

Please accept this letter as a public comment to the planning process for the proposed Baker to Bellingham Recreation Plan ('B2B').

You and I have spoken several times by telephone. I appreciate your assistance. I expect that we will continue to talk from time to time as the 828 project progresses.

First, to confirm, I ask that better notice be provided to non-user folks, like neighbors and abutters of DNR properties being considered for the B2B project. DNR's public community meetings and the monthly committee meetings have not been well advertised for the public who does not have a vested interest in seeing DNR lands opened up to recreation. Yet the public will be significantly impacted by the DNR proposals. In the interest of transparency, good notice is important.

We do not have local newspapers or magazines out here in the County. The local Post Office and library bulletin boards are good places to post notices of upcoming meetings for the local Foothills communities of Glacier, Maple Falls, Kendall, Deming, and Sumas. The South Fork residents also would appreciate notice in their communities where there are additional DNR managed lands being considered under B2B.

Second, I have some familiarity with the Foothills area as I live in Maple Falls on Silver Lake Road. In addition, I served as the Maple Falls representative on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Foothills Subarea Plan. That committee was active for several years until the Subarea Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the County Council.

Third, I understand that DNR is presently reviewing the Whatcom County Zoning Code for Commercial Forestry due to Zoning Code restrictions on Off-Road Vehicle Parks in Commercial Forestry zones. To confirm, *I urge that instead of taking the avenue of an amendment to the Zoning Code, that DNR adopt non-motorized recreation plans for DNR managed lands in Whatcom County.* There should not be motorized recreation on those DNR managed lands.

There are many non-motorized recreation users who would love to use DNR managed lands for such activities as soaring, foraging, mountain biking, hiking, hunting, horseback riding, trail running and cross-country skiing. All of those uses qualify for the statutory multi-use mandate for DNR managed lands.

There does not appear, however, to be a mandate that such multi-use *must* include motorized uses. As you know, there are many non-motorized uses which actually conflict with motorized uses, such as hiking and horseback riding to list a few. DNR's own surveys, as well as the committee member comments, confirm that the public perceives that such conflicts exist with motorized uses.

To include motorized uses in the relatively small DNR managed lands in Whatcom County will effectively shut out the bulk of non-motorized users. Surely there are other counties in the State that have larger parcels of DNR lands that could be developed for motorized uses, similar to the Capital Forest.

In addition, as you may know, there are over 4,000 people living in the Columbia Valley Urban Growth Area, which sits right between Red Mountain and Sumas Mountain, on either side of the Kendall Road. Those folks would hear motorized use from either of those two Mountains, and although there will be folks in Columbia Valley who enjoy off-roading, there will also be folks who do not want the noise or traffic that comes with off road use. There are also folks in Kendall, which is outside of the Urban Growth Area, who do not

want such noise or traffic. That will likewise be the case with many folks along Silver Lake Road and South Pass Road. There are at least several hundred homes hidden off on side roads in the area, so this is not the uninhabited area that it seems to be at first glance.

Rather than DNR seeking an avenue to amend the Whatcom County Zoning Code, I urge DNR to choose non-motorized plans for DNR managed lands in Whatcom County.

Such plans would be less costly to DNR to design, implement, maintain and enforce and such non-motorized plans would not include the expense of amending the Zoning Code. In addition, non-motorized plans could be implemented more quickly than motorized plans, which would more quickly satisfy the public's desire for more recreation on state lands.

Thank you for your consideration. Please enter this letter into the public record for B2B.

