

PUBLIC COMMENT <i>This table includes responses made during the full public comment period through SEPA, written comments at the public meeting, emails directly to WDFW staff, and emails to the Snoqualmie Planning Email.</i>	
	<p>For ease of review, the comments are grouped roughly by topic, starting with the non-dog focused comments. Out of 146 comments received, 94 of them mentioned something about dogs on the wildlife area. One response was written to address these comments. Instead of repeating it for each comment, the text is provided here, and is referred to as “Response #1” throughout the document.</p> <p>Response #1: Thank you for your comment regarding dog training or other dog-related issues on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. Because of the strong interest, the comment period was extended an additional 30 days for a total of 60 days in order to allow more time for comments.</p> <p>The management plan includes an action for the Snoqualmie advisory committee to address dog training and other issues related to the presence of dogs on the wildlife area. Monthly meetings have been scheduled through December, and the WDFW Regional Wildlife Program Manager will facilitate these meetings. Discussion topics will include year-round bird dog training, bird dog training events and trials, and the Cherry Valley farm and maintenance plans. There will also be coordination with bird dog training representatives, other interested and affected stakeholders, and the WDFW Region 4 District Team. The SEPA comments received will be considered through that process.</p> <p>The current plan supports continued dog training at Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake. For the 2018 bird dog training season, the 2017 Pilot Plan is in effect. <u>Crescent Lake:</u> 11.5 acres year round bird dog training in designated area <u>Cherry Valley:</u> 65 acres year round bird dog training in designated areas except during hunting season. During hunting season: 25-30 acres</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- WDFW is committed to working with the bird dog training community to provide opportunities for bird dog training events and trials.- WDFW worked with the farmer to incorporate bird dog training community concerns related to farming at Cherry Valley.- The bird dog training maintenance plan for Cherry Valley (6/1/18) is currently being implemented. <p>WDFW has many things to consider in the management of these units, and dog training opportunities must be balanced with the conservation goals and other recreation opportunities. No lands on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area were donated or purchased specifically for dog training. However, some funding agreements mention dog training as one of the uses that may occur on the wildlife area. Crescent Lake and Cherry Valley were purchased primarily for hunting, wildlife conservation, and wildlife related recreation.</p> <p>Imposing a permit fee for dog training as was mentioned in the comments requires Washington State Legislature to grant the authority to WDFW to charge a fee.</p> <p>Relevant rules and regulations on dogs are provided here for reference.</p>

	<p>The hunting regulations in the <u>Washington State Migratory Waterfowl & Upland Game Bird Season</u>, p.17, describe the bird dog training season as August 1 – March 31. It also states that “Dog training may be conducted year-round on designated portions.... [of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area]. The Crescent Lake and Cherry Valley units have designated areas for year-round bird dog training opportunities.</p> <p><u>WAC 232-12-041</u> describes the permit required for holding field trials. “ (1) Except as authorized by permit issued by the director it is unlawful to hold field trials for hunting dogs during the months of April, May, June, and July. Field trials on department lands or those involving use of live wildlife may not be held without a permit.</p> <p>(2) Applications for a field trial permit must be filed with the department at least thirty days before the proposed date for holding such trials. The application shall state the time and place the field trials will be held, the names of sponsors and persons who will conduct the trials, and such other information as the director may require.”</p> <p><u>WAC 232-13-180</u> describes the regulation of pets on the wildlife areas. “(1) The department may prohibit or regulate pets, except for bona fide service animals for persons with disabilities, on department lands. (2) It is unlawful for any person to allow pets to roam unattended on department lands. (3)(a) It is unlawful to cause or allow a pet to roam unleashed on department-owned lands from April 1 through July 31, unless posted otherwise. (b) It is unlawful to cause or allow a pet to roam unleashed on designated access sites or within five hundred feet of a designated campground on department lands”.</p> <p><i>Public comments and response follows.</i></p>	
	<p>PUBLIC COMMENT</p>	<p>WDFW RESPONSE</p>
<p>1</p>	<p>As a resident of Snohomish County I have visited Spencer Island, in particular, many times over the past years. I am a wildlife photographer, birder, and advocate of watchable wildlife policies. I support the new management plan for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Areas. Thank you for inviting the public to participate in the planning process for Snoqualmie Wildlife Areas. Respectfully, -Joan Poor</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>I am a birder and a naturalist, and I support the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan in its present form. The plan provides significant preservation and conservation values in areas that well-deserve such treatment and protection. Sincerely, -Reg Reisenbichler</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan, specifically Goals 1 and 2.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Having had the pleasure of visiting and/or doing habitat restoration work at four of the six areas in the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area, I support the plan as written. As the population increases in our area, it is essential to have areas like these where one may go for a restorative outdoor experience. I appreciate your work on this management plan and look forward to my next outing. Sincerely, -Kathryn Piland</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan and your restoration work on the wildlife area.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>We are writing in support of this plan for the management of this WLA over the next 10 years. These areas provide badly needed habitat and protection for many species of wildlife and the focus of management should be based on science and policies that put the needs of wildlife first. Passive recreation, such as hiking, birdwatching, and photography are enjoyed by a wide segment of the population, and these activities do not conflict with the wildlife management goals. We have spent many hours walking</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan, specifically Goals 1 and 2.</p>

	<p>the trails around Spencer Island, near our home, and it is most pleasant to see the wildlife in their habitat, not being bothered by human intrusions.</p> <p>While there is a place for hunting and the training of dogs in our state, it makes sense to confine those activities to areas where they are not in conflict with other goals. The percentage of the population that engages in these activities is relatively small, even though they may make up a more vocal group in terms of the comments you receive. When hunting and dogs are present wildlife is harder to observe and photograph, and needless to say these activities are stressful for the birds and other animals. We support the plan as written, with an emphasis on conservation and protection of wildlife.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this plan, -Sally and Bill Lider</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
5	<p>I am a birder who is active with both Pilchuck and Seattle Audubon Societies. My comments represent many others. Both Audubon groups offer field trips to the Stillwater Unit, and Pilchuck offers field trips with stops at the others with the exception of the Cherry Valley Unit. Pilchuck Audubon even averages a field trip once a year (with prior communication with Lynn Dye) to the Corson Unit. Many of us also individually bird many of the areas with the exception of Cherry Valley and Corson. As Audubon members we are in support of conservation goals. I am pleased to see the inclusion of goals to increase staff support and interpretive efforts toward educating people regarding wildlife and our usage of the wildlife areas. We are in support of the management plan. Thank you</p> <p>-Sherrill Miller, Pilchuck Audubon</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan.</p>
6	<p>Thank you so much for developing a plan for the Snoqualmie wildlife units. I just want to note how important these areas are for our birds, and for so many of us who are part of the birding community and Audubon. These areas are important nesting areas for marsh birds, including American Bittern, Sora, Virginia Rail, Marsh Wren, Common Yellowthroat, Willow Flycatcher, Red-winged Blackbird, Bald Eagles, and other raptors. They also provide important wintering habitat for our ducks and other waterfowl, and migration stopovers for many passerines.</p> <p>I am a volunteer for the Puget Sound Bird Observatory, which conducts surveys of breeding "secretive marsh birds" to determine the health of their populations in our area wetlands, including areas within your jurisdiction. Many of these birds are threatened by development, climate change and other factors, and they depend on our wildlife units. In addition, as an active birder, I join hundreds of other local people who enjoy watching the birds and other wildlife at your units, while countless other people enjoy walking the trails you provide. Thank you.</p> <p>-Philip Dickinson</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan and for your volunteer work.</p>
7	<p>I very much support the plan as written as it provides protection for wildlife at a time when habitat loss is ever increasing. I have been birdwatching in the wildlife area and can't imagine using these places for dog training. How disruptive would that be. Surely the dogs could be trained at other areas that would not be so sensitive. It would also be very disruptive for birdwatchers, although that is not the important issue.</p> <p>I do not feel there is an obligation to use a wildlife area for dog training. Please leave the plan as is and protect the wildlife for our children. Thank you.</p> <p>-Janet Carroll</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan.</p> <p>Response #1</p>

8	<p>It is apparent to any who are paying attention, that more and more disparate needs are vying for less and less available spaces. I wish to add my small voice to the community trying to protect these dwindling sites for the birds and other wildlife using them. Dogs are not wildlife, and are a threat merely by their presence, regardless of their behavior. I cannot count how many times I have been quietly trying to observe birds or other wildlife, only to be interrupted by an overly-exuberant dog running through the scene. Yes, it is clear there are ever-increasing numbers of dogs, but that doesn't mean they belong everywhere their owners believe they do. The humans don't necessarily belong, either, and I will respect any area off-limits to us, too. It seems to me that there are no places left, anywhere, that are dog-free, and those of us seeking wildlife without them are dismissed. We do not tend to be the loudest, or most aggressive, to be advocating for what should be an absolute given - areas protected for wildlife to feed, nest and live without bother and interruption. Please keep the wildlife areas wild.</p> <p>-Cathy Clark</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the plan, specifically Goals 1 and 2.</p> <p>Response #1</p>
9	<p>Increase pheasant release numbers and frequency at Snoqualmie valley sites, and scatter the birds more across the parcel, thus dispersing hunters. Regular scheduled plantings allow for predictability and can allow people to hunt during the week and take the more crowded weekends off.</p> <p>-Ken Bowman</p>	<p>Supports Goal 3.B to provide pheasant hunting opportunities.</p>
10	<p>I fully support the department's efforts to conserve any and all areas. This, by definition, means fewer or no ATV activity, no motorcycles (on or off road), fewer he-man trucks with the 22" wheels with supplemented exhaust, twin whip CB antennas, able to drive over 14" logs, etc.</p> <p>Let people get out ON FOOT and enjoy what "nature" means without internal combustion engines and pretending that "nature" always blasting something.</p> <p>I also fully support drastically reduced or eliminated hunting on these lands. If angling is involved, catch and release only with barbless hooks.</p> <p>Nature should be enjoyed with binoculars.</p> <p>Fewer "John Wayne 'Sportsmen'" please. If this is not understood, "John Wayne" was not a real entity. He was a pretend entity. Please preserve Jimlorihughes</p>	<p>Thank you for support of the conservation efforts.</p> <p>Off road vehicle use is not allowed on the wildlife area. Under state law, WDFW is charged with "preserving, protecting, and perpetuating" the state's fish and wildlife species, while also providing sustainable recreational opportunities. Fishing and hunting are recreational opportunities supported on WDFW managed lands.</p>
11	<p>p. 34: Vision should include natural process restoration to improve conditions of fish, wildlife, and recreational opportunities. Proposed actions should include the long-term objective of a levee setback to this end, as was proposed by DD7 through floodplains by design.</p> <p>-Jamie Glasgow, Wild fish Conservancy</p>	<p>Specific details of the restoration plan will be developed in coordination with the WAAC and other interested stakeholders.</p>
12	<p>p. 34: unit description should include documented presence of two ESA-listed salmonids and state-sensitive Olympic mudminnow. Also extensive use of aquatic habitats by rearing coho salmon.</p> <p>-Jamie Glasgow, Wild fish Conservancy</p>	<p>The presence of Puget Sound Chinook salmon, Puget Sound steelhead, and Olympic mudminnow were added to the text, as was use of habitat by rearing coho salmon.</p>
13	<p>p. 72: (table 7) Add Olympic mudminnow (SS) for Cherry Valley</p> <p>-Jamie Glasgow, Wild fish Conservancy</p>	<p>Olympic mudminnow has been added to Table 7 on species conservation status.</p>

14	<p>p. 72: (potential species) We documented western pearlshell mussels in Cherry Valley during the de-fishing of laterals B, C, and D. -Jamie Glasgow, Wild fish Conservancy</p>	<p>Western pearlshell mussels have been added to the list.</p>
15	<p>p. 72: (invasive species) We documented catfish, LM bass, crappie in Cherry Valley: -Jamie Glasgow, Wild fish Conservancy</p>	<p>Catfish, LM bass, and crappie have been added to the list of invasive species.</p>
16	<p>Please address the blackberries at the stillwater unit. The stillwater unit is over run with blackberries and can result in lost birds when they land in blackberries, they also create tripping hazards for hunters and can hurt dogs. -Ken Bowman</p>	<p>Supports the Weed Management Plan, Appendix B.</p>
17	<p>Please consider these suggestions for incorporation in the Draft Snoqualmie Area Wildlife Management Plan.</p> <p>Page 35 Proposed Actions Specific to Cherry Valley: Add for Goal 1. Inventory, map, and control annually those noxious weed species required for control by RCW 17.10. Currently, this is purple loosestrife.</p> <p>Page 38 Proposed Actions Specific to Stillwater: Add for Goal 1. Inventory, map, and control annually those noxious weed species required for control by RCW 17.10. Currently, this is tansy ragwort and purple loosestrife.</p> <p>Page 52 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures: For Goal 1. C. Weed Management Plan (cannot find where this Weed Management Plan is detailed).</p> <p>Add to Performance Measures: Number of acres of noxious weeds inventoried. Noxious weed locations mapped annually for monitoring. Number of acres of noxious weeds treated. Percent control of noxious weeds. Method of control. List each high priority county noxious weed species occurring on site.</p> <p>Add to Tasks: - Inspect for noxious weeds annually (delete “as time permits”), focusing efforts on high priority noxious weed species. - Coordinate with partners such as county noxious weed control programs on priority species. - Note and map new infestations for active control efforts.</p> <p>- Identify and apply for funding sources to implement noxious weed control.</p> <p>Page 82 Weed Management: The Weed Management Plan (Appendix B) identifies species, timing and management practices to control noxious and invasive weeds. The goal of weed management on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area is to reduce the impacted area of noxious and invasive weeds, improve the habitat for fish and wildlife and meet legal obligations of RCW 17.10. Species of concern include Himalayan blackberry, reed canary grass, invasive knotweed,</p>	<p>This will language will be added to the Weed Management Plan under a new “a): “Inventory, track, and control annually those noxious weed species required for control by RCW 17.10. In 2018 for Cherry Valley, this is purple loosestrife and for Stillwater, tansy ragwort and purple loosestrife”.</p> <p>Goal 1.C is to “Implement Weed Management Plan annually”, so it will not be listed separately as an action in the unit descriptions. The Weed Management Plan is in Appendix B.</p> <p>These items have been added to performance measures or task, to Goal 1.C. Instead of “mapped”, noxious weed locations will be “identified”.</p> <p>These tasks have been added to Goal 1.C.</p> <p>This task has been added to Goal 1.C. WDFW acknowledges that other sources of funding are needed to control noxious weeds. WDFW also appreciates the partnerships</p>

<p>purple loosestrife, tansy ragwort, butterfly bush, Canada thistle, common teasel, and English ivy. Several of these species are required for annual control by RCW 17.10.</p> <p>Strategies employed to reverse these conditions include use of mechanical and manual biomass removal, and herbicide treatments.</p> <p>In recent years, collaborative weed control efforts have included assistance from the King County Noxious Weed Control Program, habitat restoration partners, and agricultural leaseholders.</p> <p>Page 93 Appendix B. Weed Management Plan SNOQUALMIE WILDLIFE AREA WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN Weed Control Goals at the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area</p> <p>The goal of weed control on Department lands at the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area (WLA) that includes the Corson, Spencer Island, Ebey Island, Crescent Lake, Cherry Valley, and Stillwater units, is to reduce the impacted area of invasive and noxious weeds, improve the habitat for fish and wildlife, and meet legal obligations of RCW 17.10.</p> <p>To these ends, WDFW uses integrated pest (i.e., weeds) management (IPM), defined in RCW 17.15.010 as “a coordinated decision-making and action process that uses the most appropriate pest control methods and strategy (check source to see if this reads as strategies) in an environmentally and economically sound manner to meet agency programmatic pest management objectives.”</p> <p>At the Snoqualmie WLA, the weed management objectives includes:</p> <p>a) Wetlands, Riparian - Monitor up to 600 acres annually for maintenance needs at all the units. The majority of management effort is the mowing of reed canary grass and blackberry in the floodplain to improve habitat for wildlife and waterfowl, while providing improved conditions for hunting and wildlife viewing. Maintain restoration plantings until they establish to increase plant diversity and to help shade out reed canary grass. Treat other invasive weeds and noxious weeds found in wetland areas to control spread or reintroduction of wetland invasive and noxious vegetation such as purple loosestrife and knotweed. Comply with RCW 17.10 through annual surveys for noxious weeds, control of noxious weeds found to prevent spread by seed production or vegetatively.</p> <p>b) b) Agricultural - Continue to expand agricultural acres at Stillwater, Ebey Island and Cherry Valley units to historic levels (120-350 acres) in agricultural crops to reduce the levels of noxious and invasive weeds, and provide economic benefits to the agricultural community, while providing forage and cover for wildlife, waterfowl and upland birds. Benefits gained from reducing noxious and invasive weeds will also improve wildlife related recreational opportunities for the public as well as being in compliance with RCW 17.10.</p> <p>c) c) Public Access and Dikes - The Snoqualmie WLA lies in a heavily urbanized area and receives a great deal of public use. Treat noxious and invasive weed species such as blackberry, knotweed, purple loosestrife and teasel that impede recreational access at Ebey Island, Spencer Island and Stillwater units, and complies with RCW 17.10.</p>	<p>and collaborative effort needed for weed control.</p> <p>Text referencing RCW 17.10 has been added to the Weed Management Plan.</p> <p>“Noxious” has been added to the Weed Management Plan as indicated in these comments.</p> <p>“Manual” has been added to this sentence.</p> <p>RCW 17.15.010 was checked, and it does read: ““Integrated pest management” means a coordinated decision-making and action process that uses the most appropriate pest control methods and strategy in an environmentally and economically sound manner to meet agency programmatic pest management objectives.</p> <p>These addition (in bold text) have been made in the plan.</p> <p>These addition (in bold text) have been made in the Weed Management Plan.</p> <p>These addition (in bold text) have been made in the Weed Management Plan.</p>
--	--

