



**Public Comments\*\***  
**Recreation Planning Committee Meeting**  
**April 10, 2018 | 6 to 9 p.m.**  
**Mt. Baker High School, Deming**

**\*\*Note: Names and comments were captured to the extent possible by DNR staff**

Rainbow Medicine Walker – Member of the Cherokee Nation. Resident of Columbia Valley. Showing of hands of folks opposed to motorized trails in our county forest lands. Defies common sense that the six motorized representatives have not been removed from the committee. Motorized representatives have dominated this committee. Unacceptable. Not a single environmental group or local land owner representative. No fish and wildlife or watershed represented. This is not the case with other DNR rec plans in other areas. The committee is unbalanced. The larger community is not happy with the imbalance. DNR is creating an aura of mistrust. The committee should be restructured to reflect the local populations. Many locals who are opposed to motorized recreation in our local forest are fed up with the DNR's lack of response to this issue.

Luba Pekisheva – Live in Kendall. Enjoy hiking on Red Mtn. I don't understand what the six motorized reps can add to a non-motorized rec plan. There are other supported groups that you can work with. You should dismiss those motorized representatives, and allow six new people to join the committee. Recognize that motorized trails are not a part of the foreseeable future of a recreation plan here.

Max Duncan – I appreciate the announcement that ORV areas have been removed from the planning process. I appreciate the community involvement. Thanks to the members of the advisory committee and I hope you have heard our approval for the non-motorized components of the plan. When I try to speak with my representatives, they were unaware of our 5,000 residents between the two recreation areas. Shouldn't the bird watchers, mushroom pickers, and tribes have a seat at the table for this planning committee? Committees work to develop a shared understanding. Please add new members to this committee.

Holly Koon – Thanks to the committee members for their time. (Quotes an article). The Baker to Bellingham plan failed to represent the local land owners. I have invested time and money for fish passages on my land. But my interests are not represented on this committee. As a conservationist, I have not seen conservation discussed at either of the two committee meetings that I have attended. Two suggestions; add additional members to represent our community and increase communication with the local communities.

Laura Abernathy – Yields her time.

**DRAFT – Subject to Change Without Notification**

**BAKER TO BELLINGHAM RECREATION PLAN**

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

[BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov](mailto:BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov) | [www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham)

# Baker to Bellingham



Michael Savatgy – I think the DNR should purge the motorized representative from the committee. I was rejected from the committee. A friend was also denied. (Quotes rejection letter). User and interests groups represented by this committee are listed but they are a fabrication. Why should the committee be moving in a direction that is not legally possible but also does not represent the interests of our community? Quotes Aldo Leopold.

Brock Milliern (DNR) – Being a part of a committee means you begin to understand each other. This group has spent two years doing this. Just because they come to represent motorized does not mean they don't have valuable input to this process. I have heard so far that the non-motorized plan is supported by the community.

Public Comment – Do you understand that having motorized members on the committee breeds distrust amongst us?

Public Comment – You said “we will not be planning for motorized vehicles in 2018”. What does that mean? Is land being reserved for motorized recreation at some point? Will motorized recreation be revisited in the foreseeable future?

Glenn G (DNR) – I said the county council is not considering the proposed amendment to the county ORV ordinance in 2018. Trust land is reserved for working forest. We do not reserve land for recreation, and in this instance specifically not motorized recreation. This is a 10-15 year plan.

Gibbler ? – Audubon society is happy this non-motorized plan is moving forward. I have a trail proposal. I would like to connect a trail to Lost Lake on the northwest side of Sumas Mtn.

Glenn Glover (DNR) – We are not planning any recreation on the west side of Sumas Mtn at this time. There are environmental concerns in that area.

Kathy Levalle – I would like to address enforcement. It is non-existent. We need more officers. Prove your intentions to us that you will do so. Stop education, and start citations. The slap on the wrist is having zero effect on the violators. You need to bring someone from our community on to this committee. We should have a voice as we are effected. Build trust and start an authentic dialogue and we have no reason to trust you.

Molly Pacheko – I would like to voice my continued opposition of motorized use and development on DNR land.

Rafael Mithuna – I am a farmer on the North Fork road. My neighborhood would be impacted by an increase in motorized vehicle traffic. If we ride bikes on North Fork Road, we are forced off the road by large vehicles heading up into the North Fork. How do you intend to police the issue of more vehicles heading up our community roads and what will you do about the increase in noise?

**DRAFT – Subject to Change Without Notification**

**BAKER TO BELLINGHAM RECREATION PLAN**

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

[BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov](mailto:BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov) | [www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham)

# Baker to Bellingham



Glenn Glover (DNR) – We try to locate trailheads away from neighbors. Our roads are popular. A lot of people want to go drive our roads and watch wildlife. We consider legal access amongst other things in this process. Siting trailheads happens much later in this process.

Lin Mithuna – I would like to invite all of my neighbors to remember that the people who drive ORVs are our neighbors. This is their choice to enjoy the land this way. Why can we not put our heads together and figure out a way for motorized recreation to exist on the landscape? I probably need an ORV to get into the woods now because of a recent hip surgery. Let's find a way to work together.

Frank Bob – I'm with the Lummi tribe. I support opposition of the ORV Park. I appreciate the contact the DNR has had with the tribe over the last two years. In my 20 years working with the tribe, I have seen the damage this activity has on the watershed. Until you show us you can enforce ORV rules and regulations and protect Natural Resources, we do not support ORVs on the landscape. I am concerned about the seven ORV users on the committee and no biologist or conservationists. Lummi support the non-motorized recreation plan, but if you can't build in enforcement and oversight, then that is a problem. WDFW needs to be brought into this process as well.

Karen Bean – Farm on the side of Red Mountain that butts up against DNR on two side. We need a more diversified committee. There is a lack of transparency from the DNR on this issue. I had no idea this was going on in 2016. Let us know what is going on. People might regain trust in the DNR with transparency. Your lips are moving, you may be lying. You've got to improve your public contact if the community is going to have any faith in what you are going to do.

Leaf Schumann – Raise your hand if you live in Whatcom County. Ironically, motorized folks can already ride on DNR roads, but they don't need to be street legal. Add someone from this community to this committee. I think the DNR has a secret agenda that will be revealed in a year. Register to vote folks.

Tina Bixby – We are surrounded by DNR on Mosquito Lake Road. I support the non-motorized plan. A lot of folks have keys to the gates, and ORV's go off road. We need more enforcement and staff to manage this activity. It needs to be controlled in a manner that protects the environment.

Judith Akens – I thank the committee. Sounds like the committee will be together for another few months. Why can we not add new members? The committee could continue with new members to replace the ORV members. Why can't we get more people on the committee? Hilary Franz should come down and talk to us.

Glenn Glover (DNR) – We are only considering non-motorized recreation in this plan, to be clear. The entire committee up here has given two years of their lives, and no one here is a single issue representative. They have worked well together, and each is invaluable. Myself, Brock and Jean are all available for comments later.

**DRAFT – Subject to Change Without Notification**

**BAKER TO BELLINGHAM RECREATION PLAN**

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

[BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov](mailto:BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov) | [www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham)

RECREATION PLAN

# Baker to Bellingham



Pat Dunlap – When I heard about motorized vehicles in Echo Valley, I thought, what do we go into the woods for? Why would folks want to bring a motorized vehicle into these woods? I know dirt bikes, and four wheelers, and there are places for those.

**DRAFT – Subject to Change Without Notification**

**BAKER TO BELLINGHAM RECREATION PLAN**

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

[BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov](mailto:BakertoBellingham@dnr.wa.gov) | [www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/BakertoBellingham)