Kudos for all your hard work on the Baker to Bellingham recreation plan. Certainly it is a wonderful thing to embrace a multiple use strategy by facilitating recreation on our state's commercial forest lands! My question to you at this point is: With so many other ways to enjoy and benefit from our forests, why have you included development of infrastructure for a controversial minority user group like the ORV enthusiasts? Here are some points to consider:

1. Development for recreational motorized vehicle use is prohibited, no variance, on designated Commercial Forestry Lands in Whatcom County. If you insist on including ORV's in the Baker to Bellingham plan, it will tie the whole plan up in a lengthy public process, and perhaps litigation, while you attempt to get the zoning laws changed.
2. The Baker to Bellingham planning committee's survey results show that even the most popular form of all the motorized activities, motorcycle riding, ranks only 9th on the list of potential user groups. Activities scoring higher include hiking, mountain biking, birding, wildlife viewing, fishing, foraging and back country skiing. The survey results also demonstrate that most of these forms of recreation are felt to be incompatible with ORV use. Out of 32 recreational activities considered in the planning process just 5 fall into the motorized use category. Will you let an outspoken minority jeopardize this opportunity to move forward with a plan that will benefit everyone?
3. Your primary responsibility is return to the Trust. The construction of ORV "trails", particularly double track, takes timber land out of production. Where ORV use is not successfully contained, significant damage to timber and soil occur. The enforcement effort necessary to contain ORV use to designated trails could not be done by volunteers; it would require full- time DNR staff, which would be a direct cost to managing these Trust lands.
4. Developing an ORV area could be a net loss to our local Foothills economy (see point # 2 above). The ORV user group's argument that Sumas Mountain and/or Red Mountain would become destination ORV rally parks and bring bikers in from all over the region might be true, but it is just as likely that these sporadic events would keep many more locals and tourists away on a daily basis because the great majority of them wish to engage in activities which are incompatible with ORV's.
5. As has been the case at least twice since 1980, any plan brought forth which includes developed ORV use will encounter stiff resistance from Foothills residents. As residents of the hillsides and valleys surrounding the proposed ORV use areas, it is we who will have to deal with the negative effects, and so every aspect of the Planning Committee's concept maps having to do with motorized recreation will be fought. Some examples are:

- a.) The use is prohibited by County zoning law. We will follow closely this conversation between DNR and County Planning.
- b.) For decades we have watched illegal ORV use thrive, unchecked, as riders cut trees and tear up the state trust lands on Sumas and Red Mountains. In the past, we have contacted the DNR and asked for some enforcement regarding these illegal and destructive activities and have gotten no noticeable response. With a designated ORV trail system would come the requirement for enforcement and an increased liability for both DNR and the County. The State Recreation Liability Waiver does not exempt agencies from complying with either enforcement of the law, or with their own policy. We will follow enforcement efforts closely and insist on full compliance, regardless of cost to the Trust.
- c.) The 200 foot setback from private property is inadequate. We will insist on mitigation which may be costly.
- d.) The 30-vehicle parking lots do not address the question of decks and trailers which could allow hundreds of ORV's to be present at one time. We will ask for clarification on this point.
- e.) As has been the case in past attempts to designate ORV use areas on Red and Sumas Mountains, I and other locals stand ready to formally oppose such use. We will use every means at our disposal including litigation.

In conclusion, I want to express my support for developed recreation opportunities on state Trust lands here in Whatcom County. Into my - quite literal - back yard, I welcome hikers and mountain bikers, trail runners and mushroom pickers, bird watchers and paragliders, horseback riders and rock-hounds, picnickers and skiers and snowshoers. I welcome street-licensed vehicles driving forest roads to hunt, fish, collect firewood and access non-motorized trails. I welcome the folks from Bellingham and Lynden and cities much further afield to come recreate and spend money here in the Foothills. I welcome the DNR trying to diversify how we bring money into the Trust. I do NOT support bringing motorized recreation into the mix which could slow down or stop the planning process, potentially alienate a majority of other user groups, and certainly give local residents many legitimate reasons to protest. I encourage you to drop any consideration of ORV use on commercial forest lands in Whatcom County, and move forward with the otherwise awesome Baker to Bellingham recreation plan.

Please accept this letter as a public comment to the planning process for the proposed Baker to Bellingham Recreation Plan ('B2B').

You and I have spoken several times by telephone. I appreciate your assistance. I expect that we will continue to talk from time to time as the B2B project progresses.