	<p>d) Compliance with RCW 17.10 – conduct annual surveys for noxious weeds, control all noxious weeds found in a timely manner to prevent spread by seed production or vegetative means.</p> <p>Page 94 Table 14: add 2016 County Noxious Weed Class. For purple loosestrife Control Objective/Strategy add herbicide. For tansy ragwort Control Objective/Strategy add herbicide, manual.</p> <p>Remove mowing as a control strategy because mowing does not control this noxious weed it only reduces the height of the plant. Tansy ragwort will flower after mowing.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Snoqualmie Area Wildlife Management Plan.</p> <p>-Tricia MacLaren, King County Noxious Weed Control Program</p>	<p>This text has been added to the Weed Management Plan, in a new paragraph labeled a) (and the others moved down</p> <p>These additions (in bold text) have been made in the Weed Management Plan.</p> <p>Because of lack of funds to control invasive and noxious weeds, WDFW does use mowing to at least try and stop the spread of weeds.</p>
18	<p>Page 68 The birds in the photograph are swans, not geese. Revise caption to read: Swans at Ebey Island</p> <p>- Tricia MacLaren, King County Noxious Weed Control Program</p>	<p>Thank you. The caption has been corrected.</p>
19	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>1) Strongly support additional projects removing fish barriers where possible</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Supports Goal 2 of the plan.</p>
20	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>2) Strongly support wetland enhancements where possible</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Supports Goal 1 of the plan.</p>
21	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>3) Strongly support replacement of barn with new facilities</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Supports Goal 9 of the plan.</p>
22	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>4) Please prioritize noxious weed management</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Supports Goal 1 of the plan to implement the weed management plan.</p>
23	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>5) Please prioritize coordination with WDFD police for off-leash dog contacts (i.e. pets) to maximize usefulness to hunting dog training</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
24	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>6) support expanding dog training area</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
25	<p>The following public comments are for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan, specifically for the Cherry Valley Unit.</p> <p>7) add native habitat features to areas of canary reed grass</p> <p>-Curtis Kukal</p>	<p>This comment will be discussed during implementation of the plan, with review by the WAAC</p>

<p>26</p>	<p>As a concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comments and suggestions for the Draft Management Plan for Snoqualmie Wildlife Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RCW 77.04.012 states first that “The commission, director, and the department SHALL preserve, protect, perpetuate, and manage the wildlife”. It secondarily states that “The commission SHALL ATTEMPT to maximize the public recreational game fishing and hunting opportunities of all citizens”. Any measures taken to maximize hunting opportunities need to be given a lower priority than the primary responsibility of preserving, protecting, and perpetuating wildlife. 2. In the past, comments by non-hunters (about 95% of the citizens of the state) have been routinely trivialized and dismissed by WDFW. Public comments from all citizens need to be respected and fully addressed. 3. WDFW’s main focus has been to expand hunting opportunities. Wildlife habitat has decreased due to the increase in human population, development, climate change, fire, drought, etc. The quality of wildlife habitat has also decreased. With no end in sight, it is imprudent and unnecessary to expand hunting opportunities. 4. The practice of baiting any animal is cruel and unsporting and should be banned regardless of species. 5. Lead shot, although illegal in a few areas, is continuing to poison our wildlife, agricultural fields, and environment. Lead shot should be banned everywhere within the state. 6. Bow and arrow hunting should be banned as it is exceptionally cruel and results in increased maiming, suffering and slow death. 7. Trophy hunting and predator hunting is an abomination and should be banned. 8. High tech weapons and equipment such as scopes, decoys, electronic calls, etc. give the hunter an extremely unfair advantage and should not be allowed. 9. Playing distress calls to lure wildlife is highly unethical and should be illegal. 10. Raising and releasing over 6000 pheasants a year in the Snoqualmie WLA to be shot by hunters is highly unethical. The birds have no survival skills and killing them is like shooting fish in a barrel. 11. Studies have shown that committing acts of violence against animals is a predecessor to committing acts of violence against people. The only difference 	<p><i>Many of the comments address statewide issues, and are outside the scope of the plan.</i></p> <p>Under state law, WDFW is charged with “preserving, protecting, and perpetuating” the state’s fish and wildlife species, while also providing sustainable recreational opportunities. Fishing and hunting are recreational opportunities supported on WDFW managed lands. WDFW does have an obligation to manage the opportunities so they are compatible with agency conservation objectives.</p> <p>WDFW agrees that respectful dialogue among all citizens is vitally important. Most of the objectives in Goal 1 of the plan “Maintain or improve the ecological integrity of priority sites and systems address restoring habitat.</p> <p>Comments 4-13 and 16-19: The Washington State Legislature has directed WDFW to provide fishing and hunting opportunities of all citizens: RCW 77.04.012 Mandate of the Department and the Commission. For information about how to participate in the hunting rule making process, please visit: http://wdfw.wa.gov/about/regulations/how_to_participate.html</p>
-----------	---	--

<p>between maiming and killing a pet and maiming and killing wildlife is that one is sanctioned by the state and the other is not.</p> <p>12. Expand watchable wildlife programs and ban hunting in more areas so that wildlife can actually be seen and enjoyed. It is awfully hard to watch wildlife when they flee in terror at the sight of man. It is so much easier and enjoyable to see wildlife in our National Parks because they are not hunted. Places like the Galapagos put our wildlife practices to shame. The right of the general public to enjoy our natural areas and wildlife should not be sacrificed to the 5% of the population that hunts.</p> <p>13. WDFW trivializes public safety issues. Hunting accidents happen all the time. A friend completed a gun safety class and was told by the teacher to stay out of the woods during hunting season. He was not opposed to hunting, but he stressed that it was not safe to be out there. Public safety should be paramount.</p> <p>14. There needs to be more strict enforcement of laws and regulations in the wildlife areas. Violators should be fined and punished.</p> <p>15. I personally do not feel safe being outside during the ever expanding hunting seasons. Even if I do not get shot at, it is very intimidating to encounter people on a trail carrying weapons. I should not have to live in fear each time I go bird watching or hiking.</p> <p>16. I generally do not travel throughout the state during hunting season to avoid hunters. I don't wish to encounter them and their weapons, hear the sound of guns blasting away, see animals dying or birds falling from the sky, see dead animals in the back of pickup trucks, or dead carcasses left to rot. A former WDFW director once told me that if I did not feel comfortable being out during hunting season, I should just stay home. I am a resident and a taxpayer of this state and this response is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>17. Increased hunting is a detriment to rural businesses when people such as myself stay home rather than venturing out to see fall colors, spring and summer wildflowers, bird watch, hike, view and photograph wildlife, etc. It also, therefore, negatively affects state tax revenues.</p> <p>18. Habitat preservation should be a top priority. Our state lands should be managed for species diversity and especially for the preservation of habitat for endangered and at risk species.</p> <p>19. WDFW's wildlife management policies are cruel, barbaric, and scientifically unsound. It is past time to implement humane policies and programs along with compassionate conservation. At the very minimum, WDFW needs to take a humane step forward and outlaw cruel and unethical hunting practices. -Diane Weinstein</p>	<p>Hunter education and safety of hunters and others are priorities for the agency. Please see the Hunter Education Page: https://wdfw.wa.gov/hunting/huntered/</p> <p>Goals 8.A and 8.B in the plan are about public safety on the wildlife area.</p> <p>Enforcement of laws and regulations is a priority for the agency. Please see the Enforcement page: https://wdfw.wa.gov/enforcement/</p> <p>Most of the objectives in Goal 1 of the plan "Maintain or improve the ecological integrity of priority sites and systems address restoring habitat.</p>
---	---

27	<p>I support actions to continue efforts for hunting improvements to include pheasant and waterfowl. The Ebey area is the only easy access area for senior hunters and offers opportunity for easy access to introduction to hunting for youth as well. Trail improvements to waterfowl areas should be an action element for new projects. Handicap blinds would be a big improvement to this urban area as well. I, as have many others have supported this area in the past years and have paid the pheasant hunting fee which far exceeds the value of the harvest, but worth the price for the outdoor hunting experience. Brian Boehm has been an asset to improving this area and I support his efforts to enhance this as well as other areas under his guidance. Thanks for the opportunity to respond -Al Bartz</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of the efforts of the Wildlife Area Manager and Goal 3 of the plan. The legislature directs the commission to attempt to maximize the public recreational game fishing and hunting opportunities of all citizens, including juvenile, disabled, and senior citizens. (RCW 77.04.013).Accessibility for seniors, youth, and people with disabilities, is an issue that requires a statewide focus. WDFW recognizes the importance of ADA access, there is a goal in the plan (Goal 3.H) to identify opportunities to improve it.</p>
28	<p>I live in Gold Bar, so nothing here was relevant to my interests. Not sure why/how I was include on the email – is there possibly a way to analyze addresses for interest? -Davi Martin</p>	<p>Your name was not on the WDFW mailing list so you received notification another way. WDFW makes effort to include all people who many have an interest in the wildlife areas.</p>
29	<p>Pg. 15- What are the long-term management strategies or goals of WDFW to address white nose syndrome if it is reported in the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area? - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes</p>	<p>White nose syndrome response is coordinated at the national level, and WDFW is an active partner in the white nose syndrome scientific arena. Active surveillance for white nose syndrome is ongoing in King County. The wildlife area will cooperate in these efforts as applicable.</p>
30	<p>Pg. 15- Are there any WDFW or citizen scientist efforts to report ducks species and abundance within Snoqualmie Wildlife Area? - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes</p>	<p>Not at this time. WDFW supports the concept.</p>
31	<p>Consider adding language regarding the potential impacts of hunting and strategies to grow hunting opportunities in areas such as Spencer Island and Cherry Valley. - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes</p>	<p>WDFW’s goal is to support hunting at all wildlife areas.</p>
32	<p>Pg. 16-Have you considered the introduction of beavers as a tool for salmon recovery efforts in these areas? We know there was a call to remove beavers from the Cherry</p>	<p>WDFW does not believe that lack of beavers is a limiting</p>

	Valley area, which seems counterintuitive to the wildlife preservation goals of these areas. - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	factor to salmon recovery at Cherry Valley.
33	Pg. 32- Proposed Action of field enhancement for grazing opportunities for Elk and Deer - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	WDFW provides food and cover for all wildlife on the wildlife area.
34	Pg. 32- Identify surrounding corridors to work with partners to conserve, improve, etc. wildlife access to the site. Pg.67 Expand upon corridor efforts - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	Goal 1.I has been added to the plan to explore this. WDFW participates in ongoing effort as opportunities arise.
35	Pg. 35&43- Can agricultural lands be “saved” and dedicated to enhancement for elk and deer? Can collaborate with farmers to hay the field. - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	It is unclear what the questions is.
36	Pg. 35- the ditch network conflicts with fish habitat enhancement goals and projects. It also creates several pinch points for high head beaver dams blocking fish passage. - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	The ditches belong to and are managed by Drainage District 7. They have a representative on the wildlife area advisory committee. Coordinating with the drainage district is called out goals, especially 1.B and 2.A
37	Pg. 35- Specify whether barn replacement with a “shop” will be available to the public - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	The facility will have limited availability to registered volunteers working on the wildlife area as appropriate.
38	Pg. 35- City of Duvall will experience a lot of growth over the next 10 years. Is there coordination with “Duvall Wildlife Habitat Protections” (Environmental Science Associates study) to address how habitat corridors can reach Cherry Valley and whether local goals line up? - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	Goal 1.I has been added to the plan to explore this.
39	Pg. 38- Propose long-term strategies for managing and growing resident elk herd within the Stillwater unit - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	Elk management in the general area needs to consider negative impacts to local farmers and property owners.
40	Pg. 40- I believe the “Sky to Sound Water Trail” name is incorrect and the link is not appropriate - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	This has been corrected in the plan.
41	Pg. 40 & 43- Identify the benefits of leasing land to the public i.e. does money from leasing land go directly to benefiting the management and restoration of that specific wildlife area or all Snoqualmie Wildlife Areas or just to WDFW? - David Bailey, B.S. Tulalip Tribes	It depends, some agreements are sharecrop only. If there is a rental lease agreement, those monies are allocated to the unit that has the lease.
42	Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.	Response #1

	<p>I visit the Crescent Lake and Stillwater units regularly and often as a birder, wildlife watcher, photographer, and walker. Here are my concerns:</p> <p>1. Dogs - though there has been a dramatic decrease in off-leash dogs encountered, it still occurs. The dog owners are well aware of the regulations. Some use the guise of hunting to unleash their dogs. Others think it's okay to let their dogs go free when they are away from other people. At least one who continues this practice has already been fined. Please consider a ban of these individuals after the second violation.</p> <p>-vickie scales</p>	<p>Goals 8.A and 8.B of the plan focus on improving visitor safety and reducing illegal activities.</p>
43	<p>2. Hunting is seen as THE purpose of these these lands. All other uses are seen as subordinate. As one hunter told me, "These areas were purchased for hunters." I'd like to see attitudes change towards seeing the purpose to be wildlife preservation and all users equally invested and considered.</p> <p>-vickie scales</p>	<p>Under state law, WDFW is charged with "preserving, protecting, and perpetuating" the state's fish and wildlife species, while also providing sustainable recreational opportunities. Fishing and hunting are recreational opportunities supported on WDFW managed lands.</p>
44	<p>3. Road noise. Arrgh. With development in the valley, road noise is getting worse. It is deafening at Stillwater. I don't know how the Bitterns can hear each other during rush hour. Even walking far out towards the Snoqualmie River, road noise can still be heard. I know that WDFW can't do anything about it, but thought I'd put it out there as a growing issue.</p> <p>I do not take these lands for granted. Thank you to WDFW staff and volunteers in maintaining and protecting these lands for wildlife.</p> <p>-vickie scales</p>	<p>This comment is outside the scope of this plan.</p>
45	<p>Sorry, I forgot to include my concerns about setting aside land for dog training. I understand that dog trainers would rather have a free training area rather than pay to use private dog training areas. And I'm sure golfers would like free courses. My feeling is that when you take up an activity, you should be prepared to pay the costs. Dog training in a wildlife area can only have a negative impact, taking away habitat, affecting bird behavior, and diminishing the experience of wildlife watchers.</p> <p>-vickie scales</p>	<p>Imposing fee for dog training requires Washington State Legislature to grant the authority to WDFW to charge a fee.</p> <p>Response #1</p>
46	<p>All this land needs to stay in Ag production. Farmers are the best stewards of land.</p> <p>-Jim Anderson</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>
47	<p>As is noted on page 12, this land is nestled in a rural agricultural region. I assume that most, if not all of the 2,784 acres is zoned Agriculture-10 (acres). Therefore, unless modified to some other land use, the land should be managed as agriculture land. This management should be consistent with the needs of the agriculture community in that area (and the needs of the agriculture producers that are leasing the land). Thank you.</p> <p>-Carole & Monte Marti</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>


48	<p>In response to a Request For Comment for the document “DNS 18-016: SNOQUALMIE WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN,” I’m sending my comment by email. I was unable to determine how to comment using the WDFW website.</p> <p>Regarding the 1,237 acre Ebey Island property, I understand that you are seeking comment on the use of this property, which is currently leased to farming operations for agricultural use.</p> <p>Please accept this email as my expression of strong support for the continued lease of this land to farming/agricultural operators. I believe that agricultural operations are the best use of this land, and are also the best way of ensuring that the property will be properly preserved and cared for, and that future generations will benefit from its preservation. In addition, leasing this property also provides revenue to the county. I am a Snohomish County farmer. Sincerely, -John Connolly</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>
49	<p>Concerning the use of WDFW/State lands in and around Snoqualmie valley: I believe the current agricultural uses of these lands are key in preserving many of the main objectives set forth in the management plan. The agricultural uses seem to help maintain the access, control of noxious weeds, and provide wildlife habitat and feed during the winter. I believe it is in the community’s best interest to keep these lands as viable agricultural ground in consideration to the benefits this use creates for the community regarding access to open spaces for many other recreational activities. Thank you, -Jared Westerman</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>
50	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I would like to comment for the support of continued agricultural use in the Snoqualmie Wildlife Management Area.</p> <p>Agricultural lands should continue to be a priority for use in these areas. They are managed well, provide habitat and cover for wildlife, yet allow for recreational opportunities. They provide for revenue from the lease, and keep open spaces beautiful for the public benefit. Ag lands are something we should prize and maintain every opportunity to keep them functioning as this use. With the increase in development and continued losses to prime agricultural lands around the area, these acres become even more important to all.</p> <p>Food plots left for cover and feed for wildlife are also an added benefit. Keeping in mind that the public accesses these areas is also something that is important, but should not dictate or overshadow the types crops that are grown, especially if there is a payment to leased the ground.</p> <p>Please strive to continue the use of these working lands, to maintain the agricultural acres needed to keep our farms sustainable and viable. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. -Bobbi Lindemulder</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>
51	<p>The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have been purchasing agricultural land for public hunting and recreation. Historically, many of these sites have been utilized for forage production and growing various crops. Following the acquisition by WDFW, the sites have remained under cultivation by farmers within the vicinity. The agreement between WfffW and the farmers has been a modified share crop agreement whereas the farmer would leave a percentage of the unharvest crop.</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>

	<p>The farming activity and planted crops were closely coordinated with WDFW. That includes planting and harvesting schedules along with type of crop and location of planting.</p> <p>Farming these sites has been a "win-win" opportunity for both the local farmers, WDFW, and the general public. The sites are maintained, wildlife food plots are left, and the sites remain in agriculture. This is all accomplished at a minimal cost to the general public while providing enhanced and accessible hunting.</p> <p>The Snohomish County Farm Bureau, which has over 2000 members, supports the continued multi use of these sites and keeping them in agricultural production .</p> <p>Sincerely, -Dan Bartelheimer, President, Snohomish County Farm Bureau</p>	
52	<p>The Snohomish Conservation District Board of Supervisors would like to submit comments for the WDFW Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan. We would like to emphasize the importance of these areas to the agricultural community. With more and more agricultural land being taken out of production, all of our existing agricultural lands become even more important to maintain for that purpose.</p> <p>The loss of agricultural lands to alternative uses emphasizes the importance of maintaining existing agricultural ground. The continued ability to lease WDFW ground to farmers is both a way to maintain agricultural production, as well as manage them for public use and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Some of this ground leased to the farming community is important acreage for manure management. Whether it is corn or grass, acres in production allow them to maintain a balance on their farm to properly manage every nutrient created on that farm in the form of manure. Subsequently, these leased lands benefit from nutrient inputs needed for crop production that often has areas left for food plots. It also allows the farms an avenue for feed production needed for livestock.</p> <p>The WDFW leased ground, is maintained as open space, managed for weed control, and usually coincides well with recreational opportunities such as hunting. While the ground is being farmed during-the growing season, avenues are set forth to leave wildlife cover or food plots for fall/winter recreational hunters. During this summer use, the farmer is managing for weed control, and provides cover and habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>Realizing your areas are managed for the public, we feel that leasing to a farm entity, which is willing to pay to maintain (and crop) the land is beneficial to the public. WDFW receives revenue for management of their production areas while the leasee maintains weeds, mowing, and stewards the parcels while the public can still enjoy birdwatching, walking, or hunting on these lands.</p> <p>The SCD Board of Supervisors appreciates the opportunity to comment and would like to extend an invitation to work with you further on this issue. Maintenance of agricultural lands and minimizing the loss of any lands in production is a priority of this district board.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you to see where we may be able to discuss this further. Sincerely, -Mark Craven, District Chair, Snohomish Conservation District</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p> <p>WDFW welcomes the opportunity to work with the conservation district and to have your expertise in our planning efforts. Staff will be in contact with you.</p>
53	<p>Dear Mr. Boehm and others concerned with management of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area,</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the</p>

