

L.T. Murray Wildlife Area Advisory Committee (WAAC)
 November 29, 2022
 12pm-3:30pm
 The Palace Café, 323 N Main St, Ellensburg, WA 98926

Attendance:

Member	Affiliation	Present (yes/no)
John O' Brian	Winter recreation enthusiast/ affiliation	Yes
Dick Carkner	Kittitas Audubon	Yes
Andrea Crawford	Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance	Yes
Kevin Clements	WA Ruffed Grouse Society	Yes
Bill Essman	Kittitas County Field and Stream	Not present
Marc Eylar	Kittitas County Noxious Weed Control Board/Kittitas County Public Lands Advisory Committee/Local recreationalist	Yes
Skip Frans	NPNW4WDA-Reg4 Director	Yes
Jennifer Galbraith	Wildhorse Wind farm	Yes
Leon Ganuelas	Yakama Nation- Tribal Partner	Not present
Justin Hyland	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	Yes
Robert Kruse	CRM/ landowner/ Sportsman/ Conservationist	Yes
Scott Nicolai	Hiker/ Conservationist	Yes
Nicky Pasi	Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust	Not present
Barbara Penniston	Back Country Horsemen of WA (BCHW)/ Pres of Kittitas Valley Trail Riders/ East WA Quarterhorse Association	Yes
Brandon Rossi	Yakama/Klickitat Nation Fisheries (YKFP)	Yes
Craig Schnebly	Mule Deer Foundation / ADA hunting & rec	Yes
Jason Emsley	DNR	Yes
Ryan Stingley	Working Lands	Yes
Marc Toenyan	Northwest Motorcycle Association (NMA)	Not present
Jennifer Wapenski	Op Director for Project Upland	Not present
Bridget Wood	Mule Deer Foundation / Outdoorswoman/ Hunter	Yes

LT Murray Plan—Goals and Objectives WAAC meeting

This document is broken down into several subgroups; Species, Habitat, Roads and Recreation, Relationships, Facilities Management, and Cultural Resources and each goal is prioritized as a Low, Medium, or High priority.

The prioritization score is based on these three criteria points:

- Level of Urgency/Risk
- Level of Benefit/Impact
- Level of Effort

The feedback collected from this group today will be sent to the planning team for consideration during their review of the draft goals and objectives section of the draft LT Murray Wildlife Area plan. This draft plan will be available for review by the next WAAC meeting before it goes out to the public for review.

After this meeting, the L.T. Murray Advisory Committee will not meet again until after February, however, please feel free to reach out to Holly or Hannah with feedback or questions any time before that. The next WDFW planning meeting will be held December 14th, so we ask that you get in any additional feedback by **December 10th**.

General questions asked:

Q: Is there a target time frame for the final plan to be complete?

A: The goal is to have the final plan signed in spring 2023 and implemented in July 2023.

Q: What are the highlighted items in the draft?

A: Yellow highlights or n/a priority ranked are “bread and butter” objectives, meaning they are standard routine tasks and done every year regardless, so no priority ranking is needed.

(*Highlights in yellow denote objectives that are year-to-year-objectives that stay in the plan. They will not be ranked with the other objectives for prioritization.)

Q: When will we see a draft of the wildlife area plan?

A: The draft plan will be seen by the WAAC before the next meeting after February.

Q: When do you need our follow up written comments and feedback on the Goals and Objectives?

A: December 10th if you would like the planning team to read them on 12/15. You can email any remaining comments up until January 1st. Hannah will send out a reminder email.

Q: When ‘discuss’ priorities ranks are decided can we get an updated draft of this document?

A: Absolutely - we will send out updated drafts to the WAAC when they are updated.

Q: Do the routine “bread and butter” n/a ranked objectives have their own priority ranking?

A: Non-prioritized objectives happen every year as part of the WLA’s regular work plan, so they were not assigned a priority. However, priorities can change based on the current situation such as seasonality, staff capacity, or other external factors. For example, when the vantage fire occurred this year, everything had to re-prioritized.

Species Goals and Objectives

1. Maintain and protect big game populations.

Background information provided:

LT Murray is a full closure (no motorized vehicles or public entry) during the winter closure period and is from December 15th through May 1st. The Whiskey Dick closure is from February 15th through May 1st, and is less restrictive only applying to motorized vehicles, and doesn’t prohibit the public from walking on the area. This is to help protect the elk wintering on the wildlife area and prevents them from moving into private land or onto the Vantage highway.