First, to confirm, I ask that better notice be provided to non-user folks, like neighbors and abutters of DNR properties being considered for the B2B project. DNR's public community meetings and the monthly committee meetings have not been well advertised for the public who does not have a vested interest in seeing DNR lands opened up to recreation. Yet the public will be significantly impacted by the DNR proposals. In the interest of transparency, good notice is important.

We do not have local newspapers or magazines out here in the County. The local Post Office and library bulletin boards are good places to post notices of upcoming meetings for the local Foothills communities of Glacier, Maple Falls, Kendall, Deming, and Sumas. The South Fork residents also

would appreciate notice in their communities where there are additional DNR managed lands being considered under B2B.

Second, I have some familiarity with the Foothills area as I live in Maple Falls on Silver Lake Road. In addition, I served as the Maple Falls representative on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Foothills Subarea Plan. That committee was active for several years until the Subarea Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the County Council.

Third, I understand that DNR is presently reviewing the Whatcom County Zoning Code for Commercial Forestry due to Zoning Code restrictions on Off-Road Vehicle Parks in Commercial Forestry zones. To confirm, *I urge that instead of taking the avenue of an amendment to the Zoning Code, that DNR adopt non-motorized recreation plans for DNR managed lands in Whatcom County.* There should not be motorized recreation on those DNR managed lands.

There are many non-motorized recreation users who would love to use DNR managed lands for such activities as soaring, foraging, mountain biking, hiking, hunting, horseback riding, trail running and cross-country skiing. All of those uses qualify for the statutory multi-use mandate for DNR managed lands.

There does not appear, however, to be a mandate that such multi-use *must* include motorized uses. As you know, there are many non-motorized uses which actually conflict with motorized uses, such as hiking and horseback riding to list a few. DNR's own surveys, as well as the committee member comments, confirm that the public perceives that such conflicts exist with motorized uses. To include motorized uses in the relatively small DNR managed lands in Whatcom County will effectively shut out the bulk of non-motorized users. Surely there are other counties in the State that have larger parcels of DNR lands that could be developed for motorized uses, similar to the Capital Forest.

In addition, as you may know, there are over 4,000 people living in the Columbia Valley Urban Growth Area, which sits right between Red Mountain and Sumas Mountain, on either side of the Kendall Road. Those folks would hear motorized use from either of those two Mountains, and although there will be folks in Columbia Valley who enjoy off-roading, there will also be folks who do not want the noise or traffic that comes with off road use. There are also folks in Kendall, which is outside of the Urban Growth Area, who do not want such noise or traffic. That will likewise be the case with many folks along Silver Lake Road and South Pass Road. There are at least several hundred homes hidden off on side roads in the area, so this is not the uninhabited area that it seems to be at first glance.

Rather than DNR seeking an avenue to amend the Whatcom County Zoning Code, I urge DNR to choose non-motorized plans for DNR managed lands in Whatcom County.

Such plans would be less costly to DNR to design, implement, maintain and enforce and such non-motorized plans would not include the expense of amending the Zoning Code. In addition, non-motorized plans could be implemented more quickly than motorized plans, which would more quickly satisfy the public's desire for more recreation on state lands.

Thank you for your consideration. Please enter this letter into the public record for B2B.

This is directed to Options B and C. Specifically, this is about the proposed non-motorized trail systems on Haner Mt. That is, the blocks of proposed trail systems at the south end of Stewart just north of Park Rd, the ones bisected by the BPA lines.

There are at least two private roads that provide access from the area where these sets of trail

systems are proposed, to Highway 9:

- 1) the road under the BPA's lines; and
- 2) probably even more inviting, the private road that ends in an apron at milepost 69 of Hwy 9 (just south of the Blue Mountain Grill). That road is burdened with an easement for only limited purposes--which *not* including recreational use.

What provisions are being made to prevent trail users from trespassing on these private roads in order to access Highway 9?

