



Sustainable Recreation Work Group

Forum Issue: Access

Part 2 (Additional Information)

August 2009

Public Access Opportunities on DNR-managed Lands

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) provides an array of recreational opportunities throughout its many landscapes (see appendix A). The public can use DNR’s many roads, trails, and recreational facilities to enjoy the outdoors.

Trails and Facilities

In July 2009, DNR had to reduce services at several facilities due to budget cuts; however, DNR still manages more than 113 recreational facilities and 1,000 miles of trails.

	2007-09	2009-11
Campgrounds	79	59
Day Use Areas	22	17
Trailheads	42	37
Miles of trails	1,000	1,000

Public Access to DNR-managed Lands

In 2006, DNR’s regional staff compiled the following information about existing access to DNR-managed lands. The following table lists by region the acres and miles of roads that provide public access to DNR-managed lands. The percentages are a comparison of restricted to non-restricted acres and miles of road in each region. “Restricted road access,” usually by gating, often occurs in areas with a history of resource damage, severe safety and liability concerns, illegal activities, and limited or no staff to police the area. Restricted access may also mean a road entering DNR-managed lands may cross private property and access is limited only to DNR staff for management and maintenance activities. Statewide, about 40 percent of restricted areas are behind gates owned by private landowners. With the exception of the restrictions to access on private lands, the public can generally engage in dispersed activities—such as hunting—behind gates on DNR-managed lands.

Region	Total acres accessed by Forest Road	Acres of land with unrestricted road access	Acres of land with restricted road access	Total Miles of DNR Forest Road	Miles of unrestricted roads	Miles of restricted roads
Northwest	380,000	94,000	286,000	1,500	390	1,110
		25%	75%		26%	74%
South Puget Sound	223,430	109,377	114,053	1,245	554	691
		49%	51%		44%	56%
Southeast	313,857	251,430	63,008	1,568	720	848
		80%	20%		46%	54%
Pacific Cascade	540,398	386,885	153,513	2,983	2,021	962
		72%	28%		68%	32%
Olympic	366,423	242,768	123,654	2,612	1,975	637
		66%	34%		76%	24%
Northeast	498,000	398,400	99,600	2,800	2,461	339
		80%	20%		88%	12%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	2,322,108	1,482,860	839,828	12,708	8,121	4,587
		64%	36%		64%	36%

Public Access to State Owned Aquatic Lands

The citizens of Washington own 2.6 million acres of lands that lie beneath our state’s lakes and rivers, Puget Sound, and the Pacific Ocean. DNR manages these lands on behalf of the citizens to provide a balance of benefits. These benefits were defined by the legislature and include providing for:

- Navigation and commerce.
- Public access.
- Environmental protection.
- The use of renewable resources.
- Generating revenue when appropriate.

Access is an ongoing challenge in providing for public use and recreation of aquatic lands. Often, the state’s aquatic lands are only accessible by boat because the upland parcels are privately owned. The Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account was established in 1984 to address the problem. The fund can be used to purchase adjoining lands to facilitate access to aquatic lands. These funds may be used to purchase or develop these adjacent parcels in order to foster

aquatic land access. Project sponsors are generally local governments, ports and sometimes tribal governments. DNR generates revenue through the management of state-owned aquatic lands that goes into this fund. In the last 10 years, DNR has put \$6 to \$9 million per biennium into this fund.

When access to aquatic lands is established, it must be managed. DNR achieves this by finding partners (such as Washington State Parks) with the resources to manage public access points and improvements. DNR also facilitates public access by providing financial incentives to those who lease state-owned aquatic lands. If a lessee provides free public access to aquatic lands, they are not charged for that portion of their lease.

Managing Public Access

Increased Demand

Recreation on DNR-managed lands has dramatically changed in the last 40 years since the Multiple Use Act was enacted. When DNR began building its recreational facilities and trails in the 1960s, the majority of outdoor recreation activities included fishing, hiking, horseback riding, swimming, picnicking, and hunting. Today, the most popular outdoor activities include mountain biking, camping, and motorized trail use (motorcycles, ATVs, 4x4s). Activities such as paragliding, paintball, and mountain biking did not even occur on DNR-managed lands until well after the 1960s (see appendix A). In addition to these changes in recreation trends, the state's population has nearly doubled in the last 40 years from 3.3 million to 6.5 million. As a result, we've seen a dramatic increase in the number of visitors to DNR-managed lands.