The Whiskey Dick closure site is not a feed site, we only feed elk on the LT Murray at the Joe Watt and Robinson areas.

Q: Why is objective a low priority?

A: For Goal 1: objective e: “Monitoring for treponeme-associated hoof disease (TAHD) on the feed sites” has been set as a low priority because this is run through Washington State University and there hasn’t been clear direction from them on this objective yet (So the priority will remain low until we get that). We will confirm with Jeff Bernatowitz.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Regarding not feeding Elk on the Whiskey Dick, is that something that can change in the future if there was a severe enough winter or other condition?

A: It’s possible that we could decide to feed Elk at the Whiskey Dick site in the future. This was something discussed this year due to the Vantage fire, but it was determined that there would be enough forage, so the decision was made not to supplement. However, the need would have to be significant as the Whiskey Dick as it is a very difficult site to do elk feeding on due to the rough terrain coupled with potential unsafe winter weather conditions and the long distance from the hay storage site.

Q: Why is the “Evaluate the effectiveness of the Whiskey Dick winter closure” a “discuss” priority and not labeled as a standard “bread and butter”, is that not a standard thing we do?

A: This isn’t considered a standard task as the tasks can really vary from year to year depending on what data/information the biologists and conflict specialists are getting. The prioritization is “discuss” because the planning team is still deliberating on the prioritization. There is a push to make sure the tasks listed are specific in *how* the effectiveness is being measured.

C: There was a discussion about a seemingly good barbed wire fence being defined as “relic” and removed along the Vantage highway. It was determined that this fence removal was discussed at a previous WAAC meeting, and that the removal was intended to be temporary but the project ran out of time on the grant due to COVID so the fence was never replaced. Hannah will circle back to this to see exactly what the plan was.

The issue here is that the neighboring landowners/leasees were not informed about this project (or the information was not disseminated well) and that there is potential concern over cows making their way onto the highway potentially causing an accident and livestock casualties.

There is currently no grazing on the Whiskey Dick wildlife area for 30 years due to a previous settlement with Western Watershed.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Tasks should be updated to include better communicating and collaborating with neighboring landowners and leasees regarding removal, mapping, and inventorying of fences.
- There should be a clear standard definition on what is considered “relic” barbed wire fence.
- Hannah will circle back to the Vantage fence line removal/replacement project.

2. Improve and maintain bighorn sheep populations.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Based on a few decades of personal experience, we've noticed that the biggest impact to the sheep and ungulate populations is the cougar hunting seasons and regulations. Since the cougar hunting regulations have changed, the ungulate and sheep populations have been decimated and it's very concerning to us. Could we consider adding an evaluation on cougar hunting regulations to the goals and objectives?

A: Unfortunately, no, all changes to hunting rules and regulations are evaluated and proposed by our Game Division, and this is not something the LTM Murray management team has any power to make changes to. Although Hannah is not directly involved in these decisions, she can and will make sure these concerns are heard by the relevant parties within the agency one of our Region 3 wildlife biologists Jeff Bernatowicz.

Feedback from this discussion:

Pass on the concerns on cougar hunting regulations and their effect on sheep and ungulate populations to Jeff Bernatowicz and relevant parties within the agency.

3. Protect golden eagle nest sites.

Q: There are golden eagle nests listed for Robinson for surveys, but why aren't the ones on the Quilomene on this list?

A: Our biologists may not be aware of this golden eagle nest. We will pass this information down to the biologists so they can investigate.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Ask Jeff Bernatowicz and Erin Wampole about whether the golden eagle nest site on Quilomene near goldfish pond needs to be added to the survey list.

4. Manage for species diversity.

Background information provided:

Diversity species refers to all the non-games species.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: What does "Forest treatment" mean specifically in objective D?

A: This refers to our forest thinning and prescribed burn projects. They want to make sure that after these projects occur, they see what species are returning to the area and if they fall on the "Species of Greatest Conservation need (SGCN)" list.

Q: Where can we find the list of "Species of Greatest Conservation need (SGCN)"?

A: You can find a statewide list on the WDFW website under Species & Habitat > At Risk Species. We will also include a localized list in the appendix of the LT Murray Wildlife Area plan.

- <https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/swap> (A link to the PDF list is in first paragraph)

Q: Could you explain objective A in a bit more detail?

A: “Conducting surveys for Species of Greatest Conservation need as directed by the Diversity Division” means that the Diversity Division will evaluate the local species on the SGNC list determine if there needs to be more research/surveys done.

