



Snoqualmie Corridor Recreation Planning Committee

October 02, 2012 Meeting Notes
Snoqualmie Fire Department, Snoqualmie, WA

In Attendance:

Committee members

Jim Berry	Robert Eversole	Mire Levy
Mark Boyar	Glenn Glover	Rick McGuire
Amy Brockhaus	Ted Jackson	Robert Pattie
Jenni Creveling	David Kappler	Ann Shilling
Harold Erland	Sarah Krueger	

DNR and UW staff

Lisa Anderson	Sam Jarrett
Laura Cooper	Doug McClelland
Kelly Heintz	Curt Pavola

Meeting Purpose: To review terms that will be used during the planning process and to present and discuss the first round of recreation management plan concepts. The concepts are based on ideas generated during the public meeting, summer field trips and last meeting's brainstorming exercise. We will also discuss topics and issues that are not mapped.

Welcome: Laura Cooper reviewed the meeting agenda.

Committee Meeting Notes from last meeting: Reviewed and adopted without changes.

Recreation Management Terms reviewed by Doug McClelland.

- Developed Recreation: Trails and trailheads DNR has developed and maintains. These are accepted as part of the system.
- Dispersed Use: Described in law. On the landscape...Raging River is currently dispersed use because no recreational system has been developed. This includes activities on roads. In Natural Areas, primitive dispersed is very limited off-trail travel such as hunting.
- Primary Management Objective (PMO): Examples: PMO-hiking, PMO-mountain biking, PMO-hiking & equestrian. Enhance and create opportunities for a particular recreation but you can have other uses in same area; for example all roads are open for multiple uses. Not equivalent to "exclusive" use.

Concepts:

- Lisa Anderson described the process for developing concepts and handed out a questionnaire on which committee members could record their responses to the concepts. These responses would be used later during the meeting to help guide the discussion.
- Lisa explained what options A, B & C are. The options pare down opportunities we are aware of right now, based on what we have heard. Concepts describe ways of providing these opportunities in the near term (10 to 15 years). Today is the first rendition. There is no "right" answer. Think about priorities. Where should opportunities be developed?
- From tonight, we will create a 2nd round of concepts for review Concepts are broad brush; not site-specific; at the PMO level. What are we providing for recreation and where?

- As we refine these areas, we'll be able to define opportunities in more detail.
- We'll talk about priorities after we get the PMOs and trailhead locations right.
- We'll revisit this next meeting and the meeting after that.
- This is a good time to also identify information gaps and questions.
- Laura described the concept maps, the opportunities we need to provide and the issues we need to keep in mind.
- The concepts are not meant to be alternatives, but rather we wanted to place known opportunities and needs on maps in various locations to develop a robust discussion.
- Laura then reviewed components of each of the concepts.

Question Exercise: Committee members were asked to take additional time to review the concepts and write down their responses to three questions:

1. What three ideas do you think are the most important in the concepts and why?
2. What one thing would you change and why?
3. What is missing from the concepts?

Committee members then went around the room and shared their thoughts regarding Concepts A, B & C with the group:

- Jenni Creveling – Raging River State Forest (Raging): The Raging is big enough for every user group. Priority is to get people to destinations and scenic vistas. Can either go on a local hike, or go further out in wilderness. Better separation of uses in concept B. Is it important for horses to access I-90? Robert says yes. Concept B is good for that. Concept A is missing a more formalized trail system in the Raging. (B & C) are good for that. Middle Fork/Mt. Si NRCA (MF/Si): Drawn to smallest boat access from protection standpoint. (C) is only one with horse access in Middle Fork, not sure how to weight that.
- Bob Pattie – Concept A: Diverse recreation is a benefit with activities in a variety of places. What to change: Wouldn't lock into one individual activity as shown in concepts with specific PMOs. What's missing: motorized access to viewpoints for elderly. Educational piece is also missing. Opportunity to educate public about state trust lands, recreation, etc.
- Rick McGuire – Likes concept A, especially Dirty Harry recreation opportunities with trailhead. (He says Mike Town would agree) Wait for Hwy 18 access, but Concept A would be good place for trailhead near mainline road into the Raging. Likes Concept C trailhead access to Granite Creek from Mailbox Peak Trailhead instead of from near concrete bridge as shown in (B). Don't put Trailhead at CCC (C), not as good as Dirty Harry. So, concept A with some concept C elements.
- Rob Eversole – Likes concept of mixed use (A). Make Raging all mixed use. Add Trailhead near Mainline Rd. Likes concept C with CCC Rd. connection to federal lands as a non-asphalt connection. What's missing is camping – area near Mainline Rd in Raging is good place.
- Harold Eland – Likes concept B the best, because of trailhead and peak trail development at Teneriffe. This would take pressure off Mt Si parking lot. Likes updated day use on concept C for boat access; focus public on established day use areas and protect other areas of river. Likes trailhead at cement bridge (B) because otherwise need giant Mailbox Peak parking. Would change (C) – do not encourage more CCC road use with large trailhead as elk management groups are trying to attract wildlife through this corridor; and there is an active state forest in that area. Lots of people use it now. What is missing: Access for elderly and differently abled.
- Ted Jackson - Would like to see a map with all suggested features, and then ask what we want to remove. Would like to see more working forests added to planning area when opportunities arise, especially to the north and south to create a greenbelt. Keep the NRCA's we have but use funding to acquire more trust lands as trust revenues are needed for public schools, roads and facilities. What is missing: consider phased parking expansion coinciding with PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council) urban growth plan and "2040 Vision" for 6 million people; Parking produces Discover Pass recreation revenue.
- Mark Boyer - Likes (A) Dirty Harry trailhead and trail development – the area can handle a lot of cars. Likes (C) boat access & day use along Middle Fork River; show river access points as spots not bands and protect other areas on the river. Likes (A) north-south rural connections. What is missing from

these plans: connections across landscape and a visionary plan for North Bend as gateway - "The Napa Valley of recreation." And identifying & protecting important wildlife corridors. Likes Teneriffe trailhead. It is already being impacted and will help spread Mt Si use. The whole idea in the 90s concept document for CCC was a non-motorized access into the valley. Parking in the Middle Fork Valley is limited due to wetlands, so CCC is one non-motorized way into valley; also need to think about public transit. Camping: consider walk-in camping at Mine Creek. Need consistent management plan regarding camping between DNR and Forest Service. Need to prohibit dispersed camping along river but managed camping in designated areas.

- Glen Glover - Likes north-south connector to Preston with connection to Raging. Dirty Harry is a good spot to add a trailhead with additional hiking opportunities and improved climbing trails. Expand Teneriffe trailhead and connection to CCC from there. Likes concept C with PMO for bikes in Raging accessed from Exit 27. Would like to see PMO bikes with understanding there would be shared use. What should change: Expanded trailhead for Raging at Exit 27 and parking at Taylor Mountain County Forest will not be adequate for the Raging. Need to plan for future access from Hwy 18 even if all the details of planned Hwy 18 expansion are not known. Also missing is Bessemer access for both hiking and biking.
- Amy Brockhaus - Likes connections in (A). Likes hike to Granite Lakes with trailhead at Mailbox (C). Likes equestrian access into Raging from concept B. CCC road to trail conversion makes sense, but would like to know more about wildlife issues. Likes Teneriffe Peak and Dirty Harry.
- David Kappler - Likes family friendly opportunities along the Raging River, the river has salmon but it is calmer, warmer and good for kids. Likes expansion of hike from Rattlesnake Ledges Trail into the Raging as a loop providing additional views. Hiking the entire Rattlesnake Ridge implies parking two cars and is not a good management objective given shortage of parking. Likes expanded trailhead at exit 38 with trail development to Dirty Harry, West Defiance and Putrid Pete Peaks. Likes concept of managed separation of uses to avoid the types of conflicts that are occurring at W Tiger NRCA with bikes on hiking trails. Connection between Taylor and Raging shown in concept C is already happening on roads and unofficial trails / ditches. Would be easy to formalize. Study possible opportunities to connect Taylor across Hwy 18 to south Tiger to expand horse use. Needs further study with topography and current & future Hwy 18 bridges over rivers. May be expensive to build. Consider long-term view management such as view from West Tiger 3 – would need to compensate trust to maintain view long term as in NRCA plans.
- Mire Levy – Concept A has hike-bike access and connector from Exit 22 to Tiger is good. (A) has no south connectivity from Tiger Summit to Raging. Concept A links Tiger & Raging at low point and connection from Mitchell Hill to state parks is good to have. Middle Fork: cars on road are unsightly and concept of huge parking lot at valley entrance is unappealing. Likes two trailheads, one at Mailbox and one by the bridge. What is missing: what to do with Kerriston site if there is hiking in the area, think about this. Every time she's in Raging, she sees people with guns; how will current hunting use change when we develop more use/access...this is a question mark.
- Sarah Krueger – Drawn to concepts that maximize capacity. Across concepts, maximize trailheads for intended users. Concept B trailhead that accommodates multiple uses is good. Horse use is priority. Connection between Taylor & Raging is a social trail that we need to address in this process. Connectivity across state-federal-county is important. Third, likes rock climbing and boat access as family friendly recreation for right-off-the-road users. Likes multiuse aspect of these. This could be further developed throughout the plan. What is missing: use this opportunity in Middle Fork to focus on camping such as possible walk-in camping at Mine Creek and look at consistency across agency ownerships.
- Jim - Still has big picture questions. Need space for horses, bikes, hikers. But what do groups need? Do Bikers want access from East Tiger to Raging? Do hikers need connection from Snoqualmie Point to High Point? We are so close to a large population base that we can't create enough camping to serve the demand and could see unmanaged camping, can't control it. Has competing thoughts on what we can provide with population so close. Do we seek funds for bus routes? Likes trailhead at Teneriffe but worries about traffic and impacts to neighbors from numbers. Likes circular hikes. Although he likes Rattlesnake Ridge Trail, but then you double the parking need. Good to create more loops. Needs info on bike needs. Need viewpoint management like on Rattlesnake, keeping the overlook open (at two