DNR faces an enormous challenge meeting both the needs of increased use and the changing types of activities with the same facilities and trails it built 40 years ago. As the gap between the public's increased demand for outdoor recreation opportunities and DNR's limited resources continues to grow, the negative impacts of recreation on the environment and public safety will also grow.

Adjacent Landowners and Managers

Coordination: DNR coordinates with adjacent landowners when engaging in recreation planning. By doing so, DNR helps ensure the plans are compatible with the needs and desires of adjacent landowners and that they do not cause negative impacts to neighboring properties. Each of DNR's current recreation planning processes (Yacolt Burn and Ahtanum State Forests and Reiter Foothills) involve a planning committee consisting of various stakeholders, including adjacent landowner interests. Members of these committees provide DNR with their input and are a critical component of the planning process.

DNR plans to increase coordination with adjacent landowners and managers through a larger regional landscape approach. We want to be able to incorporate the recreation supported on the adjacent lands in our own recreation plans. To do this, we may also need to coordinate resources with public land managers, such as county parks and US Forest Service lands, to provide more cost-efficient management of recreational opportunities for all parties involved.

Impacts to Neighbors: DNR recognizes that recreation on state lands can have potential impacts to neighboring properties. Impacts to adjacent lands can include noise (see discussion further in this report), increased fire risk, growth of invasive species, and harm to water supplies. With regard to water supplies, some municipalities are concerned that motorized outdoor recreation could result in petroleum products seeping into the ground and entering aquifers relied on for drinking water. While the spillover of environmental impacts may occur incidentally, the effects to adjacent lands can be significant.

Adjacent landowners may also be negatively affected by people who access DNR-managed lands and then litter, build undesignated trails, or vandalize or steal timber. For instance, undesignated trails beginning on DNR-managed lands can easily trespass onto private lands. While the impacts to neighboring properties from recreation are for the most part not associated with recreational users who follow the rules, the fact that DNR-managed lands are open to the public makes it easier for individuals to gain access to neighboring lands and cause harm.

Education and Enforcement

Current Education and Enforcement Presence

An education and enforcement presence on the landscape is an important element in public safety. Currently, DNR has only seven law enforcement officers serving the entire state. In one region, a single DNR law enforcement officer patrols nearly 900,000 acres of DNR-managed lands. A few state forests have DNR trail wardens who have the authority to do limited enforcement. Unfortunately, most of those staff positions are linked to the Recreation and Conservation Office grants, which have been eliminated for the current biennium grant cycle. The limited education and enforcement presence is one of the main reasons why DNR lacks the ability to actively manage public use of its lands to the same level as state or national parks.

Integrated Education and Enforcement

An effective education and enforcement program uses a combination of formal and informal approaches. On an informal level, responsible citizens and DNR recreation staff can address improper behavior on DNR-managed lands by respectfully educating individuals. A formal approach, using trained law enforcement officers, is generally necessary for more serious cases to address improper behavior. Only through adequate communication and coordination between the two approaches can there be an effective education and enforcement presence on the landscape.

DNR Law Enforcement Officers: DNR's law enforcement officers go through extensive and ongoing training to properly enforce the law on DNR-managed lands. DNR officers have the authority to physically detain individuals and make criminal arrests where needed, as well as use firearms.

Other Enforcement Officers: City, county, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and State Patrol officers all have the ability to enforce laws on DNR-managed lands. DNR has coordinated with other law enforcement agencies to provide increased patrols on

DNR-managed lands, such as in Reiter Foothills. However, due to dwindling resources of other enforcement agencies, they can only provide limited help to DNR.

DNR Trail Wardens: Trail wardens are commissioned DNR staff who have received basic enforcement training and can write criminal citations. Trail wardens do not carry firearms and do not physically detain individuals. They are trained to focus primarily on educating the public about the proper behavior on DNR-managed lands. Wardens wear uniforms, which identify them as DNR employees, but which do not resemble that of an enforcement officer. In high risk situations, the trail wardens contact DNR enforcement officers and/or the local police department.

DNR Recreation Staff: DNR recreation staff have the most interaction with the public and serve on the frontline in educating the public about the proper behavior on DNR-managed lands. Recreation staff do not have authority or the training to take enforcement action. In situations where enforcement is needed, DNR recreation staff contact DNR's law enforcement officers and/or the local police department.