Q: Why is Objective A a “discuss” priority?

A: When the priority ranking is “discuss” it means that the subgroup couldn’t find consensus. For this objective, there is a high benefit but also suffers from a lack of funding and capacity for this type of monitoring research.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Provide the state SGNC lists.
- Ensure WAAC is sent updated drafts when priorities are determined.

5. Improve fish habitat and restore fish populations

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: On monitor restoration project (objective c), it seems like this work would be done mainly by project sponsors and not necessarily by WDFW. Should we be concerned that by having this objective on the plan that it might indicate that WDFW would be assuming full responsibility?

A: From our understanding, the biologists would still like to include the objectives that we work with partners on, even if we’re only partially responsible.

Q: Are there examples of partners outside of the Nations?

A: Yes; Mid-Columbia Fisheries, Yakama-Klickitat Fisheries Project, Kittitas Conservation trust, Mule Deer Foundation partnership. There are lots of other partners the fisheries biologists probably work with as well.

6. Restore natural stream processes.

Background information provided:

There are projects already being implemented and/or scheduled for objective A “Reconnect the floodplains in Taneum Creek, SF Manastash, NF Manastash, Teanaway River, and Ragland and Heart K properties”. This is an important objective that we want to see continued on the landscape.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Why is objective b (regulating stream temperature) ranked as a medium priority and not a high?

A: Without being able to ask the subcommittee now, best guess is that it’s most likely due to the limiting factor of staff capacity. They probably found this to be a high benefit, low impact but potentially high urgency.

Q: What does BDA mean?

A: Beaver Dam Analog, which is a human engineered beaver dam.

Q: Can introducing beavers to areas affect fish passage? Can beaver dams block fish passage?

A: Beaver dams can be a barrier to fish passage some of the time, but usually not all the time. These species evolved together, and good beaver habitat is good fish habitat. Juvenile coho are often found around beaver dams, even though they can be barriers some of the time

C: Using “# of BDA’s installed” probably wouldn’t be a good performance measure for this goal as there are several engineering projects done for stream restoration that wouldn’t be counted as a BDA. BDA’s may be a limited tool for LT Murray as most streams have too high a flow for them. This could be better worded to better reflect an accurate performance measure for this goal. There are a variety of “tools” for stream restoration and specifically listing only one won’t properly encompass the efforts done. Rewording to include more categories of work done, or something like "BDA or other structures intended to encourage for recolonization." might be better.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- For a more accurate metric, reword the performance measure verbiage “# of BDAs” to something that would be more representative of all types of work being done.

Habitat Goals and Objectives

7. Protect and restore riparian and aquatic habitat.

Background information provided:

The WWRP grant is through the RCO grant system. This section is highlighted because the grant has already been secured and started in year one of the plan.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Wasn’t “reconnecting floodplains” (objective c) in a previous section (Goal 6 objective b) ? Is this not a redundant goal?

A: Yes, this is the exact same objective and will count towards both goals. The previous goal was specifically called out for “fish”, whereas here it is specifically for the “habitat”. We felt it was important to have this crossover, even though it is redundant.

Q: What is a virtual fence?

A: A virtual fence is a new thing being implemented that trains cows to stay in a designated area without the need for a physical fence. A tower gets installed on the property that connects to a collar that each cow wears. A computer program is used to set and move the boundaries as needed. When a cow gets close to a predetermined boundary line, the collar will deliver a small shock to discourage the cow from going outside the boundary line. They are doing test pilot projects in Region 2 and we’re looking at doing this in the Teanaway in the year.

Q: For the virtual fence, are you guys getting funding, or will the cost be on the leasee?

A: We currently have the budget for it as a pilot project in other WDFW Regions and DNR is doing a pilot in the Teanaway Community Forest. The system is much cheaper than fencing; towers are around \$10K and collar \$35 with a \$10 battery. More than one tower may be needed depending on the area.

Q: Does this system collect data or is the data captured in real-time?

A: The system does collect data. Realtime position would be too draining in the battery on the collars.

Q: Is there a concern on data collection and that information being accessible through the freedom in information act and then interpreted in a negative light?

A: It's possible. As this is a pilot project we don't really know, but that is a potentially discussion for the future as the concern is valid.

C: The virtual fence seems like it would be a great tool to protect targeted areas, like riparian areas where physical fences aren't ideal.