Similarly, what provisions are being made to prevent trail users from parking at the base of either road and, by doing so, creating a hazard on the highway near the bottom of BPA's powerline road or clogging up the apron at the bottom of the road that ends at MP 69 of Highway 9?

If this area is opened up for non-motorized trail use that includes mountain bikes and/or horses, what provisions are being made to prevent users from going off trail and degrading the forests? That has been a past problem up there, especially with mountain bikes.

Also, and even if the steps can be taken to successfully prevent the above issues, what provisions are being taken to prevent these trails from being used by motorized vehicles? Motorized vehicle use (on and off road) remains a problem up there.

I am shocked to hear about the proposed development near Red Mountain & Silver Lake Park. As a resident/property owner on Silver Lake Rd, I would have thought it prudent of your committee to reach out to those most directly impacted by your plans. Instead, news of your proposals are only just now spreading by word of mouth in our small community. It is unconscionable that you would move forward on such far reaching development without the minimal courtesy of communicating with those of us who live here. I would respectfully ask that you send notice of your meetings, along with proposed agendas & supporting materials in such time as to adequately allow the members of our community to attend in an informed manner. To do otherwise leaves one with the impression that you are operating in secrecy and are not serving the general good of our community.

Regarding proposals for a motorized trail system on Sumas Mountain:

This is not the first time this idea has come up. Has anyone in the planning department looked at the issues raised and the precedents that were established?

I think many of the concerns then are still valid today, maybe even more so with the growing residential population in the nearby area.

Unless the new plans mitigate those concerns, these proposals will likely face long administrative, environmental and likely, legal delays.

A small vocal group of motorized vehicle enthusiasts certainly has the right to propose inclusion in public land use but whether or not Sumas Mountain is the appropriate location is another matter entirely.

Thank you for your reply. I looked through the website so I do understand that you have had community meetings. But how were the residents notified? How were we to know of these meetings? I thank you for your invitation & I do plan to attend the meetings.

I can understand where such extensive outreach would be effective with a certain demographic. However, I would ask that you & the committee would consider that the average resident of the areas in question might not have it on their radar to be on your website or other social media. As for local post offices, gas stations, grocery stores, I have visited our local locations & I most often do look at the postings. I'm not claiming that these locations in Maple Falls were not included in your committee's efforts, but I did not see a single notice. Now that our community is aware of the proposals, we are working on spreading the word here through email lists & door-to-door visits as we have community members who do not use social media at all. I can see where it would appear to be covering your bases with such extensive electronic outreach, but I would ask you to consider it from the perspective of those of us living in rural areas that would not naturally be checking the DNR's webpages. Postal notice may not be flashy but it would assure that residents were notified of measures that will so directly impact them.

As a longtime Bellingham resident, I wanted to write in to make sure that mountain bikes are considered in recreation planning for the Baker to Bellingham project. Please work with the [Whatcom Mountain Bike Coalition](#) (WMBC) to develop a plan for adding/maintaining a network of mountain bike trails. I also appreciate campgrounds, hiking trails, and other opportunities for recreation, but mountain biking is most important to me.

My family is extremely excited about the possibility of an ORV area in Whatcom county. My wife, both kids, and myself all enjoy multiple types of outdoor recreation. We hike, fish, hunt, dirt bike, jeep, big tree hunt, explore, Geocache, take nature field trips, ski, bike, swim, and all around spend our play time outdoors.

We travel the country looking for our next expedition. We have specifically traveled to areas that have outdoor recreational opportunities. Yellowstone, Grand Tetons, Grand Canyon, Painted valley, Moab, Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, and our home state of Washington are all places that we have enjoyed different types of recreating in. We represent far more than one type of user that this ORV area would affect.

Each time we return home to Whatcom county, our thoughts are on the next opportunity to continue our outdoor exploration. Not having a legal place to enjoy all of our outdoor activities "at home" is always a let down. We must travel to be able to experience some of the greatest outdoor experiences that could happen right here in our own county.

We strongly believe the ORV area will not only provide an outlet for the outdoor enthusiasts, but bring tourist type money into our economy.