Forest Watch: A Forest Watch—or similar—program consists of citizen volunteers who coordinate with a government agency to help ensure safer forests through a more active presence on the landscape. Forest Watch volunteers are responsible for monitoring and observing recreation trails, sites, and facilities. They also provide information to visitors and document and report any incidents and/or concerns to the appropriate agency staff or law enforcement. Examples of successful Forest Watch-type programs include the Eyes in the Woods program, which works closely with WDFW and the International Mountain Bike Association's (IMBA) mountain bike patrol program.

Agency staff are responsible for implementing and documenting the Forest Watch program by serving as the primary point of contact. They provide the necessary training, resources, and oversight to volunteers. In situations where a volunteer's efforts to educate a person has not stopped the person from behaving inappropriately, a timely and responsive enforcement support is necessary to keep the situation from escalating and to ensure the safety of volunteers, staff, and visitors. DNR is currently considering a more formalized forest watch-type program. However, DNR does use volunteer campground hosts to provide an education and enforcement presence at DNR-managed campgrounds.

General Public: The general public can play a key role in reporting vandalism and other illegal activities. By having phone numbers that the public can call the public can quickly provide DNR enforcement the needed information to take necessary actions to remedy the problem.

Impacts to the Environment

(Note: Earlier this year the steering committee for the Sustainable Recreation Work Group prepared a more detailed report on environmental damages. The following is a summary of that document to provide context for access issues.)

Every year, more than 11 million people recreate on lands managed by DNR, causing varying impacts to the environment. Environmental impacts, for the purposes of this paper, are defined as

“any undesirable visitor-related biophysical change of the [natural] resource.” (Leung and Marion, 2000).¹ Some human activities may appear benign but can still cause significant harm to the environment if not managed properly.

Impacts from Noise

Sound Background: Sound is produced by the vibrations of sound pressure waves in the air. Sound pressure levels are used to measure the intensity of sound and are described in terms of decibels (dBA). Sound is composed of various frequencies; however, the human ear will only respond to a limited range of frequencies. People normally experience sound levels between approximately 30 dBA and 90 dBA, depending on their activity. The smallest change in sound level considered discernable is 2-3 dBA, with 5 dBA being clearly noticeable. Generally, if a person stands 20 inches away from three ATVs they will experience an estimated sound of 91.3 dBA.

Topography: Topography and land cover can affect how sound travels. For example, valleys and depressions often limit the distance noise travels, effectively blocking the noise source (ORV) from the receiving property. Conversely, trails located along a hillside or ridgeline may be heard further away than expected.

Noise Regulations: The Department of Ecology (DOE) limits the level of sound emitted from one property and received on another. Regulations separate different types of land use into three categories based on existing or future use, with each category given an Environmental Designation for Noise Abatement (EDNA). The most sensitive areas, Class A EDNAs, are identified as “lands where human beings reside and sleep” or residential areas. When managing ORV use on DNR-managed lands, DNR is only required to address noise impacts affecting Class A EDNAs. The permissible sound level for Class A EDNAs ranges from 55 dBA to 60 dBA.

DNR Noise Study: DNR is currently undertaking an ORV noise analysis to develop guidance to be applied at the landscape planning level as a trail and facility assessment tool. While actual sound impacts will vary based on site specific topography and vegetative conditions, the guidance provides a general distance that should be provided between an ORV trail or facility and a receiving property. In some cases, additional analysis may be needed to ensure that any distance used is sufficient to meet DOE’s noise rules.

Soils

Studies show activities such as off-road vehicle and horseback riding create more of an impact on soils than human-powered activities such as hiking and mountain biking. Increased use of a

¹ Leung, Yu Fai; Marion, Jeffrey. 2000. *Recreation Impacts and Management in Wilderness: A State-of-Knowledge Review*. In: Cole, David; McCool, Stephen F.; Borrie, William T.; O’Loughlin, Jennifer, comps. 2000. Wilderness science in a time of change conference— Volume 5: Wilderness ecosystems, threats, and management; 1999 May 23–27; Missoula, MT. Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-5. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.

trail or campsite will also create a greater impact to the environment. However, all activities, regardless of the type and amount of use, can potentially harm the environment if a trail or campsite is poorly placed, designed, or maintained.

Currently, DNR manages more than 1,000 miles of designated trails, and it is estimated that there are more than two and half times that number of undesignated trails (non-authorized trails). According to a National Park Service study, soil loss due to erosion from designated and undesignated trails on DNR-managed lands could potentially equate to more than 484,000 cubic yards annually—nearly three times the volume of the Washington State Capitol Building.