<p>This letter concerns the user comments requested regarding the updating of the management plan for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area.</p> <p>“To preserve, protect and perpetuate fish, wildlife and ecosystems while providing sustainable fish and wildlife recreational and commercial opportunities.”</p> <p>-Mission Statement, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>My family has been farming land at the confluence of the Skykomish and Snoqualmie rivers since my grandfather first came here in 1959. As the third generation on our family farm, I am proud to be part of a legacy and community that supports people and values sustainability. Beginning with the generous collateral my grandfather’s friends offered to allow him to buy the farm, our family has striven to be equally as generous to the community, principally by the way that we farm. For us that means that core values such as sustainability, also reflected in the mission of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), are at the heart of what we do. What I hope to emphasize in this letter is the importance that the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area remain partnered with agriculture because it optimizes the ability of the WDFW to meet its stated goals.</p> <p>WDFW’s first goal is to conserve and protect fish and wildlife. After years of planning, my father and the other members of the Qualco Energy board were able to build and begin operation of an anaerobic digester that sits directly across the street from the Crescent Lake Wildlife Area. This operation was born of a partnership between a local Native American tribe, a local environmental group, and local farmers. The founding members are fond of describing the reason for what they do as, “Cows are better than condos.” That is, Qualco Energy was a project meant to enhancing the viability of farming on the local watersheds because appropriate farming practices can not only maintain but also enhance water quality and therefore native fish habitat. The partnership with Qualco Energy is a large endeavor for our family but still just one example of the commitment of local farmers to conservation.</p> <p>The second goal of WDFW is to provide sustainable fishing, hunting, and other wildlife-related recreational and commercial experiences. Werkhoven Dairy includes sustainability in its own mission statement. While this word has become rather cliché, the underlying meanings of renewable and continuous is of great merit. We have a deep rooted commitment to sustainability. We are the farmers who sharecrop WDFW land in the Crescent Lake Area. Through this sharecropping agreement we are able to harvest a crop valuable to our farming operation and important to proper distribution of soil nutrients and water quality. At the same time, working together with Mr. Boehm from the WDFW, Werkhoven Dairy is able to provide a crop that enhances the hunting and recreational experience of other area users by providing valuable wildlife nutrition and open space recreation areas.</p> <p>A third goal of WDFW is to promote a healthy economy, protect community character, maintain an overall high quality of life, and deliver high-quality customer service. The previous example of sharecropping also wholly achieves this objective of the WDFW. Harvesting a valuable crop helps make our dairy more economically sound. By becoming more economically viable our operation’s sustainability is enhanced and we are able to continue to contribute to the local community. While it may sound a bit antiquated, our family believes that the first step to community is simply being around. That is, by being a family living and working in the same place we are able to interact</p>	<p>agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>
---	--

	<p>with neighbors in a way that is no longer common in increasingly urban environments. Farmers having farmers for neighbors actually enhances their viability. We can help each other during harvests, borrow equipment if something breaks down, learn for each other's practices, and much more. Synergies and communities like this are increasingly rare with in growing urban landscapes.</p> <p>In short, we at Werkhoven Dairy believe that continuing and even expanding the agricultural use of WDFW land will achieve both the goals of the WDFW and also those of the farmers and communities with which they partner. We look forward to ongoing work at the Crescent Lake Area and welcome conversations to deepen our relationships. While I may not be much of a writer I would welcome you to stop in for coffee or spend some time on the farm and we could happily show you why we believe that it is in the best interest of the WDFW to keep agriculture as a partner in conservation. Sincerely, -Ben Werkhoven</p>	
54	<p>Dear Mr. Boehm and others concerned with management of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area,</p> <p>This letter is intended to be submitted as part of the public comment concerning the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) draft management plan of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area.</p> <p>Farmland and open spaces are quickly diminishing in Western Washington. The rate of urbanization and the extent of its reach is alarming to many people. To those who rely on and cultivate land as a means of making a living the close quarters has very serious effects on the viability of their operations. Specifically, farmers need land in order to make a living. Decreasing the amount of land available for farming by necessity increases competition for the remaining land, thus further pressuring the finances and relationships of farmers that are already under significant strain.</p> <p>My family and many more like ours have been farming in Snoqualmie and Skykomish river valleys for decades now. Many of us take pride in the generations of know how that has been built in understanding how to sustainably farm land in these valleys. Additionally, for many years farmers have been partnering with WDFW to conceive mutually beneficial solutions for sustainable land management. That is, there is a long history of WDFW leasing land to local farmers and working together achieve the goals of sustainable fish and wildlife habitat and sustainable farming. These goals are not mutually exclusive. In fact, the opposite is true. For instance, my family has been privileged to be a part of a project founded by the Tulalip tribe, Northwest Chinook Recovery, and the Sno-Sky Agriculture Alliance. Their combined vision was to enhance the financial and ecological viability of farming in these river valleys because land used for farming is better for fish and wildlife habitat than land used for urban development. We believe all parties involved would call the project—now named Qualco Energy, a non-profit organization generating electricity for 250 homes via bacterial digestion of cow manure—a huge success. Because of this project farming is both more economically and ecologically sound and maintains farmers as caretakers of land that they share with wildlife. In short, farmers make every effort to be sustainable, even taking on what may look like an unconventional relationship. The historical relationships between farmers and WDFW have been mutually beneficial. Both parties</p>	<p>Supports the goal of agriculture on the wildlife area managed as part of the agency mission (Goal 6) and the local agricultural community.</p>

	<p>are able to work together for common goals and synergies that are too important to let them fall to the wayside.</p> <p>Farmers also understand that these lands are multi-use areas. In fact, as part of the management of these lands we work side-by-side with local WDFW officials in organizing and planting multiple crop species, planning harvest windows, and providing proper plant nutrition so that we can assist WDFW in their goal of “providing sustainable fish and wildlife recreational and commercial opportunities.” Crop species are chosen together, seed placement is done according to the WDFW manager’s plans, and every effort is made by farmers to be efficient in their use of the land so as to minimize any interruption to other parties use the space.</p> <p>In summary, farmers believe strongly that their management of land in conjunction with WDFW greatly enhances the experiences and opportunities for all other users. Open spaces do not become overgrown. Multiple plant species are maintained for a variety of land user and wildlife preferences. And overall, we as farmers work in partnership with those around us because we understand that it is senseless to work against each other when simply working together creates benefits for all. Our hope is that WDFW will continue to work together with farmers now and in future so these benefits can be recognized by many generations to come.</p> <p>Sincerely, -Ben Werkhoven</p>	
55	<p>Farming has also negatively impacted the grounds. Farming left uneven furrows which caused greater erosion than had there been grass maintained by mowing.</p> <p>Farming also allowed noxious weeds to become established because the farmer does not actively spray. When the farmer did spray, chemicals were used which have been deemed harmful to wildlife.</p> <p>-Paul Gilmore</p>	Supports Goal 6 to develop and implement farm plans with the conservation districts.
56	<p>The Snoqualmie unit is over run with canary grass and blackberries. I have volunteered to cut canary grass at my own expense with my own equipment. The current manager is making it hard and somewhat impossible for people to volunteer to help control these invasive species.</p> <p>People have been told they cannot volunteer without the manager being there, supervising with a fire extinguisher.</p> <p>-Paul Gilmore</p>	<p>Supports the Weed Management Plan for the wildlife area.</p> <p>WDFW appreciates and relies on volunteers to help manage invasive species, in accordance with agency policies.</p>
57	<p>Hi this is Brandon. I have concern that Snoqualmie wildlife management area is going to be used for a dog park. This area is a great bow hunting and duck hunting area I enjoy spending time with my kids hunting this area. I feel like most people don't understand hunters or hunting. The areas we share with people walking dogs, was purchued with funds from the WDFD . I along with a lot of other hunters support these programs with hunting and fishing licenses and parking passes. Please keep these areas available for our kids thanks.</p> <p>- Brandon</p>	Supports Goal 3. Response #1
58	<p>I would like to express my concern over unleashed dogs on the Crescent Lake Wildlife Management area. When walking the area I often see people with dogs on leashes as they are suppose to be. This is not a concern. On trail cameras I have pictures of dogs off leash, I almost never get a picture of anyone with the dog. Domesticated, well fed dogs, like the one in the picture below in February are no match for big or small</p>	Supports Goal 3. Response #1

	<p>game in the winter time. Even if the dog does not kill the wildlife, it will chase and/or harass it. It should not be an off leash area 100 yards away from the parking lots.</p> <p>Maybe some signs indicating the unleashed fine is \$XX and there are trail cameras in the area to catch perpetrators, would be effective. Thanks, (pic of unleashed dog on trail in email)</p>  <p>- Ed Scullywest</p>	<p>Support Goal 3.A of improving signage and Goal 8.A to reduce illegal activities.</p>
<p>59</p>	<p>I have been an active stakeholder in the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area since 1994. My interest in the grounds has been primarily for dog training. I train my dogs for hunt tests and field trials. My dogs have also been loaned to friends who needed a hunting dog during hunting season. The training on the Snoqualmie Wildlife lands has served us all well as my dogs have developed their hunting instincts and become well controlled hunting companions as well as successful Master Hunters. The sport of dog training has brought me into the outdoors where I have enjoyed the fresh air and long walks required for training. The Snoqualmie Wildlife lands have provided me, over the years, with the opportunity to appreciate the land and have provided my dogs with the kind of water and terrain they need to experience in developing their skills both in a test environment and hunting situations. Please include dog training as a use of the land in your 10 year plan.</p> <p>- Terri Sato</p>	<p>Supports Goal 3.M in the plan for dog training.</p> <p>Response #1</p>
<p>60</p>	<p>I am writing to attest the need for preserving Cherry Valley area for dog training and trialing. As a member of the Puget Sound Labrador Retriever Association (PSLRA) and a dog owner and trainer, as well as a veterinarian, I have experienced the shortage of good grounds to do dog tracking. I have obtained 3 tracking titles at Cherry Valley sites through the years and found even 10 years ago it was hard to find tracking tests and areas to train in due to a shortage of available land. People frequently have to travel out of state to get into tracking tests that have long waiting/alternates lists for those who did not get into the draw for the few available tracks (few tracks due to limited acreage at the test site). Ten years ago I was the tracking test chairperson for PSLRA test for two years in a row, and the second year we got so restricted in available land that the American Kennel Club supervisor who was present with the judges was threatening to pull the site for approval for future tests. That would have been a disaster as there was not an easy alternative site, if any. Right now many tracking tests in Northwest Washington only can happen on some private land in Bow, WA, which is not available readily for training and while planted before harvesting, and if we lost that there would be no tests. I believe for hunt tests there are even less options for sites (Bow, WA is not an option).</p> <p>Historically, 125 and 200 acres were available at Cherry Valley, depending on the trials, for hunt test and tracking test needs. When this went down to 65 acres and was under corn, the site becomes almost useless so I ask that the historical amount be available at least and not all of that being planted in crop. Sharing use with hay fields that are cut yearly is a more ideal acreage for use for both us dog trainers and a farmer.</p> <p>-Michelle Schraeder, DVM, MEd, FAAVA Mountain Veterinary Hospital</p>	<p>Regulations for dog training on the wildlife areas are specific for hunting dogs or bird dogs</p> <p>Response #1</p>

61	<p>I writing to comment on the upcoming plan for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan. I'm an avid water fowler. I spend the 107 days of the water fowl season planning, scouting and hunting but during the other 258 says of the year I'm out trying to train my black lab for hunting and testing. Its how I continue to enjoy being a water fowler even when I cant hunt.</p> <p>It is concerning to me that I hunt on mostly public lands but have very little oppportunity to train on any public lands. I do appreciate the efforts last year to make Cherry Valley more accessible and manage the lands in a way that are more applicable to retriever training. I used the area to train on multiple times but it was difficult due to the distances to haul gear for training. I'm curious if WDFW knows what is needed to setup a training session for retrievers? There are a lot of steps to training a waterfowl dog. I'd be happy to take some folks out to observe what I do on a regular basis to get ready for the hunting season.</p> <p>I'm also a little concerned that the retriever community isn't represented on the Advisory Committee. Seems like a fair number of users are from the retriever/waterfowl community and yet we have no representation. For the coming year I'd love to see a plan that would enable the grounds be maintained in a way that is further applicable to retriever training as well as road access so that gear can be taken fairly close to training areas. Thanks,</p> <p>-Colin Ching</p>	Response #1
62	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my concern about dog training being restricted or removed from the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan. As a avid bird hunter it is very important to have a well trained bird dog. This can not be done at a dog park or on a leash. Over the past 20+ years a have trained 3 of my dogs and helped train countless other dogs at these areas. Over the past few years I have watched the available areas shrink steadily. These areas are the only place in the Seattle area to train a bird dog. The 65 acres at Cherry Valley are already much too small to train a big running pointer. I would like to see the trains areas at Stillwater, Cherry Valley and Cresent Lake restored to their original size. I understand some of the problems with managing these areas (they became off leash dog parks, etc). I have suggested solving this by requiring users to have a hunting license instead of a Discovery Pass. I think this would all but eliminate the dog walking crowd. Just a suggestion! Anyway it's extremely important as a hunter and dog enthusiast to have a place to train. Please consider restoring the original areas and at minimum keep the areas that we now have. This very important to me and my hunting/dog training friends. Sincerely,</p> <p>-Michael Smith</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>WDFW lands are available to all Washington State public with a Discover Pass. The agency land mission is inclusive of users beyond those with a hunting license.</p>
63	<p>I am writing to let you know there is a need for training spaces for dogs .</p> <p>There are many venues for dogs that need land to perform on. I have used the cherry valley grounds for training my up and coming hunt test puppies . I have also layed tracks to train tracking, both these events take a good part of a day, and a large diverse piece of land. I am in hopes we do not loose this great piece of property that gives many dogs and handlers a wonderful place to train. Thank you</p> <p>-Julie Germano</p>	Response #1
64	<p>I would like to share my concerns on the management of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife area.</p> <p>The gate is always locked at Cherry Valley so we can't access the grounds.</p>	Response #1

	<p>The pond at Cherry Valley that was created for dog training has been excluded from training grounds. The 386 acre area has been designated off limits to dog training except for 10-11 acres which is not reasonable The time of year the grounds is available to use is more and more limited The signage is confusing The manager (Brian) is biased against dog training and, in fact, told me over the phone that 'no one likes off leash dogs'. And he told me in person that he was going to try to find a way to shut down year round dog training. He said he was going to try to find a federal regulation that would override the WA state year round dog training areas. I think he will try anything to keep dog training out of the area. Stillwater and Crescent Lake Wildlife areas designated for field trials and training are completely blocked from use We need a manager in the area who is supportive of public use, including dog training, hunting, tracking events, and hunting tests. This is a public land use issue and the current management is overly restrictive and biased against a long-term and active group of users. -Anne Tyson</p>	
65	<p>The fact that the Fish and Wildlife folks can severely restrict dog training on the Cherry Valley property and turn it over to a farming operation is still unbelievable to me. All three of the properties in the area have been restricted to the point that they are no longer practical for dog training or even just walking your dog off leash. -Jim Rutter, Bothell</p>	Response #1
66	<p>I plan to attend the meeting regarding this subject on April 24. I am a hunter and a dog trainer. I trained my dogs, participated in hunt tests and field trials, and hunted at Cherry Valley and Stillwater for almost 30 years.</p> <p>Several years ago Cherry Valley was arbitrarily closed. Many of us were frustrated with the lack of communication as to why this happened. Now, it seems obvious that we, "the dog people," are being pushed out.</p> <p>WDFW currently lists on your website under the "Cherry Valley Unit" - "Unique Features" "This is a popular Unit for pheasant and waterfowl hunting in the fall and winter, and dog training and trials in the spring and summer." That has not been a true statement for several years now due to someone deciding to close the gate and lock everyone out.</p> <p>Regarding protecting the fish on the Cherry Valley Unit - When has there ever been a census (creel census/shock study) for Chinook Salmon, Winter Steelhead or Bull Trout in the ponds and sloughs on that property? Where is the documented study to back up that statement? Those fish do not historically frequent those types of water.</p> <p>Regarding the policy for enhancing and protecting wildlife - since when is farming and spraying toxic chemicals good for the area? (Last summer for one example). -Fran Seagren</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>WDFW has not documented this information but many others have. There are a number of plans and reports, including the Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan (listed in the References section of the plan). Goal 6.B is to develop and implement a farm plan in coordination with conservation districts</p>
67	<p>I am very concerned, upset that the Stillwater & Crescent Lake Wildlife areas designed for field trials, hunt tests and dog training are completely blocked from use. -Keely Ghirardelli</p>	Response #1

68	<p>As a Master Hunter, Hunter Education Instructor and Bird dog enthusiast, I am hopeful that the Cherry Valley and Stillwater areas will be open for dog training to the clubs and individuals who need these public land resources. We have very few options. Seeing a kid hunt pheasant for the first time is priceless: You cannot teach without a classroom and our public lands are the classroom. The dogs need acreage to train.</p> <p>Cherry valley and Stillwater flood every year, it's not a place where much more can be developed. We don't have the luxury of other parks or venues to do what we need to do with dog training.</p> <p>The Snoqualmie area is accessible to many and offers exactly what the dog training community requires: acreage, cover, water, easy parking access, and safety.</p> <p>Please allow the bird dog training community to have a place to do our work so we can continue the tradition and pass it on to our kids. Sincerely, -Dr. AnnaMaria Marchionne German Shorthaired Pointer Club of Wa</p>	Response #1
69	<p>I am responding to your request for public comment regarding the reopening of public lands that historically were used for dog training as well as field events. I first started to use Cherry Valley in the early 80's for training my dog in both tracking and the new hunt tests in AKC. At that time there was little corn and the fields were mowed, making them ideal for both types of training. My obedience club, Washington State Obedience Training Club used the area for tracking tests and it was also used for field trials. I am aware of no problems for WSDFW and it seemed that there was a good relationship between the trainers, the clubs, and WSDFW. At the time, I lived in Seattle and it was well worth the trip across the bridge to use such nice fields for my training. The north gate was open and everyone just drove in and parked at the main area. The ponds were also maintained and we were able to use the ponds for water work, essential for retriever training.</p> <p>Slowly, over the years, maintenance was not kept up, and little mowing was done. The grass was just too high for either tracking for field training in the summer months, although it was OK in the winter (other than hunting season) when the grass wasn't so high. So, my usage and that of others dramatically dropped off. Finally, the north gate was closed, making that side of the property unusable. We could park in the south lot, though that required that dogs not actively working had to be left in the car, a little less than ideal situation since it left not only the cars exposed to vandalism, but a risk to the dogs as well. The training was taking place quite a distance away and the cars were out of view which could be a safety/security issue. Parking outside the north gate is even worse as the cars are even more exposed, and, carrying in the equipment needed for training to the main parking area is really not feasible. For some older folks and handicapped people, it is just not possible.</p> <p>In 2010 I moved to Duvall, so of course was even more interested in using the state property for training. But as described above, it was more unusable than ever, with corn everywhere, no mowing, so very few useful fields and way too much cover around the ponds to use those for water work. I did join the stakeholder group of dog trainers that met to try to negotiate with WSDFW. Our group even offered to provide funds and labor for mowing, and spent countless hours in meetings, though it seemed that the representatives from WSDFW (like Kim Chandler and Brian Boehm) were just plain anti-dog or anti dog training, and really did not want to work to provide any reasonable compromise to use the land for dog training. I purchase a Discover Pass in order to use the land, which is clearly public land. It seems that the folks at WSDFW think of it as</p>	Response #1