Sanctioned cross country bike trails in the Glacier area please. Thank you for the trails that are already there and for this opportunity to comment. We are a family of 4 and love to walk and ride trails.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on recreation in Whatcom County. As a volunteer land

monitor, over the past ten years, I have spent thousands of hours in woodlands in the Nooksack and Samish valleys. As the years go by, I enjoy my time in the woodlands more.

The purpose of this memorandum is to request that you act to rein in the armed dirt bike gangs that roam heedlessly through your DNR domain and into private property destroying our environment temporarily with their disgusting noise and fumes and long-term with their wheel-spinning forays through wetlands and up and down steep slopes both on established trails and off.

For example, only this past weekend, while I was working on a forestry project, two groups came through our Whatcom County property. The first two men were from Burlington, a Skagit County town. The next five men were from Seattle, that is, King County. The Seattle group were rude and evasive and refused to identify themselves. Except for one man who conversed for a while about his conservationist credentials they refused to answer questions and rode off. After these two groups came through, I walked for two hours to each of the entrances that they might have used from DNR property and found that our boundary markers were in place and decorated with flagging tape.

We block trails with brush piles and they ride around. A man from the neighborhood looking for a missing person commented that since he last rode for recreation there are a lot of new trails.

Generally, I ask riders who ignore our property boundaries as they pass from DNR property to stop and talk. One neighborhood gang harasses me, entering from DNR property and racing through our property at high speed.

Occasionally, these armed gangs threaten violence and vandalism. See the attached terroristic note that was left on my windshield. As DNR knows, routinely the gangs vandalize and steal your signs and ours. In August, your signs in the parking lot near our property lasted about a week.

Recent research has shown that noise stresses birds and drives them out of urban neighborhoods. Is it not shameful that we allow these armed gangs to penetrate our woodland sanctuaries with their loud and destructive machines?

These views are my own. I don't represent any organization. From past experience with similar surveys, I understand that perhaps five percent of the folks who respond to your survey will request more established dirt bike intrusions into our natural environment. If you should decide to act on their request, I am sure you will responsibly police whatever land you allocate for their destruction; that would be an improvement over the ongoing unmanaged lawless armed gang activity on DNR land in Whatcom County.

More hiking trails near Bellingham would be amazing! It's a huge draw for people to come to school up at western and it could attract a lot more people to the area. More trails closer to town would help make it easier for people to get outside and enjoy the beautiful state we live in. The more time our community spends outdoors the stronger our commitment will be to protect our surrounding lands and ecosystems.

Happy to hear you are accepting feedback from the various user groups. I am from Skagit County and do most of my hiking, backpacking, mountain biking and snowmobiling in Whatcom County. I would like to do most of my Dirtbiking there as well.

As you are aware, the only legal motorbike trail system in both counties is Walker Valley, which is clearly inundated with concentrated motorized vehicles of all sorts. I believe the North Fork of the Nooksack would be a great starting location to expand both a motorized and downhill mountain bike shuttle accessed system. In general I do not feel that medium to heavy use moto trails can be combined with anything but DH Mtb trails and then primarily on a directional basis. I ride moto and unless trail entries are blocked by high skill level maneuvers, there will be significant damage caused by beginners on advanced trails.

The only legal motorized trail is The Canyon Ridge trail, but I believe that is USFS.

I believe the snowmobiling access is actually pretty good though It is primarily USFS as well.

Combining, refining, expanding and interconnecting many of the user built mountain bike systems would be my priority and will yield the largest and most organized volunteer groups and thus would be the easiest to do.

Thanks for your time and allowance for public comment.

I am VERY happy to hear that some of our public DNR lands are no longer given to the timber industry and the PUBLIC will finally have access to PUBLIC lands. Being an avid hunter, I would like to see more land allocated to hunting possibilities.

I attended the planning meeting at the Ferry Terminal in Bellingham and was very pleased with the turnout, presentation and opportunity to provide input towards my regions planning process. I am glad that you are putting together a committee of different user groups and hopefully recreational and environmentalist type folks. Working with the local recreation groups is a big plus since it improves your outreach and you will hopefully receive better quality information.

