationalizing recreation
625. Registration fees for all users-ORV Tabs, Bicycle Tabs, Horse/Owner usage fee.
626. The DNR lands should require permits for use, perhaps personal and parking. The National Forests require user permit and it seems justifiable to do the same at the state level. Policing could occur both by direct observation officials or by individuals with cell phones who can report vehicles without permits.
627. Delegate recreational areas to small groups of volunteers to maintain, as well as search for fundraising (if needed area). I like the idea of taxing gambling/ lotteries.
628. All OHV tabs should go to OHV use areas, all tabs money for trailers supporting such efforts should go to OHV taxes, tab fees and any other extra fees charged for RVs, Travel trailers, enclosed trailers and so on that were part support of such activity should go to OHV use areas. Access for all areas should be charged a fee of 300.00 dollars. These fees could be volunteer's hours; this would equal a rate of 25.00 an hour and would be 12 hrs of volunteer a month. All gas tax associated with OHV use should also be part of this package. I believe if all moneys that were sport were to support that sport there would be plenty. It is because it is being used for other uses that it is not appropriate, let the truth reveal itself. It should be done this way for all groups and no special interest money involved be done. Each group will be responsible to create their incomes as well as the care of these areas. Allow us to use Washington experience and allow others to come to our state and experience, charge a 25.00 dollar fee. Put in campgrounds, charge a fee that would cover the annual cost broke down by day. Including water, electric, sewer it's up keep. Cut down the planning costs by refining the planning procedure. Make the other groups enforcing their actions to reduce the time it takes. Many actions are duplicated and all can be refined to a much better product in what a true Washington experience is so a product can be defined in each category. Make it so people want Washington to experience more than down town Seattle. All our towns need supporting. The incentive is this, towards our dreams which in exchange will hold us responsible for making that happen. Believe me if people not goes towards their efforts it would become effortless for DNR.
629. 1.Keep all of the gas tax (that was supposed to be set aside for recreation) in the recreation budget. 2.Charge 1 day passes) and keep all the money in the rec budget. 3.Actually enforce (that's an idea!) regulations and collect fine 4.Ask volunteer groups to raise funds for specific projects.
630. Fees for organized events and campgrounds. Collaborative grants with user groups (already happening, good primitive. Americorps for maintenance.
631. User fees for developed sites (campgrounds, trailheads, etc.). Minimize resistance and increase volunteer hours day passes for volunteers at a work party and free annual passes to volunteers who provide over 100 hours in cooperative agreements with other organizations (State Parks, National Parks, USFS, BLM) so users can buy day all recreation sites in the state. Get state legislature to increase fines and/or require community service for damage Use the resulting funds/labor to repair damage and/or prevent future damage. Increased enforcement and penalties more incentive for scofflaws to behave. Set up a non-profit foundation to encourage tax-deductible donations to an enhancement fund.
632. I think that it will be very hard in this financial climate to fund the DNR Recreation Program. I understand that in a fight for budget and the risk of not maintaining budget levels over the years is that if you don't "use it you lose it" that we could focus on keeping our State DNR staff without a reduction of workforce and maintain existing trails by tabling some of the non-core functions.
633. 1. Long term funding from the State general budget. 2. Increase proportion of the gas tax allocation pursuant to and Audit Review Committee finding.
634. As a forest user I am happy to help fund the forest programs. I would be happy to pay for special permits or day other ways to fund the programs,, I would like to see portions of the ORV permits (a major portion) go to the public also like you to consider volunteers for the work you need done. Relationships with user groups benefit both the

programs as the people using the areas are proud to help support their areas.

- 635.** I love the fact that many of DNR facilities are no fee, however I believe that we must all do our part to protect our facilities to assure that they may remain. I would not oppose a fee to use recreation facilities. Ideally just a fee for day use is also understandable. Requiring a NW forest pass or something similar is acceptable.
- 636.** 1) Commemorative License Plates that can be purchased for an additional fee that says something about support maybe have three different styles/choices to choose from: one that has a picture of a horseback rider, an ATV on the trail. These images would be in the background behind where the license number is. I would buy one of the with a horseback rider. :-) 2) Annual fee for permits to park at any trailhead
- 637.** -Set up funds for certain parks that have strong user group support such as mountain biking, hikers and 4x4. -2 certain user groups. leases would be restrictive so use cannot be altered and condition of the land cannot be changed
- 638.** A small percentage of funds from lands under DNR management -- or a larger one-time allocation should be allocated as an endowment for the sole purpose of funding recreational programs/facilities/trail construction/trail maintenance/trail maintenance
- 639.** I know this is an old one and unpopular with 4X4 users as well as campers and horseback riders. Have a requirement for all transportation except in main parking areas. This would include all types of recreation.
- 640.** Definitely not through new blanket taxes. A reasonable trail user fee, so that only the people that use trails pay for the trails.