	<p>“their” land and feel free to restrict it from those who displease them. I pass by Cherry Valley often and can see that it is getting very little public use when hunting season is over. You just have not provided sufficient acreage for dog training.</p> <p>I think you need to pay more attention to the stakeholders. The lands are public and should be available for the use it was originally intended, which I understand was dog training. I know the valley is considered an agricultural area, but the land at Cherry Valley, for example, is not particularly suited for farming, as we have been told by the farmer who grows corn. This really reduces the amount of land that could be made available for dog training and I think far fewer acres would be needed for the birds that the hunters want for hunting season. In addition, the farming, due to the use of toxic weed and insect killers, is a threat to the health of the wildlife, humans, and dogs who use it.</p> <p>I know that mowing is expensive, but you should know that our stakeholder community as offered to assist with both finances and labor. If the land were maintained, it would more valuable for field training (to train the dogs that hunt during hunting season) as well as for tests and events which have been held there in the past. This could also be expanded to the sport of tracking, both training and tests, which have even less impact on the land than dog training. We are willing to share the land with others such as the bird watchers and those just walking. It is truly a waste to manage it the way it has been done for the last several years. Both of my dog clubs, WSOTC, as mentioned above, and the Evergreen Golden Retriever Club have many members who would use if for training if maintained and the gates kept open. In addition, it could be used for events, which would provide a source of income to WSDFW.</p> <p>The WSDFW needs to stop pretending that they care about public input or comments and then demonstrate that they have no intent to keep their word about promises made or about reasonable accommodation made to people who would like to use their public lands without harm to the environment or wildlife.</p> <p>-Kylahgold@aol.com</p>	<p>Maintaining and expanding agriculture is part of the vision for the wildlife area as it provides multiple benefits for wildlife, habitat, and the local economy. Staff negotiate leases with farmers based on available land and wildlife management objectives.</p> <p>WDFW agrees that respectful dialogue is vitally important.</p>
70	<p>As a hunter and dog trainer, I strongly encourage that Cherry Valley be maintained or enhanced for use as a dog training site. At a minimum this requires that grass fields to mowed periodically during the late spring and summer to make fields usable. Dog training was one if not the original uses designated for Cherry Valley and there is a strong need for more land which can be used for this purpose. Respectfully,</p> <p>-William Woll</p>	Response #1
71	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I have been training dogs on the Cherry Valley area since 1965. Back then cattle were used to keep grass down to make more usable areas. We never used areas that had nesting ducks but the person who lived on the property used to let their dog loose to run. Over the years less areas are really usable due to high cover. I believe the lady who owned the area donated it to the State of WA to be used as dog training and other things. That information has been "lost" over the years. It has been a good training site and even as a place for competition. I do hope it comes back to that. Thank you,</p> <p>-Mary Hallowell</p>	Response #1
72	<p>Gentle persons,</p> <p>For either upland or waterfowl hunters, the canine counterpart is an important element of the hunt. A well trained dog is almost a requirement. To train, that dog needs work year round, which means off leash, space and a variation of habitats in which to train. These needs are very basic.</p>	Response #1

	<p>Areas that meet the needs are fewer in number, and not well distributed. We have seen the areas in the Snoqualmie unit reduced over the decades, and very reluctantly opened up again after intervention at the higher levels of WDFW. Hours of operation, locked access and a reported increase in enforcement presence hint strongly that those decisions were not taken to heart.</p> <p>There is a very real effort to bring more people into hunting among hunting and hunting dog organizations. The WDFW has quite a bit of information displayed toward that goal as well. The commitment to a good gun dog is one that does tend to bring hunters to the field year after year. These new people and their dogs truly need to have our support.</p> <p>We need water access for training. We need sizable areas to work the dogs in the field, with a variety of cover. We need places available after work during the week as well as on weekends. We really need WDFW to step up to the prior directives, at the very least.</p> <p>-Alan Nickelson, Kent WA Pheasants Forever, Ruffed Grouse Society, NAVHDA, JGV-RM, NA-JGV, DL-GNA, VDD-GNA</p>	
73	<p>I hope it is not too late to comment on the “Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan” via eMail. I just found out about it this morning. As I work on swing shift, I am not able to attend the public meeting in Mill Creek. Please consider my comments submitted here in substitute for my comments in person.</p> <p>The hunting dog enthusiasts appear to enjoy an egregious loophole in the state’s definition of usage of state open space. Apparently it is considered a “passive” activity on an equal footing with bird watching and photography. Nothing could be further from the truth. Obviously it needs to be re-defined to a usage in line with its actual effect on the wildlife akin to hunting itself. Hunting dog training is reasonably seen to be a highly invasive activity posing an existential threat to all manor of wildlife. Birders, hikers, and photographers assume that outside of hunting season, the birds can have some respite from firearms and hunting dogs. On the contrary, after hunting season the waterfowl have migrated away and those species that are resident are subject to constant harassment by the same people and their hunting dogs. It seems as soon as hunting season is over it becomes hunting dog training season.</p> <p>I understand why the gun owners are aggrieved in this case. At the Leque Island “salmon restoration” new drainage ditches were dug and levies removed. Hunters also used to release pheasants there. The now rapidly changing habitat is of far less use for dog training or pheasant hunting. The hunters feel their voice was not heard at Leque Island. Even worse, OUR perspective WAS heard: the portion of the levy that remained was left specifically for bird watchers and photographers. They view it as a “takeaway.” As “corrective action” they have planned mass demonstration at the Mill Creek meeting. It is an alarming and sobering show of force by the NRA/FOX/GOP.</p> <p>Everything they have said is wrong. Their propagandists lie 90% of the time, and their elected officials lie 70% of the time. Their forthcoming statements must be evaluated by that standard. Their ongoing campaign of disinformation disqualifies them from any inclusive, rational discussion of the issues. We hear their voices every day at CPAC and in the West Wing. Politicians hear them in cash donations and perks. WE DO NOT BUY INTO THEIR ADGENDA.</p> <p>-Jonathan Blubaugh, Seattle</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>Under state law, WDFW is charge with “preserving, protecting, and perpetuating” the state’s fish and wildlife species, while also providing sustainable recreational opportunities. Fishing and hunting are recreational opportunities supported on WDFW managed lands.</p> <p>Leque Island is not on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area.</p>

PUBLIC MEETING (<i>Transcribed from hand-written comments</i>)		
74	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>The dog trainer have suffered a significant reduction in land. This land was purchased in large part for the purpose of hunting & dog training. The state has taken an adversarial position for allowing dog training & hunting.</p> <p>The state is not taking the opportunity to partner with hunters & dog trainers to manage this land.</p> <p>There are states that have managed a partnership with these groups. Perhaps it's time for you to reach out & learn something.</p> <p>Dog training permits Email list to distribute notes from committees Quality of land for dog training. -Holly Kroh</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>Goals 8.A. and 8.B support improved enforcement and safety.</p>
75	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Too many gate closures. Lack of communication w/staff – returning phone calls. Better access to lands for hunting & training. Possibly doing a purchase of keys to lock gates using hunting ID to get information to people. Getting information to people about needing volunteer improve access to middle lobe of Ebey Island. -Candace Sobota</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
76	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Dog training permit to use training areas. -allows WDFW staff to enforce rules of use - discourages unauthorized use of force Can follow the (?) utilized by OR Dept fw -Katrina Sullivan</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
77	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Access to areas More communication with people/clubs who would locked gate – buy a key? Dog training areas not all trainers are professionals Disable access Marty should have been present at meeting -Leslie Douglas</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
78	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Access to dog training land Only trash left on land was from farmer If someone want to damaged eqmt he can write (?) -Jim Olsen</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
79	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Comments not addressed specifically on dog training same pilot program for Cherry Valley to continue? Already it is not addressed on 10 yr plan. We are being written out of the 10 yr plan. A couple of other things. Almost everyone at this meeting is a hunter and or fisherman. And have used it for training my kids in safe hunting. I would like to have all units opened up for all recreational use include dog training. -Boyd Uish</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
80	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>The NAVHDA wants to help.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am interested in sitting on the Advisory Committee for Cherry Valley & Crescent Lake. 	<p>Response #1</p> <p>We have a process governing the Wildlife Area</p>

	<p>2. What are the issues related to increasing land for dog training. 3. Who are the stakeholders above the dog trainers 4. How can my club assist with the management of the units 5. Stakeholder email list? PNW-NAVMDA Club 6. Why are the gates always locked? -Carl Vinkle</p>	<p>Advisory Committees. The Wildlife Area Manager will contact you with information.</p>
81	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i> Even though I do appreciate the recent expansion of the Cherry Valley site for dog training it is unfortunate that it is not more acres. Further, I really do believe all the sites should be fully open to dog training. I am in the field of education, I worried about our youth, childhood obesity. These sites provide individuals & family access public lands to engage in activity. My hope is that you continue to increase access to people in general, not just dog training. The folks that use these sites are passionate about public use, as they should be. Again I hope you help to open more lands to access for public use. It is difficult to understand how public lands can be open to farming that has a greater impact on wildlife than public use. The negative impact from users is far less than the farming that is allowed. Please continue, not explore, fore open up the to dog trainers. -Darryl Pernat</p>	<p>Response #1 Maintaining and expanding agriculture is part of the vision for the wildlife area as it provides multiple benefits for wildlife, habitat, and the local economy. Staff negotiate leases with farmers based on available land and wildlife management objectives.</p>
82	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i> -Consider time sharing areas for groups on weekend; Sat AM; PM. Sun AM; PM. Where there are several special interest groups. -Have more designated dog training area/acreage. Consider opening west side of Ebey unit for dog training. With Leque Is & Fir Is being shut down the last few years its put more pressure on Sno/King county units. -Utilize volunteers to maintain the land Ebey and other areas are overgrown and need maintenance. -Jack Richbourg jackrichbourg@msn.com</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
83	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i> Other than leaving the gates open I am also questioning why so much corn is planted. It cuts down dog training surely there are other crops that would not conflict. I am also not convinced that drugs are as big an issue as was stated. I do like the idea of keys. Maybe I had more extensive comments which I submitted previously in your request for comments. It does seem to me that not much progress has been and since we stared & severval DFW staff seem antidog. -Nancy Light Kylahgold@aol.com</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
84	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i> I'm a 77 ½ y/o female & I've been training my dogs for hunting & field events for 50 years. We used Cherry Valley for many years for training, field trials & picnic training. The fellow in charge worked closely with us – came out checked parking passes and stayed and chatted – I am not aware of any big conflicts. In 2013 the gates were closed – at my age it's difficult to walk great distances while hauling my equipment & keeping my dogs safe – If the gates can't be open allowing a key to registered handler would be very effective. It seems we've attended so many of these meeting to no avail. I do resent Brian's comment to us that it's "our land & our rules". He is paid with taxpayers money & if he can't deal with the public better than he does he needs to go find a different job. -Sandy Rainaldo herrsm1@comcast.net</p>	<p>Response #1</p>

<p>85</p>	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do we find the dog training plan? 2. How do we work with the dog representative? I have not heard of him or the plan. 3. Go back to what the land was purchased for. The current plan has shrinking areas. A).Stillwater was purchased for retrievers and now no dog training allowed (same as Ebey Island). B)Cherry Valley is not useful due to restriction of corn growing in the area or has just dirt/mud where the corn used to be in the training area. 4. Need good field & hunt trial areas 5. Let volunteers work the land – many organization have liability waivers 6. There used to be 2800 acres for dog training, now less than 20 if you count the corn fields. Let’s move forward to address & reestablish the god training and trials. 7. Willing to have dog training Permit (free or nominal fee) like Oregon. <p>-Kris Colt</p>	<p>WDFW will send you the pilot plan that is in effect for the 2018 season, and it will be posted on the WLA website.</p> <p>Marty Thenell is the dog club representative on the WAAC. His contact information is on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area page on the WDFW web, under “Advisory Committee”). https://wdfw.wa.gov/about/advisory/swa-waac/</p> <p>Response #1</p>
<p>86</p>	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>I would be willing to purchase a dog training permit. This would hold people accountable for their actions while using the land.</p> <p>Allow people to use the land what it was intended for. Bring trials & tests back to the area. The more good people there will help push out the drug users. They are there because no one uses the area & they can hide.</p> <p>Allow people to purchase a key to gates for use.</p> <p>Please find a way to get these comment cards out to hunters. Maybe email it to them.</p> <p>-Barbara Rowdon</p>	<p>Imposing a permit fee for dog training requires WA State Legislature to grant the authority to WDFW to charge a fee.</p> <p>The WDFW system currently is not an effective way to mail directly to hunters. WDFW used news releases, public meetings, the SEPA process, the advisory committee members, and a stakeholder list as primary methods of communicating to all parties interested in the wildlife area.</p> <p>Response #1</p>
<p>87</p>	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>I would like to add to the comments I have previously made on the website after hearings some discussion at this meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having used Cherry Valley for dog training from 1994-2013 I can honestly say that I have never seen drugs paraphernalia left on the ground where I trained – all of this while the gate was open to trainers. With gates closed, there is more opportunity for parking in the big lot & just walking in to do drugs – there are fewer people monitoring. 2. When the majority of the 65 acres available for dog training is planted in corn it is not really 65 acres available for dog training. This feels like a ‘sleight of hand’ by WDFW. 3. I was part of a group of volunteers last summer that worked on the grounds - approved by the director. Now I am told I am no longer approved. Why? 4. I don’t understand why dog trainers are singled out – many are hunters, hunting dogs need to be trained to conserve (?) 	<p>Response #1</p>

	<p>I would gladly buy a hunting license if needs be, but I hope the bird watchers, farmers & beaver trappers would also be “fined” for their use of public lands purchased through a grant for outdoor recreation.</p> <p>-Terrie Sato</p>	
88	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>There are a lot of areas that have been preserved completely for bird habitat. Cherry Valley was originally given to the state for dog training. WDFW has not given a legitate reason for closing the gate permanently. We volunteered to work – we worked and yet the gate is closed again. We have been trying to work with SDFW but feel our concerns have not been heard. Dog trainers/hunters are the original wildlife conservationalists (sp?)</p> <p>-Fran Seagren</p>	Response #1
89	<p><i>Transcribed from hand-written comment</i></p> <p>Open access to ALL property at Stillwater & Cherry Valley not just a liited area. Dogs need 10 acres of varied terrain & water to be properly trained. Open access to all units for dog training not just Cherry Valley & Stillwater. Corson unit – WDFW Website has no information on how to get there.</p> <p>-Warren Baylinson</p>	Response #1 Access at Corson is currently through private property, with permission from the landowner. We are working to develop public access (Goal 3.G)
90	<p>We citizens of the state of WA. are pleading that you greatly increase the amount of land available for dog training. Cherry Valley should be open to dog training and dog activities as it was originally intended...</p> <p>Please hear our plea as the amount of land available for dog training and outdoor fun is fast being removed. Thank you,</p> <p>-Lennaea Gedsell</p>	Response #1
91	<p>Attention: Commissioners</p> <p>I am writing to support the continued use of Cherry Valley Unit in the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area by those who need the land to train their retrievers. I am an advocate for this cause because I used to train in Cherry Valley before the closure with no problems and understand this is public land. Over the past several months the situation of availability of Cherry Valley for dog training has been in flux. The property has gone from having the area closed to dog training, to having it partially opened with the promise of opening additional land, to the area again being off limits and now, to the possibility that we will again loose access for the foreseeable future. This situation is totally unacceptable and I along with many others in the dog training community are deeply concerned.</p> <p>As you know, members of the Washington Sporting Dog Association (WSDTA) have worked constructively and cooperatively with the Washington State Fish and Wildlife Commission since early 2016 to develop a comprehensive proposal utilizing volunteers to assist in maintaining Cherry Valley as a training area (to reduce demands on Fish and Wildlife employees) and to return the Cherry Valley Unit to historical use by the dog training community. The closure of the Cherry Valley Unit to dog training for salmon habitat restoration was presented as being temporary. With the development of the 10 year plan for the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area, there was an opportunity to reinstate the historical use of the grounds for dog training. The Washington Sporting Dog Training Group (representing enthusiasts from all aspects of sporting dog training) worked with the Washington Fish and Game representatives from Unit 4 to develop a plan for using Cherry Valley that was a step in the right direction. This plan provided guidelines for a</p>	Response #1