I label myself first and foremost as a mountain biker, but enjoy hiking, backpacking, and trail running as well. I respect the moto and ATV group and recognize that they too need a place to recreate, as well as the equestrians. I believe that our user groups have naturally set up areas that we recreate on where there isn't a lot of overlap. There is some mutual respect and recognition that certain DNR regions are where mountain bikers recreate more, or motos recreate more, etc. As the president of the Whatcom Mountain Bike Coalition, I believe that the different user groups will be working together behind the scenes to make sure that we share and respect each other but hope that you can facilitate that good relationship.

To simplify thing, I've provided a list of information that I hope is considered during the planning process.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to be heard and to work with you!

RECREATING IN THE FOREST

- Need a variety of trails for different styles of mountain biking (long epic cross country, downhill, beginner loops, etc)
- Need a variety of trails for different levels of difficulty within the different styles of riding.
- The NorthFork provides an area for shuttle-able downhill mountain bike trails. I would love to see that place re-opened.
- Provide "ascend only" trails to allow for multi-use
- Provide loops and connectivity to other parks or region:
- Silver Lake (has camping and we would love access from that area to recreate! Those campgrounds could be filled during low season if recreation was legal and we could put on some

fun events in the Fall or Spring)

- Mountain bike access from South Fork area
- Not sure if the Bay to Baker trail proposed by Dan Probst goes through DNR land but if so, let it happen.
- Connectivity through Blanchard to Chuckanut. I heard that working with the next county might be challenging but any help in making this happen would be much appreciated.
- I'm not well versed on the lands that boarder the wilderness but it would be nice to work with the NFS to provide an epic alpine experience legal to mechanized use.
- Would love to have facilities and campgrounds in high use regions.
- Would love to have good/safe parking
- Love to have a place to stage events and races.

RECREATION TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

- Do you have any concerns about the future recreation management or the planning process?
- Hope that whoever is responsible for managing recreation is open to working with user groups.
- Expect that all user groups have representation during planning process
- Expect a solid fact based explanation of why trail access is allowed or denied.
- Are there areas of environmental concern?
- I expect a balance between protecting natural habitat but not being overly protective
- Are there concerns about impacts to private property?
- Communication with neighboring property owners is absolutely crucial. I can foresee neighbors getting upset with the increase of use and general changes.

PARTNERSHIPS/OPPORTUNITIES

- What opportunities are there for partnerships with communities, other land agencies?
- I hope that local user groups are utilized for trail development and maintenance. These groups can be used to manage any issues that come up with "user built" trails, parking issues, etc.
- Would like neighboring communities to benefit from this by being able to host events, open up convenience stores, etc.

I am writing to express my support for more access to non-motorized trails (mountain biking, hiking) on DNR land as part of the Baker to Bellingham project.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to promote the idea of developing new hiking / mountain biking trail systems in the proposed DNR managed forest areas.

If Galbraith Mountain is any indication of its future success, then I have no doubt this would be such an amazing enhancement for the Whatcom County community both in terms of recreation and attraction of tourists to the area. Let's get this done!

Was interested in helping any way I can. Input, the committee team or other ways.

We came from Wyoming where trails are every where and we were allowed to ride endless. Was trying to figure out ways in Whatcom County before and would love to be a part of this amazing possibility.

Thank you

DNR has not planned for usage of UTV and side by side type vehicles (dimensions are typically 4.5-6'

wide and 8-12' long) in its previous off-road access designs. This has resulted in use of 50" width constrained ATV trails or use of logging/fire roads due to lack of access for these vehicles. In the past DNR has claimed there was little utilization of this class vehicle, but it is due to the lack riding locations rather than lack of vehicles that has limited their reported use and exposure. Since fresh plans are being drawn for this area, this is the best time to include all forms of off-road vehicle access. This is also the opportunity to open up more roads to WATV use since the infrastructure to regulate the vehicles is in place and has been successful.

