

**Teanaway Recreation Planning – Public Comments**  
**March 9 - May 10, 2018**

---

**Winter non-motorized trails**

That was a nice review of the Teanaway Community Forest Recreation Plan you led at the Cle Elum Community Center last night. Thanks to you and your team for all the hard work and outreach. One major comment on the Winter Recreation Concept:

The amount of land devoted to non-motorized recreation is a tiny fraction of that devoted to snowmobile trails. I believe it should be larger. The small horseshoe shaped grey area designated for non-motorized trails is located in one of the lowest elevation areas (with thinner snow) of the Community Forest. I believe it should extend up higher into the mountains.

I realize that snowmobilers and track-groomers have advocated for continued and increased access, but I truly doubt that the current plan reflects the wishes of the entire state population, especially the population of the Puget Sound, in terms of the relative priorities of snowmobiles and cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. Since the Community Forest was purchased with state funds, I would expect the Plan to reflect not just the voices of the Upper Kittitas and Wenatchee areas, but the millions in the Puget Sound who also paid for the forest with their taxes.

I do believe that a few simple solutions would help address my concern and still allow plenty of room for snowmobilers. In fact, I think the Plan should try hard to encourage teamwork and partnerships between motorized and non-motorized groups... while keeping them out of each other's way on the trails.

1. Extend fingers of the grey non-motorized zones out across the red motorized zones in several logical locations. Example 1: Connect the 29 Pines Sno-Park and the West Fork Sno-Park with a trail along or near the riverbed valley of the North Fork, an ideal route for meandering up the valley, while steering clear of motorized routes. Example 2: Create a non-motorized trail from the existing horseshoe across the Middle Fork and up over the hills to the Jungle Creek voluntary non-motorized zone. Example 3: Create trails from the proposed horseshoe to both Roslyn and Cle Elum. Example 4: Create an extension off the proposed North Fork trail up to Red Mountain.

2. Things to keep in mind about cross-country ski trails:

-- Not every trail, road, or path designated as non-motorized needs to be groomed; as with the Iron Creek area today, there is absolutely nothing better today than parking along the Blewett Pass road at Iron Creek and breaking new track for 4-5 miles up that ungroomed road. It's quiet. It's beautiful. It's free. What could be better? With your current Teanaway plan it's as if you only considered designated trails or roads as non-motorized if the grooming was feasible and if somebody had the budget for it. PLEASE consider designating trails, roads, or new paths on your maps as non-motorized even if they are not groomed! Also, let's face it, we don't have the gorgeous dry and relatively abundant snow of the Methow here in the Upper Kittitas. Grooming might be overkill for skiers. You might also consider just a few "Non-motorized Sno-Parks" to help skiers jump onto non-groomed trails. We do not need all the room that the snowmobile haulers require... just a little pullout (like the Iron Creek one) is great!

— It helps to have a critical mass of trails to attract cross-country skiers. The current horseshoe shaped zone on your map is so small that it almost defeats the purpose of traveling all that way

— Sure, snowmobiles can travel more miles in one day than a skier. Please do not allow that miles-per-day thinking prevent you from considering all the routes that a skier might enjoy over the course of a season... or lifetime.

— Your current Winter Recreation Concepts map seems to take a “never the twain shall meet” approach to ski trails and snowmobile trails. Of course, the whole point is to encourage separation so skiers are not smelling and hearing the snowmobiles and snowmobiles are not zooming up to skiers, and skiers are not descending out of control at snowmobiles, etc etc. Nobody wants that! Adding the new fingers of grey across the pink zones would work just fine if the few intersections are handled with common sense (eg clearing brush, a couple "crossing" signs. etc) Those crossing points might even be the logical spot for the “partnership” I mentioned above: how about placing an occasional hut at those intersections, perhaps with a flag on the outside so an injured skier could signal that he/she needs a ride out? What would make a snowmobiler feel more virtuous than that? What would be more likely to make skiers feel differently about snowmobilers?

— Keep in mind that skiers will likely continue to use all those pink areas as they do today. If we don't add a few more grey fingers into those zones, then that may encourage snowmobilers to feel like the whole pink area “is ours.” Which raises the question: perhaps the map should be re-done to indicate only the trails themselves in colors (ie perhaps red for motorized groomed; blue for non-motorized groomed; and green for non-motorized non-groomed) while leaving the current pink and grey zones undefined... because really if I'm interpreting all this correctly, you are not saying I can't ski anywhere I want in that pink zone right? The colors do help in presenting your plan, in highlighting to-do priorities about trail building, so maybe that is where you were headed, but for end-users, it might send the wrong message.

3. Question: Is there any way I could get the Powerpoint set of slides you presented so I can share with friends? In addition, I would be particularly interested in getting data on the volume of input from the community. Specifically, I was surprised in your “word map” to see that “Hunting” was by far the largest word, presumably reflecting a higher percentage of hunters returning surveys, or making phone calls, or emailing. It raises the question for me: did the DNR do any outreach in the Puget Sound to solicit input about your planning for the Teanaway? I actually believe that hunters are one the best advocates for the environment and preservation of lands and waters, plus they pay a lot of fees!, but I'm just surprised that given the demographics of the whole state that their interest is so overrepresented in your polling.

Doug, again, I am really excited about the work you and your groups have been doing. The summer plan look great! Feel free to get in touch if you have any questions.

Paul Courter  
Cle Elum and Seattle

---

### **Camping -- Horses**

In regards to Teanaway camp which has 65 sites. Currently it has only 2 group stock allowed sites and 1 single. Please include the two pull thru spots across the road and the sites at the end closest to fence line for stock allowed. Have heard comment about concerns of flies, anytime there are cows, elk, or deer there will be flies, and people leaving garbage.

Looking forward to seeing improvements at Teanaway camp and Indian camp campground from grant money!

Linda McAskill  
Landowner Teanaway Road  
Tahoma chapter BCHW  
Enumclaw, WA

---

### **Pack Goats**

Working full time it is always difficult to get off for these meetings. I have sent many emails and comments in the past re the Teanaway and keeping pack goats in the loop as a user of pack stock/horse trails. I have offered many times to give the board information about pack goats if needed, but have never heard back. We have packed with our pack goats all over the state as well as in other states for over 25 years. We have also been involved with many land management planning that includes pack goats as part of the updated plans. Pack goats are a special type of pack stock who cause little if any issues on the trails and lands we use. Please keep pack goats in mind on final decisions. Thanks much for your time.

Donna Ruelas-Semasko  
Edelweiss Acres/Evergreen Pack goat Club

---

### **Motorized Recreation**

Multiple use of the forest is a good thing, but why does your multiple use plan exclude any new motorized recreation?

Earl Nettnin, Region 4 Director  
Pacific Northwest 4-wheel Drive Association, Kennewick, WA

---

### **Gray Wolf**

Please make sure that any denning areas for our Gray Wolf species that still needs protection to reach full recovery? Wolves play a vital role in ecosystem health. Any recreation options that might threaten our wolves must be avoided.

Please add this comment to your public comments regarding this issue. I will be unable to get to Cle Elum for the April 12 community meeting because I am a public school teacher, so it would be a hardship for me to attend in person.

Thank you,  
Rebecca Wolfe, PhD  
Gonzaga University