	<p>working relationship between the Department of Fish and Game and volunteers from the dog community and had 1, 3 and 5-year benchmarks.</p> <p>It was understood by all involved in the negotiations that the year 2017 represented the initial phase of reopening Cherry Valley with sufficient acreage to accommodate various uses. This included training for several types of dogs (from upland retrievers to water retrievers) as well as protecting the habitat for breeding/nesting waterfowl and salmon. Volunteers spent many hours working at Cherry Valley to mow the canary grass and open-up ground that had been overtaken by this invasive species.</p> <p>But now the cooperative spirit that allowed for development of joint use plans has deteriorated.</p> <p>I recently learned that 2017 was considered a “pilot year” and that, once again, Cherry Valley would be closed to dog training. This was not my understanding and is not acceptable. It disrespects the countless hours of time spent working with the Fish and Wildlife Department employees and private volunteers to develop a workable plan for Cherry Valley that includes dog training. I urge the Commission to use their oversight to direct Region 4 to leave the 2017 plan in place for the 2018 training season and continue to work with dog training enthusiasts to refine the plan for the continued use of Cherry Valley for dog training.</p> <p>As the human population grows and urban sprawl continues to erode open space available for dog training in the Puget Sound area, it is critical that Cherry Valley remain available to the public. It is possible to share the property with others who wish to enjoy open space, wildlife and wildlife viewing, and dog training while preserving the natural setting and promoting community interest and the preservation of wildlife.</p> <p>I will be keenly interested in the outcome of your meeting on the 24th of April. I hope you will understand that there are more than a few people who desire to use Cherry Valley (as well as other nearby units) for training their bird dogs.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Sincerely, -Jean Fowler</p>	
92	<p>I would like to submit a comment on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan. I live in Duvall and use areas for recreation including dog training and hunting. We are concerned that the use of the area is being more and more limited and signage is confusing.</p> <p>I am also interested in using Stillwater and Crescent Lake for dog training. I would like to suggest the possibility of rotating the locations used for dog training. If one area is getting too much use, then to preserve it, close it temporarily and open up another area.</p> <p>I hope that you will take my comments and suggestions into consideration. Thank you. - Amanda McLaughlin</p>	Response #1
93	<p>Attn: Commissioners Re: Public Use of Cherry Valley for Dog Training and Events</p> <p>I am writing to you again as there appears to be an effort to re-write the use of the area that has been traditionally open to multiple uses including dog training. We have been successfully training dogs in the Cherry Valley Unit during 2017 thanks to the cooperative work between the Region 4 leadership and the Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA). The WSDTA represents a wide cross section of individuals and groups, including the Rainier Hunting Retriever Club, who use Cherry Valley to train hunting dogs.</p>	Response #1

	<p>Members of the WSDTA have worked constructively with the Washington State Fish and Wildlife Commission since early 2016 to develop a comprehensive proposal utilizing volunteers to assist in maintaining Cherry Valley as a training area (to reduce demands on Fish and Wildlife employees) and to return the Cherry Valley Unit to historical use by the dog training community. The closure of the Cherry Valley Unit to dog training in 2012 for salmon habitat restoration was presented as being temporary.</p> <p>With the development of the 10-year plan for the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area, there was an opportunity to reinstate the historical use of the grounds for dog training. The Washington Sporting Dog Training Group (representing enthusiasts from all aspects of sporting dog training) worked with the Washington Fish and Game representatives from Unit 4 to develop a plan for using Cherry Valley that was satisfactory to all. This plan provided guidelines for a working relationship between the Department of Fish and Game and volunteers from the dog community and had 1, 3 and 5-year benchmarks.</p> <p>It was understood by all involved in the negotiations that the year 2017 represented the initial phase of reopening Cherry Valley with sufficient acreage to accommodate various uses. This included training for several types of dogs (from upland pointers/flushers to water retrievers) as well as protecting the habitat for breeding/nesting waterfowl and salmon. Volunteers spent many hours working at Cherry Valley to mow the canary grass and open-up ground that had been overtaken by this invasive species.</p> <p>Now we learn that 2017 is being considered a "pilot year" and that, once again, Cherry Valley will be closed to dog training. This was not our understanding of the process and is not acceptable. It disrespects the countless hours of time spent working with the Fish and Wildlife Department employees and private volunteers to develop a workable plan for Cherry Valley that includes dog training.</p> <p>We urge the Commission to use their oversight to direct Region 4 to leave the 2017 plan in place for the 2018 training season and to support continued planning with dog training enthusiasts. The 2017 plan for the continued use of Cherry Valley for dog training was developed jointly and worked well in 2017.</p> <p>As the human population grows and urban sprawl in the Puget Sound area continues to erode open space to support dog training and encourage growth and participation in the sporting dog arena, it is critical that Cherry Valley remain available to the public. It is possible to share the property with others who wish to enjoy open space, wildlife and wildlife viewing, and dog training while preserving the natural setting and promoting community interest and the preservation of wildlife.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of our concerns. On behalf of the Rainier Hunting Retriever Club -Doug Gallucci, President Rainier Hunting Retriever Club</p>	
94	<p>I am writing to express my concerns over the management of the Cherry Valley unit. The gates are perpetually closed and locked so that there is no access to Cherry Valley. I am a committed bird dog trainer and there is no longer any access to Cherry Valley for dog training. There is also no way to park on the road (203) and walk onto the property.</p>	Response #1

	<p>Boehm and Chandler have been actively hostile and have put up many barriers to prevent dog trainers from using the property. Even though a new policy was developed to allow dog trainers onto the property with greatly restricted access to the area that policy has not been followed and the gates remain locked. The Cherry Valley unit has for many years been traditionally available to bird dog trainers and also for holding bird dog events such as field trials and now none of those activities are available. Sincerely, -Suzanne Bolwell</p>	
95	<p>WDFW Region 4 - Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan The attached document was provided by Marty Sweet who gathered signatures from individuals at a hunt test from people that are concerned about the loss of training grounds for amateur dog trainers and hunters. This petition includes 26 signatures in support of reopening the dog training grounds in the SWA's. Cindy Olson at the request of Marty Sweet</p> <p><i>Text from the PDF file: The form included 26 signatures.</i> In regards to the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area and Cherry Valley, we the undersigned urge the State of Washington to reopen the original amount of acreage that was allotted for dog training in the mid 70's, with the same days and hours of access. We are all serious dog trainers who realize the best conservation tool is a well trained retriever. Collectively, the dog training community contributes millions of dollars each year to Washington State's economy by purchasing hunting licenses, Discover passes, clothing and all of the other necessities for hunting and dog training. The numerous out of state visitors who attend our hunt tests and field trials also contribute to the state's economy. -Marty Sweet</p>	Response #1
96	<p>WDFW Region 4 - Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan The attached document was provided by Chris Braswell who is not able to attend the meeting tonight. She speaks to the need for quality, well trained bird dogs for hunting. She also speaks to the need for available land in order to train these dogs -- her email says it best Cindy Olson for Chris Braswell</p> <p><i>Text from the PDF file attached to the email:</i> Cindy, I am not able to attend the meeting tomorrow night, and hope that you get this before then. If you need any further oral support tomorrow night, here is my input:</p> <p>As a breeder for field-bred bird dogs, and have been breeding since 1988, my biggest clientele are the avid hunters. These hunters are comprised throughout the continent, primarily all throughout the United States and the states that comprise the largest hunting areas i.e., the Dakotas, Montana, etc. These hunters have been buying pups from me for nearly 30 years because the dogs I produce can meet their demand of the hundreds of birds they hunt every year. Because of that, they are looking for the parents to be proven which means those of us breeders need to be training these dogs in order to earn those titles on these proven parents. Not every bird dog owner owns their own property to train their bird dogs on which means we have to look at other sites to train on i.e. Cherry</p>	Response #1

	<p>Valley, which is/was a vital piece of property for our purpose. It is crucial for the bird-dog breeders to be able to have access to properties to train these dogs on to ensure that the hunters who buy their pups are getting the dog which meets their needs and demands. These dogs are bred specifically for birds whether it be competitive or for sport hunting.</p> <p>Between you and me, don't these DFW people hunt themselves? Don't they want/have well-bred bird dogs and if they do, where and how do they find them? Don't they look for proven parents? Or just buy whatever is in the local classifieds? I'm a bit dismayed at their lack of knowledge here, especially when one of them mocked someone for just "throwing a bumper " for his dog. Bumpers are a crucial part of training, even if it is just "throwing" one. That person could have been giving his dog a reward bumper, a happy bumper, but that incident isn't one for someone to just stand by and pass judgment on something they know nothing about. I wish we had someone with more bird-dog knowledge in this situation with the WDFW and you would think that there would be.</p> <p>I'm sorry I cannot make the meeting and I will try to post my opinion on the website provided. Work has eaten up my time. Thanks, -Chris Braswell</p>	
97	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>Long-term management of wildlife areas is enhanced when input from the members of the hunting sport dog community is welcomed. This community of people are, many times, the first to become aware of changes in the ecosystem. Because of their familiarity with the environment and their sensitivity to change in the environment, they serve as the 'singing frogs' in the environmental pond, so to speak. They are good friends and neighbors to the Department of Fish & Wildlife.</p> <p>No one is more concerned with sustainable fishing, hunting and other wildlife-related, recreational or commercial experiences than those who regularly abide and partake in the activities that our federal lands provide to us.</p> <p>The hunting sport dog community network of friends, neighbors and out-of-towners are the people who regularly pump dollars into local economies and care about life quality issues in their local neighborhoods and the rest of the State of Washington which directly affect the community. Many times it is the mere presence of the sportsman in the field or a good citizen in the neighborhood, which may be the first deterrent to crime or other undesirable activities. It is the hunting sport dog community which has been supportive of WDFW and effective at achieving long-term success with the Department at community levels and beyond.</p> <p>It makes good sense in planning to allow for the participation of and invite the presence of the hunting sport dog community by keeping open the land available historically for dog training as well as planning for increasing land areas for dog training: A particular example is the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area, Cherry Valley Wildlife Area.</p> <p>The Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife has a steadfast partner in the hunting sport dog community, a network of friends and neighbors at the local, state and national levels, who have historically supported and continue to support WDFW.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, -Monica Mance</p>	Response #1

98	<p>As a small game & migratory bird permit license-holder, and a taxpayer of Washington State, I would like to be able to access any WDFW land for the purpose of sporting dog training. I need a place to train my hunting dog.</p> <p>I hunt on public land during the season. Why can't I be allowed to access the same land during the off-season for dog training purposes?</p> <p>I don't have large plots of land where I can run my dog & train it to become a better conservation tool. My backyard is less than 150 feet wide and only 80 feet deep. You can't train a dog to do a 400 yard retrieve in this space.</p> <p>And other public areas (e.g., schools, county open spaces, and city parks) will not allow me to have my dog off-leash, if they allow me to have my dog there at all.</p> <p>I need access to WDFW lands to train my dog. Please don't take this away. Please don't give me a reason to begrudge your department.</p> <p>A humble request from a loyal customer of your product & services. Sincerely, -Jon Pretty</p>	Response #1
99	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Under your 10 year management plan please allow access to dog training in Cherry Valley, Stillwater, Crescent Lake and Ebey Island. Sincerely, -Andrea D Hanses</p>	Response #1
100	<p>I incurred a head injury 10 months ago and am on a limited budget of \$40 per day to pay mortgage, groceries and all my household bills.</p> <p>Retriever dog training has been wonderful therapy allowing me to work on memory and processing speed. Unfortunately having to pay to play (dog train) easily costs 25% of my daily budget. It's a shame that the State would deny access to those with a limited budget the opportunity to use the land and water for dog training.</p> <p>I am confused why the Master Hunter training material states that a trained retriever is a resource tool and then fails to provide an area where we can train our dogs. Possibly those making the decision on access to training grounds are unaware that these dogs don't just train themselves. The pointing dogs do what comes naturally (point/ wait before they pounce on their prey) the trainer is tasked with enhancing those skills. A retriever trainer must teach the dog to do tasks it is not naturally inclined to do (take direction to a bird it has not seen). In short training a retriever to the level necessary to be a good resource management tool takes time and grounds including water.</p> <p>The ponds at Cherry Vally are a good example of how dog training has benefitted wildlife. Those ponds are man made for the purpose of training retrievers efficiently. The fact that wildlife benefits from those same ponds is an added bonus.</p> <p>I recently trained at Cherry Valley. One of the first things I did when getting out of my car was pick up trash. While my actions were to protect my dog those same actions protected wildlife from ingesting something potentially harmful. Ask any dog trainer and they'll tell you about picking up trash, broken bottles, fishing line, etc. While sometimes it's for purely selfish reasons (we don't want our dogs getting injured) wildlife still benefits from our actions. Over the years I have reported illegal trash dumping, poaching, squatting and pesticide use that was against the land use agreement the State had with the farmer. The State has an Eyes In The Woods Program but where are those eyes if you don't allow them access to the resource?</p>	Response #1

	<p>As a licensed hunter and dog trainer I request the State provide us with dog training access to Cherry Valley, Stillwater, Crescent Lake and Ebey Island in their 10 year management plan. What the State stands to gain far outweighs what the State has to loose. Sincerely, -Matthew J Nugent</p>	
101	<p>I am particularly interested in ensuring that there is adequate dog training property at Cherry Valley. I think dog training is very compatible with multiple uses of this unit and there is no reason to limit the dog training area to a very small (15-20 acres) portion of the property. I believe the WDFW staff when they say they are supportive of continuing to provide dog training areas at Cherry Valley, however, I am very concerned that they don't understand the needs of the retriever training community and don't understand the type of grounds needed for adequate retriever training. The designated area must be suitable for retriever training. We cannot train in wooded areas, nor can we use corn fields, which can cut dog's feet and legs. Fields with natural cover and water access are essential. Serious dog trainers do not allow their dogs to run around without supervision. We leave our dogs in our cars and trucks until it is our turn to run a training set up. The dogs are under the trainers control at all times. Each dog/handler team runs the training scenario and then the dogs are put back in their vehicles. This activity is not a free for all that would interfere with wildlife, hikers, or even bird watchers. In addition, access to a larger amount of acreage for dog training will ensure areas won't get overcrowded or damaged by heavy use. The Draft Management Plan uses extremely vague language and doesn't commit to any specifics, such as the number of acres that would be available for dog training or the location of those acres. The plan merely states that WDFW will "continue to manage designated bird dog training areas " and to "explore the potential to expand." I would like to see more of a commitment in this plan to accommodate dog training needs and provide assurance to the dog training community that the department is committed to working out a viable solution.</p> <p>I have never used the Crescent Lake Unit and just saw where it was located when I attended the public meeting. My understanding is that there is only a very small area designated for dog training. That doesn't make any sense. Further evaluation needs to be done to open up more adequate acreage for dog training at this location, in coordination with decisions being made at Cherry Valley.</p> <p>I would be willing to buy a yearly dog training license to use at any and all of the units covered in this plan . License fees could help support maintenance of these lands, much the same way that hunting licenses provide revenue.</p> <p>A number of people at the recent public meeting mentioned concerns about opening the gates and what might happen if that were to happen. There seemed to be a lot of support to set up a system where the gates would be locked and users could purchase keys. It seems that this suggestion is worth pursuing. I guarantee that every dog trainer would be willing to purchase a key if a reliable system could be installed.</p> <p>There are a number of dog training clubs throughout the region who can contact their members and organize volunteer help. I understand that funding is limited and the WDFW has budget constraints and competing priorities. Tapping into dog training clubs</p>	Response #1

	<p>and their volunteers is a great solution to help maintain the areas we need to train. In addition, when these properties are used by law abiding citizens, when there are people around and using the areas, it is more likely that the undesirable elements will not take over.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would like to be put on your mailing list and receive any information relating to the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Draft Management Plan. Thanks.</p> <p>-Nancy Harney</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest. Your name has been added to the mailing list.</p>
102	<p>I'm writing to voice my support for keeping dog training access a priority for sites within the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. Maintaining access to public dog training grounds is an important part of wildlife conservation for two primary reasons: effective game recovery and new hunter recruitment.</p> <p>Well-trained hunting dogs are an essential tool for conservation. Properly trained dogs can find and recover crippled game birds that may otherwise elude the hunter. The recovery of these crippled birds ensures that the species does not suffer the unnecessary loss of unrecoverable and often fatally injured birds. In order for hunters to responsibly use dogs in the field, we need opportunities to practice and train throughout the off-season.</p> <p>Additionally, dog training events can be effective outreach for potential future hunters. Many new hunters come to the sport (and stay in the sport) through an interest in working dogs. In my personal experience with the NAVHDA and JGHV organizations, I know several people who started hunting simply because they owned a gun dog. In an era of alarming decline in the hunting population (and subsequently an alarming decline in hunter-funded conservation efforts), we should be looking at any and all opportunities for new hunter recruitment. Convenient access to dog training events and facilities is essential for attracting and retaining new bird hunters via the dog community.</p> <p>The Snoqualmie Wildlife Area is unique in that it serves an urban and suburban population that does not otherwise have good access to open public spaces. It's time for outdoor enthusiasts, conservationists, hunters, and dog handlers to join the same side of the fight for wildlife conservation, which starts with fair access to public lands. Thank you for the consideration of public comment. I look forward to the inclusion of the hunting dog community in the ongoing plans for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. Kind regards,</p> <p>Jennifer Wapenski</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
103	<p>I love that our state and country has so much public that for us to use and that a lot of this land supports multiple use recreation. Please keep this in mind when you decide how to manage this wildlife area and all others lands you manage.</p> <p>I believe that this wildlife area and others should have an area where dog training is allowed. As our population grows in the northwest it is harder to find good areas to train. Please support hunting dog owners with keeping training grounds open just as we passionately support wildlife and wildlife management. Thanks,</p> <p>-Owen Bacon</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
104	<p>I am writing in concern of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan for 2018.</p>	<p>Response #1</p>


	<p>I wanted to express my wish that access be maintained for dogs and dog training in the existing areas, and expanded where possible - pertinent particularly to Goal #3, Draft Objectives M and N. I support these objectives.</p> <p>In the Seattle area there are significantly more people opting to own pets, particularly dogs, over having children. This quickly growing population of dog owners want and need places where they can take their canine family members.</p> <p>In addition, a growing number of young people are entering the hunting world alongside/because of their dogs (which is the case for me), and the contributions hunters make through license and gun purchases toward conservation cannot be overlooked. If these up and coming outdoorsmen and women have nowhere to work with and train their hunting companions, then they could lose their passion for this new hobby. Access is already a struggle, let alone being unable to work with your hunting dog. Thank you for your time, -Adrienne Barber</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of Goals 3.M and 3.N.</p>
105	<p>I have used all of the wildlife areas between Monroe and Carnation all of my life. I would enjoy nothing more than to continue to use these areas with my kids who are now of age to hunt and train with me. The use of these wildlife areas is extremely important to my life and the surrounding communities. -Ryan Dill</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
106	<p>I attended the 4/24/2018 public meeting to discuss the draft management plan for Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. To be honest, I'm a land owner in the nearby Cherry Valley area and was hoping to learn more about WDFW's management plan for the large predators that live in the area: wolves and bear.</p> <p>My comments specific to the Snoqualmie Wildlife areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I support the public's use of these lands for bird hunting and dog training, and I encourage the WDFW to open as much land for these uses as possible. I understand the lands were given or purchased specifically for this use, and it is important that the land not be diverted to other uses such as farming. 2) Many citizens expressed concern that these wildlife areas have been gated off/closed for most of the last two years. I am not a favor of public land management via gates and locks. Gates and locks stop recreation, not management it. Further, when you deny the public access to their land(s), law abiding citizens will obey leaving the land wide open for meth labs and homeless camps. We need the public to be in and using these lands – eyes in the woods – in order to report violators to the authorities. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One member attending last night's meeting suggested WDFW selling gate keys to dog trainers and bird hunters so they could have access while keeping the meth labs and homeless out, and this would be a good option. Respectfully submitted, -Linda Driscoll 	<p>Response #1</p>
107	<p>How dare you renege on the original commitment to dog owners and trainers. Access and open area has been restricted to the point where the original promise made to this community is merely a suggestion in your eyes.</p> <p>Both Cherry Valley and Stillwater were given to the state with the express purpose of serving dog owners and their dogs. Your blatant land grab is shameful and dishonest. You can restore faith in the agency and state government: Live up to the original commitment and restore off-leash and dog training/exercise as the primary purpose of these areas, increase the area where training is allowed. Open Cherry Valley completely to honor its original intent. Sincerely,</p>	<p>Response #1</p>