I am not available to come to the meetings. How am I able to provide effective input?

NO internal combustion engines on our trails, please. They are polluting and destructive of public lands. They are a serious danger to hikers and backpackers, whose activities result in the least destruction of biosphere. Please keep all ATVs and the like out of the trail system.

Equine needs more trails that are user friendly

An ORV in Whatcom county! What a wonderful idea! Make it happen

Please consider creating a motorized trail (motorcycle) system in this area. There is no where to ride in Whatcom county and I'm sure there is plenty of demand for such a system. I'd be happy to volunteer anyway I can to help with this.

Does this new recreation plan in Whatcom County include any motorized usage - single track, two track and 4x4 - or is it, as usual, shutting down motorized access for the benefit of the non-motorized users?

I was dismayed to see the BBJ article below**

I'm not sure who's coordinating this effort, but I'm very unhappy to see that meetings for this "Baker to Bellingham" recreation plan are being held in Bellingham and LYNDEN - not in the actual geographic corridor between Mt. Baker and Bellingham, that basically follows the Nooksack along Mt Baker Highway.

Who will decide which citizens will serve on a committee that will recommend "guidelines" for recreation in our area??

I've lived in Glacier for more than forty years, and numerous "area" recreation plans have been dreadful because input has hardly ever been gathered locally, as it absolutely needs to be.

What sort of corridor - area - does the DNR envision?

Over many years, a limited number of groups with very narrow interests (including, frankly, self-serving commercial interests) have claimed that they have entire communities behind them, when

nothing could be farther from the truth.

Which “groups” are involved so far, who will review the “applications” for this committee? Will their meetings be OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS? Will the material be made public, open to the PUBLIC RECORDS ACT? How? Where?

Also, who (at which DNR office) is in charge of this effort?

I'd like to know more - and others up here would too, no doubt.

** Business Journal Article

[State seeks help developing Mount Baker area recreation plan](#)

by [jimdavis](#)

Filed on 06. Jan, 2016 in [Contents](#), [News](#)

OLYMPIA – The Washington State Department of Natural Resources is looking for help as it develops a new recreation plan for state lands from Mount Baker to Bellingham.

The state agency is currently seeking applications for a recreation planning committee of 12 to 15 volunteer members with diverse recreation interests.

Members will create recommended guidelines for DNR staff to use as they develop the plan. The committee will begin meeting in the Whatcom County area in March with evening meetings on the second Tuesday of each month. Meetings will continue for the next two years, with occasional breaks. To apply, complete an application before Jan. 29, 2016.

The public is also invited to learn more at two open houses. Attend the Bellingham open house on Jan. 19 at the Port of Bellingham Cruise Terminal in the Dome Room, 355 Harris Ave., or the Lynden open house on Jan. 20 at the Lynden Community Center, 401 Grover St. DNR is hosting the open houses from 7-9 p.m. with presentations at the start.

DNR's Baker to Bellingham Recreation Plan will act as a blueprint for the next 10 to 15 years to clarify what types of recreation will occur and broadly define where those activities will happen in the 86,000-acre area. The area includes Sumas Mountain, borders the three forks of the Nooksack River, connects with Whatcom County park lands and provides views of the north Cascade Range.

The final plan will help DNR to pursue construction and maintenance funds for facilities, such as campgrounds, picnic areas and trails, consistent with its vision. To apply for the committee or to learn more, visit www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham.

To ask questions, email BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov or call 360-902-1600.

My family and I would like to see an ORV use area in Whatcom county. Thanks

Hope the planning session went well tonight! Sorry I could not attend, as Bellingham is a bit far from Portland. However, I've attached two links to the EIS for proposed ORV parks on both Sumas Mtn and the Van Zandt Dike. Also, attached is a proposal from a group of ORV users who wanted to resurrect use on Sumas mountain back in 2009. Lastly, a map of the ORV trails and rough area that users had before closure in 2005.