8. Protect and restore meadow habitat.

Background information provided:

For objective b, conducting desktop inventory means that we are using our RGIS programs and using satellite images to determine what areas are meadows. Region 3 has a new ORV Educator on staff who patrols out in the field, looking out for opportunities to educate the public on correct ORV use.

Recently there is proposed rulemaking on how "posting" is defined in our regulations. In the past "posting" information was defined as physical signage, which has led to issues as people could remove or destroy these signs and claim that they were not informed. The update now defines "posting" to include virtual posting and other mediums of information.

WDFW is working on universal signs standards so the whole department will have uniform signage.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

C: Having educational signage in heavily used areas might be more impactful to recreators and could increase the likelihood that they follow the rules and regulations.

A: Hannah is currently working on getting some nice interpretive signs to put out on the landscape with information about the various types of habitats in the region.

Q: It has been observed several times by hunters that there are people not respecting the Green Dot system, such as finding totaled or abandoned vehicles, and this is very frustrating. Is there something that can be done so hunters can help Enforcement deal with these violations such as providing pictures or real-time coordinates?

A: The first thing people can do when finding or witnessing a violation is reaching out to WILDCOMM, which is the dispatch for our Enforcement program.

There is also a new app being developed out there called TREAD map where state agencies can post real-time information on Washington State trails, and there should be an option for the public to post information as well.

WILDCOMM Communications Center
WILDCOMM@dfw.wa.gov
360-902-2936 Option 1

C: Back Country Hunters and Anglers have a rewards program if a person reports a violation and that then helps lead to a conviction. Perhaps we can consider partnering with them on this issue as well.

C: “Treating Noxious weeds” is a task in goal 7 for protecting riparian habitat but should probably be included in all the habitat goal objectives. Meadows especially as they are much more effected by noxious weeds.

C: Regarding the update about how posting is defined, you can cite someone even though there are no physical signs if it’s posted on your website? Even if you’re in an area with no internet to look up this information.

A: Yes, if it’s posted on the website, you can be cited for not following the regulations. It’s the publics responsibility to know the rules before they go out.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- WILDCOMM is not a wildy known resource that people can utilize.
- Look into BCHA for their rewards program on reporting violations.
- “Noxious weeds treatment” should be included as an objective for each habitat type.

9. Improve biodiversity areas and corridors (PHS).

Background information provided:

All these are ranked as a high priority as this goal is particularly important to our habitat biologists and they are pushing for more of this work to be done. On a larger scale, WDFW is working on an overall statewide corridor plan to improve wildlife migrations through the state.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Are more wildlife overpass part of this plan?

A: The wildlife overpasses are a WSDOT plan, and they are planning and creating more. WDFW is working towards improving wildlife movement across the landscape with actions such as land acquisition, creating preservations, or creating conservation easements.

10. Protect and restore native shrubsteppe habitat that supports a diversity of species.

Background information provided:

Shrubsteppe is really important to WDFW, and especially now as there has been a push for shrubsteppe habitat to be converted in solar farms. WDFW is working hard on shrubsteppe conservation and education.

WDFW has a new division called CAPE that is dedicated to public outreach and education and has been working on increasing their capacity.

Objective A is a discuss priority as it’s considered a high benefit, but we’re limited by capacity. Objective B is low because it takes time to develop and is a low urgency.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: What are the results and recommendations from WDFW and Audubon regarding the sage brush surveys? Does WDFW make the recommendations or does the recommendations come from Audubon.

A: We do not have the information readily available we can reach out to Scott Downes. Audubon does the surveys, then Scott and Jeff Bernatowicz will use the information and make their own recommendations

C: When it comes to restoration there are two windows Fall and Spring, but the Fall window is far better for better plant survival. After a fire happens the best opportunity for restoration is the next month, but it seems we have missed our opportunity this year.

A: There were a lot of delays that happened this year that for the Vantage Fire restoration. Funding was delayed, and then because of the immense size of the affected area, it took several weeks for cultural resource surveys to be completed. After that there was a consolation period with the Tribal partners before getting the greenlight to go ahead with planting. It's a very long process with several factors

Q: Regarding this complicated process causing delays in restoration on the Whiskey Dick, is there a way we can work into this plan a way to address this problem? Is this something we can work with the partners?

A: While it's not in this plan, Hannah has developed a 5-year plan for restoration for the Whiskey Dick Vantage fire. Now that we've gotten past most of the snags and delays, the restoration work will run smoothly over the next 5 year. The biggest issue really is that it takes a lot of time and effort to initially set up these big projects and set all the future plans in motion, but it's worth it to really slow down and plan it out.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Get the Survey results from the songbird surveys.