	-Scott Linden	
108	<p>In the two years that followed the public scoping meeting in April 2016, the ten year planning process resulting in the current draft does not appear to have taken into consideration any of the comments from this meeting as it relates to dog training. Please consider these comments from 2016 in the final plan.</p> <p><i>The attachments to this comment which contain notes from the April 26 public meeting are in the Appendix</i></p> <p>-Cindy Olson, WSDTA</p>	Response #1
109	<p>Here are some of my suggestions. I primarily use the Ebey Island area for pheasant hunting, and I am always seeking areas to dog train.</p> <p>It would be great if dog training were allowed on the unfarmed portions of Ebey. I think the west side is not used, except for hunting. It is overgrown with thistles which makes hunting (especially with pointing dogs) difficult to impossible. If it were open to dog training, there would be more traffic on it which would make it easier to hunt. I believe the dog training community would also volunteer to help maintain the growth, by mowing, planting,,, or whatever is needed to improve the land not just for dog training but for habitat and others to be able to have clear access and enjoy.</p> <p>I would also like to see other areas in the unit opened to dog training, and dog events (hunt tests, field trials,...). There is simply too little access for dog training. The current direction for SVWA combined with the recent closures in Skagit, have pretty much shut down dog training and reduced pheasant hunting in WA North of Seattle. Fort Lewis used to be a great alternative but access and the ability to plan events there has gotten stricter over the years, making it virtually impossible. So, the only viable alternative in western Washington is scatter creek.</p> <p>Considering the overall picture, I hope that you can open up hundreds or thousands of acres of property to dog training. Other interests interest groups, like bird watchers, duck hunters,... have alternative lands/areas to go in the region, but dog trainers/pheasant hunters do not. The wildlife areas are our only venue, so please consider this in your plan, and take action to allow more dog training. In return, you'll have a volunteer network that will close the budget gap on the labor needed for maintenance. regards,</p> <p>-Jack Richbourg</p>	Response #1
110	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I attended the meeting at Mill Creek on April 24th. I appreciate that Staff altered your agenda to take comments from the public. There are a couple misconceptions about dog trainers that your staff seems to use as fact. One misconception that is to class "dog trainers" as rich folks making money and using dog trucks with more than 5 dogs. If anyone in your office knew the "dog training community" you would realize 95% of us make 0\$ on this hobby. The other 5% can barely make ends meet and use other private grounds for training opportunities. These other grounds cost \$ to use and most beginning dog trainers can not afford or find these properties.</p> <p>Perhaps a dog training permit to use public lands should be proposed. Then WDFW could use the money to address the concerns WDFW Region 4 office seems to have to "dog training" on public lands. Other regions seem too have a very good relationship with the dog training community and use volunteers from our many dog clubs for</p>	Response #1

	<p>WDFW projects. There were volunteers out at Cherry valley last year and invasive species were controlled so every user of Cherry valley could benefit.</p> <p>One other misconception I have heard with my own ears is the statement “our land our rules” told to us at a meeting by a biologist from your mill creek office. Her biology concerns trumped anything ever being done to land for “recreational” purpose including access to properties.</p> <p>WDFW seems to have a negative attitude to dogs disturbing wildlife. Personally I think that is a tiny footprint that is blown out of proportion by “biologists”. The dog training community only wants to train on a fraction of the acreage on each unit but 10 acres is a tiny are not useful for us to use to train our dogs for hunting. We need more acreage at every unit to train properly.</p> <p>Sorry I am going over some of the points made at the meeting on the 24th.</p> <p>The dog clubs in the dog training community are willing to volunteer to help with WDFW projects. If you use them and not block access or limit the properties to 10 acres there will be much less pressure on the region 4 office. Thank you,</p> <p>-Boyd Ulsh</p>	
111	<p>How many acres will be available for dog training at Cherry Valley. At the meeting I heard 65. If I read the report under goals it looks like 35.</p> <p>As this property was originally given to the state as training grounds, it should be available to everyone in its entirety. Planting pen raised pheasants and allowing hunters to tromp through the area can’t be any more disruptive to the ecosystem than dog training. Open the gates</p> <p>-Carl Vinke Manager, Fabrication Division</p>	Response #1
112	<p>Please consider this email regarding dog training and a meeting to discuss the closure of the SWA's to dog training a part of my public comments.</p> <p>Cindy Olson WSDTA Fenner</p> <p>Please block out May 16th from 2:00 to 4:00 PM for our meeting. I would like to suggest we meet at the Duvall public library which is near half way between Auburn and Mill Creek, I can see about reserving a room.</p> <p>The primary discussion will be the problems caused by the dog trainers that necessitated the closure of all but a fraction of the land available prior to the closure. In order to pitch our case for reopening the land we need to understand why it was closed in the first place. I have attached an additional PDF file with all of the emails that appear to support our contention that this was a direct result of Kim Chandlers dislike of dog trainers, using his interpretation of what his authority allowed him to do and Brian's following Kim's lead to close the lands. You can see by the emails attached that they would have liked to close the entire SWA to all dogs but they ran into a few road blocks. These road blocks allowed hunting dogs during hunting season, dog training in "designated areas" (hence the 10 to 15 acre plots) per the hunting regs and a sane person that did not think closing the SWA's to all dogs was right so they settled on dogs on leash only.</p> <p>You have a copy of my email to Martha asking her to shed light on this issue. At the meeting last night she asked if we can't let go of the past and just move forward from here. I told her no. To move forward we NEED to know why we were shut down - the reasons, the issues, the concerns in order to address them to everyone's satisfaction.</p>	Response #1

	<p>Where was the transparency in 2013 when this was happening? Where is the documentation to support these reasons? If the reasons were not valid (valid to be determined) we want the historical land reopened immediately and we can then work on the dog training program for future years.</p> <p>The purpose of this meeting will not be expanding the dog training acreage for 2018 or the dog training and volunteer plans. To your point about transparency, please invite Martha or any of the WAAC members if you feel it is appropriate. Martha was perhaps the only other CAG member that was on the board in 2013 that can shed light on why the dog trainers were shut out.</p> <p>We are looking forward to this meeting and getting some answers to this very critical matter. Thanks -Cindy</p> <p><i>See Appendix for attachments</i> 1. April 12, 2018 notes from dog training association 2. Collection of notes and emails</p>	
113	<p>Please keep Cherry Valley open for what it was intended. My 14 YO son trains our dog and is working towards more AKC hunt test certs. He will be utilizing this land for many years to come! Thank you for your consideration. -Leah Pernat</p>	Response #1
114	<p>Good Morning, I breed and compete in field trials and hunt tests with German Shorthaired Pointers, I hunt big game and birds, I am a WDFW Hunter education instructor and Master Hunter. I am begging you to please allow year round dog training at Cherry Valley and also Stillwater. These areas are in a flood plain, there isn't much else to do there. We need to use this property as it was originally intended for dog events and training.</p> <p>I love going there and working with my dogs. The percentage of public lands for the public to use OTHER THAN FOR DOG TRAINING is tens of thousands of acres more compared to what we are asking for. So let us please have this spot to call our dog training area year round, it really isn't much. Have a great day! Sincerely, -AnnaMaria Marchionne</p>	Response #1
115	<p>Please keep as much desirable area open to dog training in the off-seasons of hunting as possible. Regards, -Spencer H. B. Kunath</p>	Response #1
116	<p>I would like to see the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area open to dog training and hunt tests like it was originally set up. Brian mentioned improvements to Ebey Island. Access to the middle area, possible bridge, mowing more of the east side of unit i think are positive ideas. Can we also look into dog training at some point at Ebey. Thank You -Dirk Sobota</p>	Response #1
117	<p>I would like to see a more dog training friendly environment, and from other recreation groups that I am in, there is a culture (or perception of such) resistance to recreation that land management deems "unfavorable", like dog training for hunting, hunting, dog</p>	Response #1

	<p>trials and even horse/stock use. I would like to see that change, and that can be done with a directional change encompassed in the 10 year plan.</p> <p>Year round training, maintaining dog training on grounds that were purchased for that purpose, and even expanding these areas should be considered in the plan.</p> <p>Also, as these groups are loosely connected, an extension of the comment period is helpful to hear everyone's views -Kita Morris</p>	<p>The comment period was extended 30 additional days for a total of 60 days.</p>
118	<p>As a bird dog enthusiast, I urge you to keep open and increase the amount of wildlife area for dog training, testing and competition.</p> <p>With over two decades of experience hosting, assisting, and competing in these events I have found that the bird dog community is the most careful, respectful, conscientious and conservation-minded group you could ever ask to have on land. For long years in our training and competition activities, we have honed the discipline of "leave it better than you found it". There is ample opportunity for this; at every event I have myself, and observed others to, pick up trash, fill holes, and correct other infractions by prior users of a site when we arrive to set up for an event.</p> <p>To alienate/ostracize/shut out the bird dog community is a tragic mistake that I hope will not be made. The bird dog community is the strongest ally you could have in keeping the land clean and safe for all inhabitants and users. Best regards, -Julia Pond</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
119	<p>I am reaching out requesting that our state leaves access to Cherry Valley to off leash dog training, which is what it was originally given to our state for. Thank you, -William Josie</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
120	<p>I am writing in regards to Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management, especially as it pertains to dog training. The Cherry Creek and Stillwater areas where originally set up for dog training as well as field trials and hunt tests. I think it is a gross overreach by your department to change this use or restrict it in any way. I hope common sense will prevail in this matter and the original intended uses of these areas will be honored. Thanks you -Jess Spradley</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
121	<p>I am concerned that there are not enough acres of public land, open to dog training year round. I have been an avid hunter for most of my life. I buy hunting and fishing licenses every year, and also spend money on hunt and fishing trips, which goes to help the Washington economy. I hope that you will allow continued access to places like Still water and Cherry Valley areas, and even add to the available acres, in the coming years. I also live in the area, in Carnation. -Jason Astuto</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
122	<p>Hi, I'm a retriever trainer who has been training at Cherry Valley for decades, when it has been available to dog trainers. The areas most valuable to us are the two big ponds north of the gravel road at the second (north) entrance. In recent years when the gate for that entrance has been closed, the property has been useless to retriever trainers. The "designated area" for dog training was far too small, dangerously close to a 60mph highway, and had no water, which we need both for training duck dogs and for safety</p>	<p>Response #1</p>

	<p>(cooling dogs off when they get hot). Signs were also posted saying we couldn't have our dogs off leash, which was preposterous--how can a dog retrieve game or training bumpers while on leash?</p> <p>This property was purchased specifically for hunting-related recreation, and I don't know why it would be closed to that purpose.</p> <p>While it was closed to dog trainers, this once-beautiful property, natural and full of wildlife, was torn up and turned into a corn monoculture. After the corn is harvested, what's left is bare earth and corn stubble. I don't understand how this serves any public purpose. Growing corn produces income (for the state? for an individual?). But this land is supposed to be for public recreation! I'm enclosing two photos of what it looks like right now (I took these photos today). There is no public benefit, nor any conservation benefit, to land destroyed like this. Can you imagine if your beloved local park and sports fields were turned into corn stubble, for some entity's financial benefit, and nobody could play baseball, football, or soccer anymore? You and your neighbors would be up in arms! Let Cherry Valley grow wild again, for the wildlife and for the public to enjoy. We need the land areas for training, as well as the water areas.</p> <p>The property does need maintenance in the form of mowing, because the grass, left to its own devices, gets incredibly high (over my head!). The dog community is organized and willing to perform this mowing.</p>  <p>-Amy Raby</p>	
123	<p>This comment is directed toward your department's management of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area, and more specifically Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake and Stillwater. In the past Cherry Valley and Stillwater were heavily used by dog trainers. I believe all, or the most part of these properties were given to the state specifically for the continuation of the traditional use of dog training, field trials and hunt tests. Over the years we have seen a significant reduction in land open for dog training within Region 4 and this trend needs to stop. I strongly urge you to develop plans toward returning acreage lost to the hunting dog community back to its originally intended purpose. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>-Lawrence Moores</p>	Response #1
124	<p>PS: Again the smaller dog training designated area's are fine for shoot and retrieve / live fire training birds. 90% of pointing dog trainers are fine with no live fire i.e. blank pistol's. Homing pigeons or tethered release birds to limit flight distance are utilized; dog finds and points the bird / birds planted, the handler flushes the bird "if the dog holds" a blank is fired and the dog is lead away and released to find another. Nobody gets hurt and its good fun / training and fairly benign to other folks who may be around utilizing the wildlife area. We could help draft no life fire training area language that makes sense for trainers, WDFW - The public advisory committee and finally legal review upon request.</p> <p>Thanks again for taking the time to read and consider pubic comments!</p>	

	<p>From: Tony and Kris Thompson Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 8:05 PM To: SEPADesk2@dfw.wa.gov Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 18016 HI Folks, The current bird dog training area at Stillwater appears non-existent, it's the best and safest option even split in half. We realize there are pet elk and etcetera their. Cherry Valley is entirely to close to a major highway and to small for most any pointing breed to really be useful. Crescent lake, the postage stamp clear grass designated bird dog training area is ok for shoot and retrieve only. The reference to local off leash dog parks is necessary for the general public but, ridiculous as a pointing dog trainer. We don't want to take our prized bird dogs to run free with the average untrained mix breed or aggressive dog anymore than you folks want the same dogs running on Stillwater chasing elk and other wildlife! We can only dream of a Sauvies Island or a Scatter Creek in the north end, please try to look kindly on the folks who really could and would appreciate one real bird dog training area. I can speak for the all three Washington Brittany Clubs when I say, we are willing and able to help the WDFW with any effort to improve the dog training areas. Thanks for the effort on the public land management and the draft management plan. Sincerely, -Tony Thompson</p>	
125	<p><u>First, my summary:</u> It is requested that the originally designated public lands that were set aside for dog training be re-opened for public access and specifically for dog training as originally intended.</p> <p><u>Relevant discussion:</u> A public meeting was held at the North Puget Sound-Region 4 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife earlier this week to discuss the plan for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area, which includes Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake and Stillwater. At the meeting it was shared, that both Cherry Valley and Stillwater were originally given over to the state specifically for dog training, field trials and hunt test. In the past these sites were used heavily by dog trainers as was the original intended use for this land. Now the use is significantly less due to restricted access by the WADFW. It was shared that within the last 10 years the amount of land open for dog training has decreased from 2,080 acres to now just 10 acres, and seasonally 65 acres. The meager amount of land currently available for its originally intended use amounts to less than 2% annually. This is greatly concerning to people like me. Public lands should be open to the public for use. The Cherry Valley Unit should be a place where we are free to bring our families and our dogs and enjoy the outdoors. I personally spend a considerable amount of my "free time" engaged in training dogs and handlers both for obedience on and off lead, and for useful field work, including searching for and tracking specific scents, while responding to directive handler commands. I encourage the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to restore a significant portion of the large amount of land originally available to the public, specifically for dog training. Cherry Valley should be fully open to dog training and dog events as it was originally intended. Since the originally designated public lands have decreased so substantially, there should now at least be designated sites solely for the purpose of</p>	Response #1

	<p>public use for dog training, including on and off leash dog training and dog and handler skill tests. These skill tests are required and attended by several National and International Hunting Dog Organizations. These tests include dog breed conformance and skill demonstration to standards & requirements and are often attended by judges and other trainers from outside our beautiful area.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u> It is requested that the originally designated public lands that were set aside for dog training be re-opened for public access and specifically for dog training as originally intended. Thank you for your consideration, -Jim Halwachs , Member, PNW NAVHDA</p>	
126	<p>The Cherry Valley and Stillwater properties were specifically gifted to the State for public space to train bird dogs and over the last 22 years I have used the property to train 5 of my own dogs as well as helped at least a dozen other people with their dogs. The reduction in access (unmaintained/overgrown habitat, dog training restriction, and randomly closed gates with no notice) are not in keeping with the terms of the gift. When a land donor gives property to the State in good faith for a specific purpose and the State accepts such a gift, they should be required to abide by the terms of the gift unless extraordinary circumstances exist.</p> <p>Unfortunately I have seen several properties, gifted to the State, that are no longer available for their gifted purpose. This trend of the State accepting the gift, saying they will abide by the intent of the gift in order to get the property and then reneging on the terms is extremely disheartening and ethically concerning. Please stop this trend and live up to the agreements. No land owner will gift the State property if is obvious that the State will eventually stop abiding by the terms and intended purpose(s) of that gift. Thanks you for your consideration, -Ken Reid</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>WDFW takes land management and legal property obligations very seriously and abides by all legal agreements.</p> <p>No acreage on the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area was gifted or purchased specifically for dog training.</p>
127	<p>In the recent past WDFW has decreased the amount of land available for hunting dog training, field trials, field tests and so forth. The Cherry Valley area which, I believe, was originally intended to provide a venue for sportsmen to conduct this training has been virtually made off limits. There are a number of us who look to your leadership to continue to provide land and opportunities for us to train, test and otherwise exercise our hunting dogs. I encourage you to make the Cherry Valley area open to all such use and training and to not continue to further limit opportunities for those of us who choose to use trained and tested dogs and are also a primary source of conservation funds through the purchase of hunting and fishing licenses. Thank you, -Philip F. Swain</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
128	<p>As a dog trainer, it concerns me that both Cherry Valley and Stillwater were originally given over to the state specifically for dog training, field trials and hunt test. In the past these sites were used heavily by dog trainers. Now the use is significantly less due to restricted access by the WDFW. It was shared that within the last 10 years the amount of land open for dog training has decreased from 2,080 acres to now 10 acres, and seasonally 65 acres. This is of great concern to people like me. Public lands should be open to the public for use. The Cherry Valley & Stillwater units should be a place where we are free to bring our families and our dogs and enjoy the outdoors. Please listen to us and do the right thing. Thank you for your time -Keely Ghirardelli</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
129	<p>I'm very concerned by the arbitrary closure of the dog training area at Cherry Valley. This area was historically an area that was utilized and enjoyed by dog owners who</p>	<p>Response #1</p>