Sumas EIS: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/c8uc239j8rncizg/FullSumasEIS.pdf?dl=0>

Sumas December 2009 Proposal:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/68ye5e3ltovb7me/Sumas%20Draft%20Proposal.pdf?dl=0>

Van Zandt Dike EIS:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/9qlbri32sjh3ff0/VanZandt-Whatcom%20ORV%20park.pdf?dl=0>

North Fork ORV Map (before 2005 closure):

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/vl7n5cb0423ovrp/North%20Fork%20ORV%20Map.png?dl=0>

If there are any other materials or slides from a presentation you can share from the meeting, I'd love to take a look at them.

First off, I'm really glad to see this process in action. Whatever the outcome. Of course I have my many preferences for the outcome but here are the highlights:

Involve the user groups in the planning and build - The users know the experience they want and how to achieve that.

Build trails for all ability levels - Flat gravel paths are super boring but have their place. All user groups want advanced, challenging and exciting trails.

Base trail priority (what gets addressed in what order) on the involvement of the user group - Please don't build something that will not or will barely get used when there is another user group ready to put in the volunteer sweat equity, collect funds, etc. to make something else happen.

Divide trail use by speed - Hikers, horses and uphill bicycles are slow. Moto and downhill bicycles are fast. Downhill biking is unique in that it almost mandates user group specific directional trails.

Access to the snow - I'm not a snowmobiler but I have friends who are. They are crammed into Glacier creek and Canyon creek. They don't need much more than a defined area to recreate and a place to park and unload near the snow. I do splitboard and would also use any new access points for recreation. The two previously mentioned areas have very long distance approaches which makes them unreasonable for non-motorized recreation.

There is a considerable recreation oriented community in Bellingham and the trails we have are huge draw to the area. I can only imagine how much more popular this area would be if we created the amazing trail system we're all dreaming of.

I am a Geology Master's Student and beginning mountain runner. I learned about the Baker-to-Bellingham project in an email (forwarded to me by the Western Washington University Geology Dept), and would like encourage the construction of single-track, biking, and horse trails, ideally connecting Bellingham to Koma Kulshan.

I would like to voice my eager support for increased mtn bike trail access on DNR lands. I have been a long time active member of the Bellingham/Whatcom County community and moved back to Bellingham many years ago for the easy access to the outdoors. In the past and continuing through today, trail access for mtn bikers on DNR lands has not been clear and as a result the local bike community have suffered a huge loss by not being able to legally access these publically held land tracts. I strongly urge you now to take this opportunity (as many other municipalities have done...including Larrabee State Park and DNR managers on Tiger Mtn) to constructively work with the mtn bike community and allow access to these public lands.

I would like to see more trailheads and trails for horses.thanks

I'm a Bellingham resident and passionate outdoorsmen and conservationist. I am thrilled with the Baker to Bellingham concept. However, I am concerned that motorized traffic (ATVs, Snowmobiles) would jeopardize both the safety of hikers and bikers as well as contributing to environmental degradation of this beautiful place. Therefore, I would advocate strongly for prioritizing hikers and bikers. After all, the goal should be healthy communities and healthy lands, and motorized trail use is damaging to both.

I'm emailing to voice my support for the inclusion of mountain bikers and mountain bike accessible trails on the DNR lands of Whatcom county. The mountain bike community is both large and well organized in Whatcom county and this has two distinct benefits for land managers. First mountain bikers are a huge resource for volunteer trail maintenance and construction. I feel that this does offset increased wear from the use of mountain bikes on multi use trails. Secondly word of trail closures, restrictions, and rules spreads quickly through the community and the vast majority of mountain bikers are happy to cooperate. The continuing use of the Galbraith Mountain trail system is testament to this. Lastly I feel that where it is feasible and does not negatively impact other members of the public, Whatcom county residents have a right to use public lands for recreating in whatever form they choose. I hope that you will include the mountain bike community in the planning process and embrace the tremendous volunteer resource available to you.