Poor planning and improperly located trails and campsites pose an even greater threat to soil stability and environmental health than impacts from recreational use. To prevent erosion, many factors need to be taken into consideration such as slope gradient, rainfall intensity, and soil properties.

On DNR-managed lands, most of the soil erosion happens on undesignated trails, which are approximately three times more eroded than designated trails. Generally, these unauthorized trails have been improperly located and poorly—if at all—maintained. The poor location of many undesignated trails and campsites, such as in wetlands or on steep slopes, causes significant environmental damage.

And once an area has been impacted by soil erosion, recovery is difficult. In many cases, the trail or campsite needs to be removed for soils to recover.

Impacts to Vegetation

Recreation-related activities on campgrounds, trails, and roads presents two potential environmental impacts to vegetation: loss of vegetation and the introduction of invasive species.

Vegetation loss varies greatly depending on the durability and recovery of the vegetation being affected and the type and amount of trail use. Placing trails and campsites in areas of durable vegetation can help reduce impacts. At the lowest levels of recreational use (200 to 400 passes by hikers), some species of vegetation may recover from trampling and soil compaction in as little as a year. However, once recreational use meets or exceeds moderate levels, it may take several years for vegetation to recover. Winter recreation may also cause vegetation loss as a result of snow compaction affecting soils and plants.

Recreational trails and roads can serve as primary corridors for transporting **invasive species** onto DNR-managed lands. Invasive species can be highly adaptable to a variety of environments, spread easily, and can displace or eliminate native vegetation. Across Washington, invasive species threaten the state's biological richness and diversity, which can have serious consequences to resources such as timber and agriculture. Transporting invasive species often occurs passively, such as on tire treads and horse hooves. Yet it takes a significant effort to remove these species once they are established.

Impacts to Water Quality

One of the most significant threats to water quality from outdoor recreation is sediment delivery into streams. Recreational trails and roads, depending on their location and design, have the potential to deposit large amounts of sediment (several tons annually) into fish-bearing streams. In an Idaho study, a single forest road deposited 1,268 tons of sediment into a river over the course of a year. Sediment delivery from roads and trails into streams can kill fish and produce long term damage to an aquatic ecosystem.

ORV use may also pose a threat to water quality, if a vehicle tips over, for example, and spills gasoline and oil in or near a stream.

Other impacts to water quality as a result of outdoor recreation can occur from toxic lead buildup at unmanaged shooting sites. With enough accumulated use, lead and other metals from bullets, shot, and gunpowder can cause toxic buildup in soils which could potentially reach surface and groundwater which is consumed by humans and wildlife.

Impacts to Wildlife

Many people are drawn to the outdoors because of the opportunity to view wildlife in a natural setting. However, the presence of people can affect the overall wellbeing of Washington's wildlife and may be farther reaching than the impacts to plants and soils, since wildlife can travel great distances and pass learned responses on to their offspring.

As mentioned previously, outdoor recreation can affect vegetation, soils and aquatic systems, which serve as habitat for various wildlife. Impacts to habitat from recreational use can occur from building a trail in the forest to removing wood for a campfire. By negatively impacting habitat wildlife have a reduced ability to survive.

Continuous disturbance of wildlife, even when it appears to be benign, can have an impact on wildlife. In some cases, disturbance to wildlife may lead to illness or death of wildlife. The degree to which wildlife is disturbed depends largely on where the recreation activities take place. Studies have shown that wildlife are more disturbed by recreational users in areas where the presence of people is less common, such as off trails and away from campsites. Wildlife are also more susceptible to the stress caused by a disturbance during the winter, migration, and pregnancy.

Impacts to Air Quality

Both motorized trail use and commuting by motorized vehicle to a recreation area affects air quality. Comparatively, ATVs, off-road motorcycles, and snowmobiles emit more air pollutants than a passenger car. For example, a passenger car would have to drive five hours to equal the amount of hydrocarbons emitted over the course of an hour by a four-stroke ATV. Motorized use tied to outdoor recreation can result in the emission of various harmful pollutants such as carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter. The end result of these pollutants can impact plant life and human health, and increase smog.

Managing Environmental Impacts

Spreading Use vs. Concentrating Use

The initial use of land for recreational purposes will have a higher environmental impact relative to later or additional recreational use of the land. Therefore, except at the lowest levels of recreational use (e.g. infrequent light foot traffic), spreading recreational use, instead of directing it to a concentrated area, will accumulatively cause greater environmental impact. While the specific environmental impacts on a given trail may increase from concentrating use, the overall impacts on the landscape will be much lower per user visit than by spreading recreational use across the entire landscape.