	<p>enjoy the sport of hunt training. This is a hobby for many of us. We may just compete in the sport or we may hunt with our dogs, either way it is one of the ways we choose to enjoy outdoor recreation. Most of us are outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy and respect the land. Washington State has considered the needs of people who ride horse and recreate by the use of ATV's, both which are much more impactful on the land than dog training. The multiple references by WDFW representatives to the land as "Ours" is appalling! Please remember that dog trainers are tax payers and we have a right to proper representation in the planning of State land use. Not only should this committee be restoring the Cherry Valley training area to its original configuration, the State should look at supporting and opening additional areas for dog trainers.</p> <p>-Davie Kindell , President, Newaukum River Retriever Club</p>	
130	<p>Is this communistChina? Who is this Wilkerson lady. Since when is this her land? Is this land no longer public land? I've hunted and trained dogs on public land most of my life. Like many other true sportsmen I've never left public land without picking up other people's garbage. I'm so disappointed in the selfish idiots that are running our supposed public land it's hard to contain my real feelings. These people making these selfish decisions need to be removed and maybe go to China where they will be appreciated. True Washingtonians and Americans will not put up with this. Thank you for giving me my American opportunity to give my thoughts.</p> <p>-Jon Beernink</p>	<p>Cynthia Wilkerson is the Lands Division Manager, Wildlife Program, WDFW. She is responsible for the acquisition and management of DFW's land and water access sites around the state.</p> <p>Response #1</p>
131	<p>I have used this area for dog training for years. The acreage has been significantly reduced over the years. The original acreage needs to be restored.</p> <p>-Burt and Marty Sweet</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
132	<p>I've enjoyed the use of Snoqualmie Valley wildlife management areas (Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake and Stillwater) for a number of years for pheasant hunting in the fall. I've also been an active dog trainer on the Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake sites when accessible (not flooded or mowed). In both the Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake sites, the allotted off leash training areas are quite small for pointing dogs. I'd like to see these training areas available for use year round and the area expanded as there are few other sites on the Eastside that can accommodate dog training with shotguns. I recognize that there are other non hunting / dog training users desiring access, but there appears to be sufficient public land to accommodate numerous users. Finally, my fellow dog trainers and I have been good stewards of the area and leave the area cleaned up after use.</p> <p>I understand there has been some concern that dog trainers don't buy hunting licenses. I can attest to the fact that at least six dog trainers I've trained with on those sites purchase hunting licenses and pheasant tags as well as Discover Passes and are thus providing some financial support for the maintenance of these sites. This contrasts with other users like bird watchers, dog walkers, hikers, that don't buy hunting licenses. It should also be noted that the vast majority of attendees at your April 24 meeting were dog trainers and/or hunters. I hope you'll consider that large number of dog trainer / hunter users in deciding on the allocation and use of these wildlife management areas in your management plan.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,</p> <p>-Ron Behrens</p>	<p>Response #1</p>
133	<p>We appeal to you to help stop the disappearing dog training properties. The Snoqualmie Valley was once a go to place for both upland game dogs and retrievers.</p>	<p>Response #1</p>

	<p>Various dog clubs had many fun events there for both young and old . As a kid a local club "The Washington Retriever club" held "picnic trials" throughout each year that offered family fun with their dogs, firearm safety and provided work parties to improve the grounds. My family participated at many events. Few of these areas are now available. Please do not continue this trend. Sincerely, -Jackie & Jim Gonia</p>	
134	<p>My name is Christina Evans. My husband Taylor and I are new to field dog training. We travel from Whidbey Island to Monroe, Rainier, sometimes even Eastern Washington in order to attend training for our one year old Labrador Retriever. Unfortunately, finding land to train on is becoming increasingly difficult. I can say as far as my husband and myself we are willing to volunteer to clean up the training grounds, and keep eyes out for potential illicit people. We value the knowledge we are able to learn by attending these trainings and our Labrador loves the work as well! As I'm sure you know, dogs love to work! They especially love to work towards something they were bred to do. I hope you take the information from the dog community to heart. We are a growing sport with dwindling land to practice on. We would love for the opportunity to prove ourselves and help maintain the land, and use it for practice. Thank you. Respectfully, -Taylor & Christina Evans</p>	Response #1
135	<p>I attended the June 24th WDFW meeting in which the Sporting dog community requested that specific issues be addressed pertaining to the proposed 10 year plan for Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake and the overall reduction of available acreage everywhere as well as consideration of the needs of dog enthusiast pertaining our loss of rights and use. I appreciated the fact that WDFW representatives were willing to adjust their meeting criteria to hear our voices. It was not however apparent that much had been accomplished. The meeting itself should have provided the WDFW planning and advisory committees numerous public comment without also requiring those individuals submit the same comments again in writing if they want to be considered. Still in an attempt to comply here are a few points of importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept and solicit the Sporting dog community to volunteer to improve grounds for events and training. 2. Utilize this group to be your "Eyes on the ground" through expanded use to help reduce illicit activities. 3. Recognize and acknowledge that these lands were an endowment for dog training activities by restoring and opening them up for their original purpose and intent YEAR ROUND. 4. Do not shut us out! Consider opening the gates and increase revenue through selling keys for dog events and training to interested individuals. 5. Allow additional time to submit comments on the proposed plan. 6. Notify in advance through email or some other means individual hunting license holders thereby reaching out directly to interested and impacted parties of important proposals, changes, meetings and comment limitations. <p>-Nancy Noble</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>The comment period was extended an additional 30 days for a total of 60 days. The WDFW system currently is not an effective way to mail directly to hunters. WDFW used news releases, public meetings, the SEPA process, the advisory committee members, and a stakeholder list as primary methods of communicating</p>

		to all parties interested in the wildlife area.
136	<p>First and foremost we need the public comment period extended because many concerned citizens did not have any idea that today was the last day.</p> <p>Second, the dog training community stands ready to volunteer for up keep, repairs, mowing, etc. Please allow us to help maintain the areas and keep illicit activities under control.</p> <p>Third , these areas are the only training areas in the Seattle area. People with hunting dogs need a place train and Stillwater , Crescent Lake and Cherry Valley are where I have trained for the last 25 years and I drive an hour each way to get there.</p> <p>Finally, we need access to the pond area at Cherry Valley (the gate has been closed most of the time for the last few years) and the ability to train more of the year. Thank you for the chance to comment. Sincerely, -Michael S. Smith</p>	Response #1
137	<p>I recently attended the public meeting in Mill Creek and have decided to add a few comments to the ones I have already submitted in writing. I appreciated your flexibility in changing the format of the meeting to better meet the needs of those in attendance. My interest is in keeping the areas of Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake available for dog training. I have been a user of these properties since 1994 and have been dismayed by the closures of the properties for the past few years.</p> <p>While I understood the need for closures due to salmon habitat restoration, that was to be time limited...something that has not been the case.</p> <p>For the past 2 years, several dedicated volunteers have worked with WDFW employees to find an equitable middle ground that meets the needs of wildlife and people. I thought that a plan had been developed but the continued animosity between some staff and citizens regarding using Cherry Valley (specifically) for dog training has been discouraging. Some of the emails that have come to light reveal a bias against dogs and dog training in Cherry Valley.</p> <p>I know specifically that volunteers spent many hours last year to help prepare a portion of Cherry Valley for dog training (mowing the invasive canary grass) and that there were plans to return the ponds to their previous condition by removing invasive plants along the edge - opening up salmon habitat in the process.</p> <p>I am pleased that the department has decided to continue to allow the use of Cherry Valley by the hunting sport dog community for the next year - continuing the pilot project for 1 more year - but I am deeply concerned that the 10 year plan will not include the use of these areas for dog training. I urge the commissioners to work more closely with the citizen advisory committee to understand what the needs of the hunting sport dog community are, what plans had already been developed in conjunction with WDFW staff, and how the 1, 3 and 5 year proposals (by the dog community) were beneficial to both wildlife and the public. You will find that representatives of the dog community had worked closely with the farmer who farms Cherry Valley to problem solve and meet both his needs and dog trainer needs, that volunteers were trained last year on equipment use and were ready to work again this year, that additional land had been proposed for dog training and that closures for nesting and hunting had been agreed on.</p>	Response #1

	<p>One thing that was mentioned at the meeting on the 24th was a concern about drugs and crime occurring on the properties if the gates were unlocked. I would like to propose that the dog training community can provide some additional security in Cherry Valley just by our mere presence. Illicit activity is less likely to occur when there are honest, law-abiding folks on the property. Additionally, it benefits the WDFW to build partnerships with the community - the goodwill it engenders is paramount to the positive perspective of "government".</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the time to read and reflect on my comments,</p> <p>-Jean Fowler</p>	
138	<p>Keep our land open, and open to all. The above two areas were for the purpose of conservation, hunting, fuel trials / hunt test, and dog training. There is over 2000 care that were set aside and we either have no use of them or 10 to 65 acres for a training area. This is not enough and is going against their intended purpose. These areas must remain open for their original use and the purpose. Our taxes and fees not your land or your rules and we get to pay.</p> <p>You know the public outcry and this will be just the start if this situation is not solved.</p> <p>-Larry Schwerdt</p>	Response #1
139	<p>Wanted to drop a note that we are only in favor of keeping Cherry Valley open to Dog Training. Personally I've never used the place. If you close it, you're going to push all of those people training there on to another site. Making conflicts that you are going to have to deal with yourself.</p> <p>Typically, someone in your department, doesn't want to manage the area, so it is way easier to just close it. Not the right thing to do.</p> <p>-Dan Hoke</p>	Response #1
140	<p>I am writing in support of state land use for dog training, especially in the Cherry Valley site.</p> <p>I have lived in Woodinville for the past 28 years and purchase a state and federal hunting license, Discover Pass and Western Washington Pheasant permit pretty much every year. While I don't hunt pheasants in Western WA, I believe that my fees are going to a good cause.</p> <p>In the 1980s and 1990s the Cherry Valley site was frequently used by small groups of dog trainers, generally amateurs. The combination of open grasslands, ponds and variable cover were a unique environment with lots of options and space for groups to not be on top of each other. I mainly trained by myself or in a small group using bumpers, but have also had the experience there of official AKC events [both hunting retriever tests and field trials] that were possible due to the grounds themselves and the access. In addition, AKC Tracking events [sort of a search and rescue type event] were held there through the 1990s. In addition to the dog training, these were also lands that one could just walk around on and enjoy the wildlife [including early on some of the errant cows from the dairy].</p> <p>Not sure what happened but the maintenance [mainly mowing] stopped and the grounds became unusable for most purposes. It seems like over the last decade the fields have been leased for corn planting. I believe from seeing the fields that the corn is RoundUp GMO seed, as the fields are pretty bare of weeds between the cornrows. The ponds became unusable due to corn cultivation and due to the locking and closure of</p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>Your contact information has been updated.</p>

	<p>the main gate, which in the 1990s seemed to be open from at least March to pheasant season.</p> <p>If the purpose of these grounds is to provide access for residents for multiple uses, the current mono-culture of corn agricultural slant seems a bit restrictive, and if the grounds are being sprayed with herbicides that also seems a bit contrary to the habitat concept. There are very few lands left in King County [or Snohomish either] that allow dog training. Dog parks are not a substitute to the acres needed for either tracking or field training. There is a belief that the initial deeding/purchase of the land included dog training as a desired use, but that appears to have been deleted from the current plans.</p> <p>I spent one day last Spring with a group of volunteers mowing and weed-whacking trying to make these grounds useful for dog training. By the time we were there however, corn had been planted in such a way as to make the grounds useless. Didn't seem worthwhile spending more time especially given the communication from the regional authority about future uses.</p> <p>I could not make the meeting last night, but hope that the attendees were able to get some opportunity to dialog about future plans. It will be a shame if these lands are lost for multiple citizen uses and devolve instead into off-limits agricultural land. [please use this email address in the future] -Fred Drennan</p>	
141	<p>We were unable to attend the meeting on the 24th but want to weigh in on this issue. Our dogs are family pets but they are also our hunting PARTNERS! A well trained dog enables us to collect all downed birds. A well trained dog is an excellent conservation tool. We also contribute significantly to Washington's economy with purchases of hunting licenses, Discover passes and all hunting and training necessities. We need areas to train our dogs. We have wonderful relationships with the managers of other wildlife areas in Washington state, so we don't understand the animosity towards us in the SWA and Cherry Valley.</p> <p>When we realized Brian Boehm and other state employees had no knowledge of what our training entails, we offered to set up an entire training scenario for them to view at their convenience. Unfortunately, our offer was ignored. We find it appalling that State employees are creating policies for issues they know nothing about! We are concerned that Brian has lost his objectivity and turned this into a personal issue.</p> <p>We urge the State to expand the dog training acreage and hours and days of accessibility to what they were in the mid 70's.</p> <p>We are willing to donate time and equipment to help maintain these areas as we have done in the past.</p> <p>Remember, the best way to prevent crime and vandalism in an area is to allow good access to responsible, law abiding citizens. -Burt and Martea Sweet</p>	Response #1
142	<p>Comment on SEPA No. 18016 - Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas <i>The text from email from April 25, 2018 contains information about dog training and clubs and is provided in the Appendix</i> - Sam Pace</p>	Response #1
143	Greetings:	Response #1

SEPA RESPONSE: Public Comments and WDFW responses to public comments received during the public review of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan draft under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) from March 30, 2018 through May 25, 2018 (5:00 pm)

	<p>Attached are additional comments I'm submitting for the record in connection with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife SEPA #18016 for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan.</p> <p>These comments are submitted on behalf of me personally, and not on behalf of any other organization, or any other person. Sincerely,</p> <p>- Sam Pace</p> <p><i>Text from PDF contains dog training and clubs and the budget is provide in Appendix</i></p>	<p>Comments about budget are outside the scope of the plan.</p>
144	<p>Major - But Avoidable - Opposition to WDFW 2019-2021 Budget Is Forming</p> <p>- Sam Pace</p> <p><i>Text from PDF contains dog training and clubs and the budget is provide in Appendix</i></p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>Comments about budget are outside the scope of the plan.</p>
145	<p>RE: SEPA # 18016 - Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan</p> <p>- Sam Pace</p> <p><i>Text from email provided in the Appendix</i></p>	<p>Correction of typo noted.</p>
146	<p>RE: Major - But Avoidable - Opposition to WDFW 2019-2021 Budget Is Forming</p> <p>- Sam Pace</p> <p><i>Text from email provided in the Appendix</i></p>	<p>Response #1</p> <p>Comments about budget are outside the scope of the plan.</p>

APPENDIX TO SNOQUALMIE WILDLIFE AREA PLAN SEPA COMMENTS

Comment 108 - from Cindi Olson:

Comments Recorded at the Meeting

Overall:

- Keep access open
- Collaborate with dog/hunt groups for upkeep on training areas
- What are the results of dog use study – last year and this
- How did having field trial/tests effect study
- Mowing for dog training
- What about tracking or search and rescue
- Not allow pro-trainers to use the area w/o permit or ban
- At dog meeting must have maps for people to draw where they want dog training to be at Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake
- Resolve conflict of use between retriever, field trial, upland bird trainers – they all have different needs
- Cherry Valley and Stillwater: more shallow ponds for waterfowl hunting
- Acquisition for dog training – Pepper's
- .003% of wildlife land in state to serve 38% of the population
- Put ponds in other places
- Hunting hours are not good for deer/elk hunting
- Breed pheasants with gills
- Solar powered outhouses? Not enough outhouses and not clean enough
- Brian is doing a great job
- Better signs so bikers can get to the river and enjoy more of the WLA
- Signs on parking lots that designate the N vs S parking lots – better signs in general
- More shallow ponds for bird watching
- Why are ag activities allowed during nesting season when dog running is not allowed?
- Car break-ins: need more enforcement presence – may be coordinated with the sheriff.
- DuVall High School or other schools are good sites for holding meetings.

Ebey Island:

- Improve roads for volunteer access for pheasant release and public access
- Shallow ponds and access improvements
- Develop master plan for the Island
 - Incorporate agriculture & moist soil management where practical

Stillwater:

- Eradicate Himalayan blackberry – there is a lot and it is a noxious weed

Crescent Lake:

- There is water available here for dog training
- Keep access open year around
- Clarification on Crescent Lake sign to show dog training area. Zoom out & show "you are here"
- Bring back the bridge @ Crescent from south to center area

Cherry Valley:

- After hunting season open the gates
- Maintain access for dog training

Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Public Scoping Meeting
May 11, 2016

Page | 3

Comment 112 - from Cindy Olson:

Washington Sporting Dog Training Association

April 12, 2018

Snoqualmie Wildlife Areas

Closure of Snoqualmie Wildlife Areas to Dog Training "Enthusiasts" in 2013

Dog Training Enthusiasts - thoughtful users, tax payers, current on all required licenses and fees, active land maintenance participants

Why are the dog trainers the only class of stakeholders that are restricted to 10 to 15 acres of land?

- The complaints about dogs chasing or harassing wildlife are about dog walkers that let their dogs run free. From the 2006 ten year plan: "There is concern that dog walking (not training) on wildlife areas has increased"
- What study was done to support closing the units?

What areas historically were off limits to all stakeholders?

- Open access to all SWA's from the mid 1970's to 2013
- Restricted areas: Nesting areas and other wildlife sensitive areas.