locations). A crew recently opened them. Major use is always going to be day use, meaning day use transportation/parking is the biggest problem we have. Not able to keep up with population growth. “Take reservations on Rattlesnake Road” because the area can’t handle current parking needs.

Break

Concept Discussion:

- Mark B - What do blobs mean along the Middle Fork River? Doug - could be shown more as blue dots on river rather than big blob. Mark – there are existing sites that aren’t going away, so we need discussions of them. Also on parking limitations, need discussion of public transportation.
- General Comment – Trailheads should be located away from residential use. King County Mitchell Hill new proposed parking lot had universal local opposition.
- How much did we use the purple map to map the concepts? Doug - everything shown can be supported. All of these came out of public and committee comments and work.
- Mark/Ted - Other places to consider for camping, such as Granite Lakes, Mine Creek and other ideas on how to work with the USFS on dispersed camping. We should look to partner opportunities with state parks?

Discuss of topics that were not mapped

- “Managed Road Access” – Raging is gated. Some would want gates removed. But how should we manage access to this gated area?
 - Check out key for gates; or combination lock numbers
 - Do this for groups and organizations, not individuals. For example, rock hounds pay a yearly fee for access to rock pits.
 - But what if only wanting to sightsee; not a group activity.
 - And individuals need information about where to go and what’s going on in the area.
 - Doug - DNR has done groups/clubs, but they need to do volunteer time before getting access.
- Hunting? – If we bring in developed recreation, we will impact hunting.
 - Best hunting is a good hike from Hwy 18 into the Raging
 - Doug - what if we limit type of weapon or season?
 - Harold - More chance of harming yourself instead of being shot by a hunter. Wear orange in the fall.
- Day use / Night use? – at Mine Creek or Granite Lakes in Middle Fork NRCA?
 - Question – can DNR charge for camping?
 - Lisa - Developed camping area would need to be leased to a concessionaire to manage – campgrounds need to be very large capacity to work economically for the concessionaire.
 - Camping takes away space for day use on river.
 - Mark - if had 12 Mine Creek spots, would have ability to manage where camping does and does not happen. But at Granite Lakes it is more of a problem to police. At Granite Lakes, use wilderness area rules.
- Events? – in the Raging
 - Area with controlled access for overnight events would be hugely beneficial; don’t have this opportunity in this area.
 - Raging has flat ground near BPA station, but depends on Hwy 18 expansion for access.
 - Doug - Snoqualmie Park has some capacity for camping currently.
 - Concern - increased uses on trail during event and for training, plus usual users - trails don’t get to heal; but separate areas by permit, then trails can heal.
 - Established facilities and continual use would be expensive vs. Designate an open field with no permanent facilities for a few registered events would be more manageable. Overnight use would only be for a registered event, not a regular occurrence.

- Ted: ADA Access and DNR implementation

Doug - we'll work on developing the layered alternatives. At our next meeting we need to talk about other topics such as bootleg trails, Kerriston, prioritization, etc.

Next meeting is Tuesday Nov 13, 6 PM Potluck and Meeting 6:30 PM – 9:30 PM.