Planning and Relocation

Undertaking proactive planning is key in minimizing impacts, since environmental factors, such as slope, rainfall intensity and soils play a key role in the degree of environmental impacts a trail or campsite will produce. Through proper planning, a trail or campsite can be located in an area that can better withstand impacts, while avoiding areas that are highly susceptible to environmental impacts, such as riparian areas. When trails and campsites are poorly located it may be necessary to relocate the trail or campground through proper planning in order to adequately address environmental impacts.

Design, Construction and Maintenance

Once the location has been planned properly, trail and campsite design becomes important. By designing and constructing a trail or facility with mitigation measures, such as trail hardening, water bars or physical barriers around campsites, environmental impacts can be reduced. While there is an initial investment in the proper design and construction of a trail or campground, this proactive approach may be necessary to minimize environmental impacts. Maintenance is needed, especially as a trail or campground receives more use, in order for the environmental benefits from the proper design and construction to continue to be realized.

Seasonal Closures

Recovery rates for a natural resource will vary depending on the landscape and the type of environmental impact (e.g., soil loss usually requires longer recovery than vegetation loss). Seasonal closures are an effective means of avoiding substantial environmental impacts to trails and campgrounds during the seasons they are most susceptible to degradation, such as during wet periods. However, seasonal closures to allow trails to recover are seldom effective, as recovery rates on a given landscape are almost always slower than their deterioration rates.

Safety and Liability

Safety to Individuals: Outdoor recreation provides certain inherent risks, partly because the outdoors is not an easily controlled environment. Over the last five years (2004-08) there have been 18 deaths and 21 potentially life-threatening reported accidents related to recreation on DNR-managed lands. While most of the accidents involved motorized recreationists, accidents also involved equestrian and mountain bike trail users. The reported number of accidents does not include those in which people were seriously injured, but never informed DNR. Based on anecdotal evidence, we estimate that 95 percent of accidents not resulting in a fatality are never reported to DNR.

Safety to Property: Property damage occurs on DNR-managed lands and neighboring lands, from shot-up signs to gates being ripped out of the ground. In the last biennium (2007-09), more than a thousand incidents of property loss and vandalism occurred on DNR-managed lands. Addressing damage can be costly. In the last year alone, DNR spent more than \$125,000 repairing damage, which is equal to the annual costs of having an enforcement officer and maintaining 30 miles of trail. While property damage and vandalism are by no means a direct result of outdoor recreation, the fact that DNR has provided the public access to DNR-managed lands with a limited education and enforcement presence makes it easier for those looking to perpetrate criminal activities on DNR-managed lands.

Liability and Recreational Immunity

Washington law provides public and private landowners immunity from tort liability if they allow the public access to their property for outdoor recreation purposes. The purpose of the law is “to encourage owners or others in lawful possession and control of land and water areas or channels to make them available to the public for recreational purposes.” (RCW 4.24.200)

Landowners who allow access without charging an access fee are not liable for unintentional injuries to users. The only exception is for State Parks and Fish and Wildlife who are allowed to charge a fee for a statewide pass and still retain their recreational immunity. While the statute does provide DNR some protection from liability, DNR still has to pay for the legal costs in defending themselves against claims and lawsuits involving injuries arising out of people recreating on DNR-managed lands. Legal costs to defend these lawsuits can easily range in the tens of thousands of dollars, even where DNR successfully dismisses the claim based on the recreational immunity statute.

Almost all other states have some type of recreational immunity statute, which protects landowners who open their lands to the public for recreational purposes. While many states’ recreational immunity statutes prohibit a fee of any kind being charged, there are states such as Minnesota and Montana that allow government agencies to charge user fees to recreate and still retain their recreational immunity.

Washington’s recreational immunity statute is one of the least protective of landowners in the nation because it does not apply in situations where there is a known, dangerous, artificial, and latent (concealed; dormant) condition for which warning signs have not been conspicuously

posted. If a landowner knows of dangerous conditions that are artificial and latent, they must take action to address the dangerous conditions, otherwise they risk losing their recreational immunity.

Oregon’s recreational immunity statute used to have a similar provision that waived a landowner’s recreational immunity for the willful, wanton and reckless failure to guard or warn against a known dangerous structure, improvement, or activity. In 1995 Oregon repealed the provision, thereby providing more protection from liability to landowners.