11. Protect and restore native, rare, or endangered plant communities and culturally significant plants.

There was no feedback for this goal.

12. Protect and enhance pollinator habitat.

Q: How does weed management protect pollinator plant species?

A: We will consider the type of chemicals we use in weed management and select chemicals that won't affect pollinators, or we will schedule chemical treatments during a time when those species are not present.

Q: There was a situation years ago where there was an area that was a monoculture of Russian knap weed that was being used by turkeys and chukars to forage for grasshoppers. When these sites were treated to annihilate the invasive Russian nap weed, those birds disappeared and then the sites were then overtaken by invasive cheat grass, which didn't offer the same benefit as the Russian nap weed, and essentially trading a weed for an even worse weed. How do we consider this in our current restoration practices?

A: Although that was a practice done in the old days, it is understood now that this is not a great strategy for weed control. Presently there should always be restoration in the plan for this kind of

situation, although the better strategy is preventing large monocultures of invasive weeds in the first place. We would not consider leaving large patches though, even if they provide some benefit, as the goal is to provide better opportunities for native species

13. Maintain or improve the ecological integrity of priority ecological systems and sites (name) by protecting, restoring, or maintaining the habitats.

Background information provided:

The Weed Management Plan is an addendum to the Wildlife Area Management plan.

14. Protect and restore forest habitat.

Background information provided:

In addition to the Weed Management Plan addendum, there is a Forest Management Plan addendum and Fire Management Plan addendum to the Wildlife Area Management Plan.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

C: There is a frustration that state owned timber can only be used in restoration projects that are on state land, and groups that are doing restoration projects on non-state lands are using public money to pay for timber and it must be hauled over, often from up to 100 miles away. This is frustrating because state lands comprise over 2.5 million acres of forests.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Ask foresters about using state trees for state natural resource restoration projects that aren't on state land.

Relationships Goals and Objectives

23. Maintain productive and positive working relationships with local community neighbors, lessees, and permittees.

There was no feedback for this goal.

24. Offer multiple and varied opportunities for stakeholder participation and engagement.

There was no feedback for this goal.

Facilities Management Goals and Objectives

26. Hire, train, equip, and license, as necessary, WLA staff, to meet the operation and management needs of WLAs.

Background information provided:

WDFW is creating lots of new positions across the agency, including Volunteer Coordinators. Once the Region 3 Volunteer Coordinator is hired, Hannah will let the WAAC know.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Should there be a performance measure related to monitoring turnover rates or addressing retention?

A: We don't really do tracking on this kind of data specifically, and for the most part LT Murray specifically has been doing fairly well in that regard.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Provide Volunteer Coordinator contact information to WWAC members.

27. Protect cultural resources on the wildlife area.

28. Maintain safe, highly functional, and cost-effect administration and operational facilities and equipment.

(These goals were discussed together)

Background information provided:

Regarding objective c "Maintain water access areas" there are technically no designated water access areas on LT Murray, but we are looking at incorporating some of the surrounding water access areas into the LT Murray complex.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Are there any plans for those low-value upland habitat Kittitas county properties?

A: This gets brought up at almost every quarterly meeting, but surplus land is a complicated process with a lot of red tape. One of the properties has been leased out for agriculture.

Q: When it comes to maintaining water access, are we talking about maintaining facilities?

A: We are looking at water access area launches and where improvements can be made, like including such as parking lots, vault toilets, and ramps.

Cultural Resources Goals and Objectives

29. Manage wildlife area lands with consideration to tribal history across the landscape.

Background information provided:

All of these are now a standard and are being built into our processes and procedures. We're currently at a point where we are finding the balance on how to go about protecting these cultural resources while still being able to go in and do basic work, such as fixing fences, without an undue burden of red tape.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Is there a designated person handling these cultural resource considerations?

A: Yes, there will be a new Cultural Resource Division manager and cultural resources is being made into a new Division. We currently have a staff of 2 archeologists but will potentially see up to 10 hired.

30. Maintain communication between WDFW and the tribes to ensure mutual interests are managed and protected.

There was no feedback for this goal.

31. Investigate and improve the cultural ecosystems represented by shrubsteppe and low elevation mesic forest types.

There was no feedback for this goal.

32. Update and expand WDFW cultural resources site knowledge for the LT Murray WLA Complex

Background information provided:

This goal is intended for staff to be made aware of the culturally significant sites, so that we can use that information to better our planning efforts.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Would this information about these site locations be available to the committee?

A: No, it's completely closed door. Information is provided to staff ONLY on a case by case basis and usually only when absolutely necessary. It is restricted to WDFW archaeologists who have undergone training and/or have certifications to work in this field.

Q: Why wouldn't this be available to a private owner?

A: As a private landowner you can go through and get your private land assessed on your own. But regarding state having this information, it is to prevent this information from being made public and avoiding the potential for individuals to go and loot and/or damage the site.

Roads & Recreation Goals and Objectives

15. Develop and manage a sustainable system of motorized travel that protects habitat, wildlife, and cultural resources.

Background information provided:

RMAP is a standard developed for forest practices that outline the standard a road has to meet to protect streams, wetlands and riparian areas from erosion and other impacts associated with roads. This is mainly used for forested areas, but we would like to apply this standard to our non-forested areas as well.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: What does the ~1mile/square mile mean?

A: This is a metric defined as a road density of 1 mile of road per square mile.

16. Protect priority and sensitive habitats from the impacts of unauthorized motorized road and trail development and travel.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: What's been being done with the issues of people illegally fording across specific areas in the Quilomene bay?

A: The area had been gated off to prevent people from fording across the area, but someone has broken the gate. The plans are now to completely block off this area with rocks this coming spring.

17. Provide information and education to protect cultural and natural resources.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Where is the interpretive panel going to be located at for Parke creek?

A: It'll probably be in the lower Parke creek where the parking is located.

Q: Is Parke Creek in the Green Dot Road system?

A: No, not currently but we're looking into adding it in the next couple years.

18. Create outreach materials on Green Dot-road recreation.

Background information provided:

We are thinking of adding more Carsonites with trail names as well as adding QR codes that would allow someone to scan it and bring up the Green Dot Road rules and regulations.

19. Develop and manage a sustainable system of non-motorized travel that protects habitat, wildlife, and cultural resources.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Are there any plans to make new trails?

A: Not necessarily, we are planning to work on getting an inventory done for all the non-designated trails. Once this is done, we can look at possibly designating/approving some the non-designated trail or adjusting the non-designated trails into better areas.

20. Manage seasonal closures to reduce recreational impacts to overwintering, nesting, or rearing wildlife.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: What would the dates be for a seasonal closure for golden eagles.

A: We don't have a set date for this as it would be situationally dependent. These closures wouldn't be for the whole wildlife area but would instead be a site-specific closure.

Q: Are there any concerns with highlighting specific sites for closure might encourage people to harass the golden eagles?

A: We will just have to evaluate this as we go along and see what is working and not working.

Q: Why is the LT Murray closure day the 15th and not the 8th or 9th when the hunting season closes?

A: When the winter closure standard was developed for the region this was the date that was decided on.

21. Manage recreation activities to reduce impacts to resources and improve user safety.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Why hasn't the shooting area been closed off on the Umtanum in the Wenas Wildlife area?

A: This would be a good question to bring up to the Trails committee or to Melinda Hughes. This site is a designated long-range shooting area, and those trails are not technically authorized.

22. Improve non-motorized access and provide recreational opportunities.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

Q: Why isn't there anything for establishing handicap access to trails?

A: Although not currently on this list, we are working on including it as an objective for the future.

Q: Why isn't there anything in the plan about the issue with the Green Dot Road running through the state park that still hasn't been reopened? We would like to see that public access is maintained through the state park to get to be able to access WDFW land.

A: This is ultimately up to State Parks. They are currently going through their CAMP process for land classification for this area and will determine what long-term recreational access looks like for that site through their process.

Q: Will this information help update the Green Dot maps or is this a separate process? The dates to use the wind farm access rd. aren't very clear on the Green Dot map currently.

A: Green Dot map updates are a separate process, but it would be easy to update the wind farm access rd. information at the annual DNR-WDFW green dot planning meeting.

Q: How much more detailed will the Plan get from this Objective and Goals, since there aren't specific items mentioned here, such as snow recreation?

A: There will be more site-specific recreation information in a separate recreation plan, which will follow the LT Murray wildlife area plan. Within the narratives of each section there will be more information included that will describe the recreation opportunities and trail maps that have been mapped.

Key feedback from this discussion:

- Add ADA Access improvement as an objective.
- Add Wind Farm Rd access information to the Green Dot maps.

Public Comment Period : There was no public comment at this meeting.