Currently, Washington’s exception to recreational immunity for certain dangerous conditions is the only one of its kind in the nation. No other state waives a landowner’s recreational immunity simply by knowing of certain dangerous conditions located on their land.

State	Protections Provided	Limits on Liability	Loss of Immunity for Charging a Fee?
Washington	No duty of care to another person using land for recreation	*Cannot cause injury through willful and/or wanton misconduct *Cannot have a known dangerous, artificial, and latent condition with no conspicuously posted warning signs.	*Government – Yes, with an exception for State Parks, and Fish and Wildlife *Private – Yes
Arizona ARS § 33-1551	No duty of care to another person using land for recreation or education	*Cannot cause injury through willful, malicious or grossly negligent conduct *Cannot maintain an attractive nuisance	Yes
Minnesota MSA 604A.20 – 27	No duty of care to another person using land for recreation	Cannot willfully cause injury to another	*Government – No *Private – A profit commercial entity cannot charge an access fee
Montana MRCA 70-16-302	No duty of care to another person using land for recreation	Cannot cause injury through willful and/or wanton misconduct	*Government – No *Private – Yes
Oregon ORS 105.682 – 688	No duty of care for those entering land to recreate, cut wood or harvest special forest products	Cannot intentionally cause injury to another	Yes
Utah UC 57-14	No duty of care to another person using land for recreation	Cannot cause injury or damage to person or property through deliberate, willful or malicious conduct	Cannot charge an access fee of more than \$1 a year

Potential Options for Addressing Access Concerns

Gaining Access to DNR-managed lands

The following addresses two potential options for gaining public access onto DNR-managed lands:

Large Multi-Agency Fund

The legislature could create a large fund that various state agencies—including DNR—could use to purchase public access on private property with the goal of allowing better access to state-managed lands, including aquatic lands. For aquatic lands, DNR also would need statutory authority to acquire private tidelands for access.

Direct Appropriations

The legislature could directly appropriate funds for DNR to purchase public access from willing sellers to allow the public better access for specific blocks of DNR-managed lands. Under this scenario, funding for purchasing access would be done on a case by case basis by the state legislature.

Undesignated Trails and Uses

The following is a straw proposal for addressing environmental and other impacts from recreational use on DNR-managed lands, including impacts from undesignated trails. This proposal is based largely on the Sustainable Recreation Work Group members' discussion during their May meeting.

1. In prioritizing recreation landscapes for detailed planning, DNR will explain in a transparent way how environmental impacts (soil/water/fish; noise; wildlife; other) contribute to prioritization of those landscapes. DNR will also consider the presence or absence of safety, liability, or user interaction problems when prioritizing landscapes for planning, and will place priority on those cases where the presence of these types of impacts requires a in-depth solution at the landscape level. Where planning is occurring for a landscape, DNR will explain how restoration, correction, and/or prevention will be incorporated to address environmental impacts. DNR will specify if it is deferring to or incorporating adequate pre-existing statutes or regulations (e.g. Ecology noise rules).
2. Where planning is deferred, DNR will determine what site-specific, landscape and/or statewide measures are to be relied on to control and/or mitigate unacceptable impacts, including those impacts associated with undesignated trails. Examples include education, redirecting or limiting use, closing areas, undesignated trails, or facilities, and enforcement. In other cases DNR, with help from users, may, to the extent feasible, incorporate into DNR's trail system undesignated trails which are not causing environmental, safety, liability,

or user interaction problems, are logically located on the landscape, and for which DNR has the resources to manage the trail.

3. In developing landscape plans and other strategies, as above, DNR will, to the extent feasible, work collaboratively with the public (including neighbors), user groups, landowners, governments and agencies, and other organizations. DNR will also pursue the possibility of grant funding, partnerships, and other sources of funding to develop and implement planning and other strategies.

Appendix A: Recreational Activities Occurring on DNR-managed lands

Camping	4x4ing	Rock climbing
Hunting	Geo-caching	Snowshoeing
Picnicking	Body boarding	Kite boarding
Swimming	ATV riding	Paintball
Fishing	Kayaking	Target shooting
Hiking	Dog sledding	Studying nature
Snowmobiling	Scuba diving	Photography
Motorcycling	Rock hounding	Skijoring
Horseback riding	Trail running	Zorbing
Pleasure driving	Gold panning	Paragliding
Boating	Hang gliding	Berry/mushroom picking
Mountain biking	Airsoft	Birding