The dog training community believes we were singled out as a stakeholder as a result of:

- A single enforcement officer, Kim Chandler, in Region 4 having personal issues with dog trainers and Brian Boehm having a dislike of all dogs on the units.
- In 2013 Brian Boehm is hired as the WLA manger for the SWA's and Brian begins a dialog with Kim Chandler and this begins a series of emails between the two (public records), with Kim Chandler is expressing his strong dislike of dog trainers. The following are some quotes from these emails:
 - Note: the gate was never locked for 40 years until the water wheel project
 - Feb 28, 2013 Kim to Brian: responding to Brian's question about unlocking the gate Kim states "**once again these dog folk's are pretty pushy**"
 - March 11, 2013 Kim to Brian: Brian asks about nesting birds (signs) Kim states signs were mainly for dog trainers and "rules signage on the area needs to be there so we have some teeth in citing someone"
 - March 13 2013 Brian to Kim: "I don't want to set a precedence that the gate is open to the public"
 - May 22, 2013 Brian to Kim: at the CAG meeting people asking about re-opening CV to dog training & trials
 - May 22, 2013 Kim to Brian: "**many dog trainers quit using Cherry Valley because the grass got so high -----that was kind of self regulating" why should we mow just for them**
 - May 22, 2013 Brian to Kim: "I told the folks that ----- things may not return as they were in the past"

- June 3, 2013 Brian to Kim: Brian wants info from Kim on the enforcement/historical perspective
- June 3, 2013 Kim to Brian: "once again **I am not really excited about dog training on OUR LANDS** anyway. **What's in it for us?**" **"very few of them are hunters and buy our licenses"** "these guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests" **" one guy just out tossing a dummy for his dog. although technically training, probably isn't much of a concern to us"**
- June 5, 2013 Brian to Kim: "I will add this to the stack of information to consider as I wade through this issue"
- April 2, 2014 Brian to Kim: Brian asks enforcement to cite dog trainers not in designated areas
- Dec 3, 2014 Brian to Kim: "our unclear dog-use and training policy, I would like to establish an SWA dog policy"
- Dec 3, 2014 Kim to Brian: "**you both know my feelings about dog training on OUR LANDS**" "**we can certainly post rules ... any rules ... as to what you can and can't do ON OUR PROPERTY**" ... "I think the no dogs except when hunting would probably solve the problem"
- Dec 4, 2014 Brian to Kim: "**My feeling is** that training should be seasonal, not extended into the hunting season"
- Dec 4, 2014 Kim to Brian: with regard to hunting regulations specifying SWA allows dog training year round in designated areas, Kim states "**If we want a designated area, we can put up the signs when we want and where we want**" and "a lot of folks think the whole area is open for training"
- Dec 8, 2014 Brian to Kim: notice concerning dog use signs
- Dec 8, 2014 Kim to Brian: signs about new restrictions
- Aug 17, 2015 Brian to Kim: closed all dog training during hunting season except designated areas
- Nov 9, 2015 Paul Gilmore to Commission: requesting the Commission's help regarding access to the lands, loss of parking, locked gates and the location of corn plantings including commenting on the "Chandler emails" referenced above
- Nov 23, 2015 Bob Everitt's response on behalf of the Commission: "your claims of denied access to the Cherry Valley unit are not true" "People have not been denied access to that or any other unit."
- Nov 23, 2015 Paul Gilmore's response to Bob Everitt: shortly after one of Chandler's emails, access to all but designated areas (10 to 15 acres) were created denying us access that Bob seemed not to be aware of in Nov 2015

Note: in 2014 signs were for the first time posted significantly reducing the size of the dog training area to 10 to 15 acres while not restricting any other stakeholder.

Closure of the SWA's to Dog Training - Timeline

Ref Doc	Related Emails:	From	To	Subject	Summary of comments
	16-Apr-16	SWA Management Plan public scoping meeting			
A	16-Mar-16	Brian Boehm	Russ Link	SWA Dogs on Leash	SWA Unleashed Dog Proposal
B	23-Nov-15	Paul Gilmore	Bob Everitt	Re: Upcoming Meeting	Paul's response to Bob Everitt letter dated Nov 23, 2015
	23-Nov-15	Bob Everitt	Paul Gilmore	Re: Upcoming Meeting	WDFW response to Paul's letter to the Commission
	9-Nov-15	Paul Gilmore	DFW Commission	Re: Upcoming Meeting	Requesting Commission help re parking, locked gates, location of corn plantings, lack of dog training access. Brian says he will schedule the meeting as his schedule allows
C	6-Nov-15	Brian Boehm	Paul Gilmore	Re: Upcoming Meeting	CV volunteer plan for maintenance on the unit
	3-Nov-15	Paul Gilmore	Brian Boehm	Upcoming Meeting	closed dog training on all but "designated areas" during hunting season
	17-Aug-15	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Emailing: Athn all wildlife users	meant note explaining new dog use restrictions
D	8-Dec-14	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Emailing: Athn Wildlife Area Users	note concerning dog use prior to posting new signs
	8-Dec-14	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Emailing: Athn Wildlife Area Users	hate to prevent dog walking on Eby Island - allow dogs year-round - non-hunters keep dogs on leash
E	9-Dec-14	Jennifer Maurstad	Brian Boehm	Re: signage for dogs	concerning dogs on wildlife areas - hunters complain about illegal dog activities - address with signage
	8-Dec-14	Brian Boehm	Jennifer Maurstad	Re: signage for dogs	"If we want a designated area, we can put up the signs when we want and where we want" There has been confusion and "a lot of folks think the whole area is open for training"
	4-Dec-14	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: signage for dogs	"My feeling is that training should be seasonal, not extend into the hunting season"
3-Dec-14	4-Dec-14	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: signage for dogs	"You both know my feelings about dog training on our lands" We can certainly post rules ... any rules As to what you can and can't do on our property"
	3-Dec-14	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: signage for dogs	"our unclear dog-use and training policy. I would like to establish a Snoqualmie WLA dog policy" "our WLA's are literally going to the dogs"
3-Dec-14	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	signage for dogs		

F	2-Apr-14	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Eby Is & Crescent Lake Update	asking enforcement to cite dog trainers for training outside the designated training areas
G	30-Sep-13	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Crescent Lake	other issues
	30-Sep-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: Crescent Lake	contract said no later than 10/4 - written before Brian was hired
	30-Sep-13	Russ Link	Kim Chandler	Re: Crescent Lake	thought the date was 9/30
	29-Sep-13	Kim Chandler	Russ Link	Crescent Lake	Corn still not harvested at Crescent Lake - hunters cannot hunt in standing corn
H	5-Jun-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: Cherry valley dog groups	Brian will add Kim's comments to his stack of information on the dog issue
	3-Jun-13	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Cherry valley dog groups	"not real excited about dog training on our lands. What's in it for us?" "These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests"
	3-Jun-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Fw: Cherry valley dog groups	"connect to discuss this from an enforcement/historical perspective"
	22-May-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: Cherry valley dog groups	Thanks for your thoughts
	22-May-13	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Cherry valley dog groups	many dog trainers quit using CV because the canary grass was to tall - why should we mow just for them
	22-May-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Cherry valley dog groups	"CAG meeting a number of people asked about returning dog trails and training to Cherry Valley" " share your thoughts from an enforcement perspective"
I	11-Mar-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: Cherry Valley	Brian to reply to dog trainers question about unlocking the gate
	11-Mar-13	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Cherry Valley	nesting signs were mainly for dog trainers. "the rules signage on the areas need to be there so we have some teeth in citing"
	11-Mar-13	Brian Boehm	Kim Chandler	Re: Cherry Valley	Question on nesting birds and hunting
	28-Feb-13	Kim Chandler	Brian Boehm	Re: Cherry Valley	mid April for drive in use "Once again these dog folks are pretty pushy"
	27-Feb-13	Paul Zoba	Kim Chandler	Cherry Valley	Unlocking the gate for dog training
	14-May-12	Signed contract for the Waterwheel Project - gates locked for the project			

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 11:02 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: FW: Snoqualmie Wildlife Area dogs on leash

-Brian Boehm

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 1:01 PM
To: Link, Russell E (DFW) (Russell.Link@dfw.wa.gov)
Cc: Dahmer, Paul A (DFW); Sprague, Clay L (DFW); Host, Heidi M (DFW); Myers, Alan A (DFW); Chandler, Kim K (DFW); Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW) (Jennifer.Maurstad@dfw.wa.gov); Milner, Ruth L (DFW); Anderson, Christopher D (DFW)
Subject: Snoqualmie Wildlife Area dogs on leash

Greetings All,

Please see the attachment above detailing my "leash only" plan for users of the Snoqualmie WLA. Most above have provided comments during the DRAFT version. Paul and Clay, I want to include you so you know, and about future action during the Wildlife Area Management Plan update process currently underway.

If you have comments, please let me know as I would like to post new signs tomorrow, since the hunting season will be over.

Brian Boehm

Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Unleashed Dog Proposal

March 8, 2016

Issue: There are documented and increasing concerns and conflicts occurring year-round relating to the high volume of unleashed dog use on the Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake, and Stillwater Units of Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. Signs requiring pet owners to leash their dogs have been posted for the past two hunting seasons with little effect.

Basis: Based on comments and feedback received from local WDFW Enforcement officers, District Biologists, the Wildlife Program Manager, Customer Service, and the public, there is a need to manage unleashed dogs on these three Units, primarily for the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat. Documented comments and monitoring data also support the need for this plan.

The proposal: The above three Units will be posted as Wildlife Areas for the benefit of wildlife. Each entry point will be posted with signage that reads: "Wildlife Area, Dogs must be leashed, WAC 232-13-180". Additional signage referring to leash requirements will also be posted on sign boards. Initiating a year-round leash requirement for pets may resolve user conflicts during the hunting season.

At Cherry Valley and Crescent Lake, where there is a designated dog training area, entrance points will be posted as "Wildlife Area, Dogs must be leashed except when posted WAC 232-13-180". Signage will be posted on sign boards, and within the designated dog training areas, stating that no leash is required while training in the designated area.

Other Units: All of the Ebey Island Unit is currently posted as nesting area with signs stating: "Nesting Area, No dogs allowed" and "No Dogs Except When Hunting" signage (since 2014). This will continue as very few issues arise now that people are aware of this rule. Dogs on leash are allowed on the Ebey Slough dike trail only.

Corson Preserve: Already is a no dog area.

Spencer Island: Based on my observations during periodic visits, most users do not leash their dogs. "Wildlife Area, Dogs must be leashed, WAC 232-13-180" signs will be posted.

Considerations:

1. This Plan is simple and consistent for users to understand and for WDFW staff to communicate.
2. This Plan is enforceable. Signs at entry points are passed by all users. This eliminates repeat signage inside the unit.
3. This Plan is easy to implement, requiring minimal resources to create, install, and maintain signage.

4. This Plan is supported by existing laws, policies, plans, hunting seasons, and regulations.
5. This Plan is in perfect timing with Wildlife Area Management Plan update and Recreation Management Planning processes. Stakeholder meetings are already scheduled, SEPA review is already required for the plan, and Olympia staff and managers are already engaged in the process.
6. This Plan will be implemented and monitored in 2016. If compliance is achieved, there is no need for further restrictions. If not, next steps are to move to a no dog policy across all 3 units, except in designated dog training areas. This will be communicated in the revised Wildlife Area Plan update.

#137287223
Public disclosure

cindyto

From: Paul Gilmore [paulg@northwestlinings.com]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 1:44 PM
To: Everitt, Robert D (DFW)
Cc: Boehm, Brian J (DFW); Link, Russell E (DFW); Director (DFW); Commission (DFW)
Subject: RE: Upcoming meeting?

Bob,

I don't find pleasure in writing these emails. The main reason I emailed again was because we had our meeting in JUNE and we discussed performing volunteer work after hunting season closed. It took many emails to get the single meeting in June scheduled to get the problems put on the table. Not to mention about two months. There is effectively NOT an active CAG forum. The last meeting discussed the guidelines established in Ellensburg. I have missed very few meetings where I have been given reasonable notice of the date. I requested a simple planning meeting to begin planning. In fairness to those wanting to donate their PERSONAL time and money, a month of notice before a planned work party is respectful. I simply asking for a meeting in the coming weeks to plan what we will do and what volunteers may need to fill out to make sure we are doing everything "by the book". I don't want to expect to give people some paperwork the day before a planned volunteer day and expect them to drop everything at that moment. Being proactive is the only way to be successful in any project.

Regarding the access, this property is not different from any other. All areas have people off-road illegally, dump garbage and experience seasonal crowding. These are enforcement issues. Should an area become too crowded DFW has made policy to close off access, render property unusable and limit parking at Cherry Valley. If any of you experienced these problems as a businessman, the answer is more access, more parking and increased availability. Can you imagine Walmart closing half the parking area because they see black Friday on the calendar? Because there are a lot of hunters, should we put "Hunting Only" areas limited to just a couple acres on one property? My interest is ensuring we have proper public recreational opportunities available all year long. This does require maintenance year round.

Regarding maintenance, after we paid via donations to have a large area mowed, I had people come up and give me donations to do it again right on the spot. Another took my address and sent a check. It's not hard to get a nod of approval when "Anything" is done. It was really a slap in the face to see people enjoying the property during a time when high canary grass traditionally limited use. Timing the improvements for everyone to enjoy should be the strategy. Sure, mowing right before pheasant release sure makes pheasant release users very happy. What about people who would like to enjoy the open space in late June? The corn is high and canary grass higher. It is unusable to everyone. The pheasant release hunters who use the property a couple times a year certainly won't complain about it after its been knocked down come fall. I'm sure you can understand the point. Catering to a special interest group at any time of the year is inappropriate for the public land. I find this last statement to be even more important now I have read The Outdoor Recreation Act passed into law by Congress which provided federal tax dollars to make the purchase of Cherry Valley possible for future generations to utilize for recreation however they see fit. I am concerned that DFW has not followed the requirements set forth in the Outdoor Recreation Act.

Regarding the plantings, over the last 30 years share cropping has been performed on and off. The current contract has no provisions for replanting in a suitable grass. I have read the contract with the farmer and it states no revegetation must be performed after farming activities. I'm quite certain he would not crop the land if he was required to replant. I brought the issue up prior to the last contract being issued and my comments were disregarded. I recall what was once a nice meadow in Stillwater. It was farmed in corn two years then, abandoned. It first filled with noxious weeds then, filled with alders and blackberries.

Myself and many others are prepared to make positive contributions to the year round maintenance and upkeep on the properties to benefit all people interested in recreation in our open spaces. The people need an open forum where positive

4/6/2018

B

actions can be accomplished and not just discussed. In the time I've spent emailing, I pulled out about 200' LF of barbed wire and posts at Cherry Valley after we mowed a few years back. I'd rather pull out rusty fences than keep going around in circles in emails. I took time off work to meet with the group in June. This takes up my vacation time. I don't think I'm asking a lot to use an hour of a public employees paid time to discuss how I can help get volunteers organized to donate their time, money and equipment. It is also prudent to allow as much time as possible in advance for people to plan around their family and work obligations.

Immediately following Sergeant Chandlers comments the simple access road was blocked and soon after a tiny area was designated for "dog training". They are not "allegations" they are Sergeant Chandlers words. Based upon testimony from a few older dog trainers and his comments, he has a certain and definite bias against the groups. If he didn't, he wouldn't have told Brian how to "keep us out" and go on to call us, "pushy and arrogant" and "we shouldn't let them on "OUR" land". I think he doesn't want any one on "his" DFW properties. Your comment should be that Sergeant Chandlers comments are inappropriate and not representing what DFW represents. At least, that is what I would expect from a public agency. I know this is not how all DFW and WSP employees are instructed to dialog with management about the public. At least not from my experiences working with both departments back in the 1990's.

Best Regards, Happy Thanksgiving to you all. Paul

Paul Gilmore
Construction Installation Sales and Business Development
Northwest Linings & Geotextile Products, Inc.
21000 77th Ave South
Kent, WA 98032
P: 253-796-0012 Construction Office
D: 253-867-5367 Direct Line
C: 206-851-6326 Cell
F: 253-872-6953
paulg@northwestlinings.com
www.northwestlinings.com
"Helping to Protect the Environment"
Celebrating 41 Years of Service 1973-2014

From: Everitt, Robert D (DFW) [mailto:Bob.Everitt@dfw.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 11:59 AM
To: paulg@northwestlinings.com
Cc: Boehm, Brian J (DFW); Link, Russell E (DFW); Director (DFW); Commission (DFW)
Subject: RE: Upcoming meeting?

Dear Paul:

The Fish and Wildlife Commission asked me to respond to your November 9, 2015 email message (below) regarding your concerns with management of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. Frankly, I was surprised to read your complaint as it is very similar to one I responded to in April 2015 and resulted in an onsite meeting with you, me, and several other staff and interested parties in late June. During that discussion we went over your concerns (including your assertions on the intent of the original acquisition) and kicked some dirt around on the Cherry Valley Unit. I thought we had reached a good understanding and course of action (which was intended to be implemented in 2016; copy attached). I'm not sure what has changed to prompt your most recent letter, but encourage you to continue your ongoing dialogue with Wildlife Area Manager Brian Boehm.

4/6/2018

B

Brian has held his current position since only 2013 and has spent considerable time attempting to reverse the back log of neglected work on the Wildlife Area that resulted during a number of years of inadequate funding and staff cuts. During this time Brian has welcomed volunteer help as evidenced by frequent projects described in his weekly reports (you can access past copies of these reports on our website at: http://wdfw.wa.gov/about/wildlife_weekly/). Not only does Brian complete projects with volunteers, he has also provided donated equipment, fuel, and supplies to help volunteers complete necessary tasks on all units of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area. As you know, Brian has no other paid staff (permanent or seasonal) to help with this work and relies on volunteers, and engaged, dedicated people like you, to get things done.

Your claims of “denied access” to the Cherry Valley Unit are not true. People have not been denied access to that, or any other unit. However, it is true that people are less free to access these areas by driving the field and farm roads to the extent that was allowed in the past. People access the unit through the entrance gates. Given that this Wildlife Area is located near a higher human population than any other the agency manages, dealing with an urban populace is a challenge. However, the Wildlife Area still has access restrictions that are more liberal than other parks and open spaces operated by other governmental agencies in the general vicinity. As we discussed with you in June, changes to service road entrances, parking gates and other access related changes were in response to over-crowded conditions, damage caused by 4X4 vehicles “off-roading”, safety concerns and farmer and restoration contractors requirements for protection of equipment. These changes were not made unilaterally but were part of an ongoing conversation with users, including members of the Wildlife Area’s Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) members. Again, I encourage you to participate in CAG meetings and have your issues heard by others users, some of whom have very different ideas on how best to manage the area.

Agriculture is an active management tool to reduce the many acres of invasive vegetation on the Cherry Valley Unit, which in itself is a barrier to access in many spots. The location of fields under sharecrop contract is based on hydrology and its ability to be accessed by large, heavy farm equipment. Again, we have discussed this, but to repeat, fields are not farmed in order to discourage users. A rotation of corn, grain and grass is a standard agricultural practice. While such rotations may occur in some years at locations where dog training has occurred in the past, in our current rotation plan, a dog training area has been provided in another field near the parking area and has been used by dog trainers.

Brian Boehm has spoken with the disabled veteran referenced in your email. He invited this hunter to join Dolores Noyes, the Department’s ADA Program Manager, on a tour the Cherry Valley Unit on April 16, 2015. Ms. Noyes explained the ADA registration process and how we could accommodate his needs. Apparently the disabled hunter chose to not complete the required paperwork, but Ms. Noyes and Manager Boehm are still prepared to assist him if he changes his mind. If you have contact again with this individual, please pass along this offer.

I want to emphasize that while past and planned management activities may have impacted historic dog training practices, they were not undertaken specifically to target dog trainers or deny their access to the Wildlife Area. The agency’s message on this matter is unchanged from our earlier conversation: which is that these Units are in a period of transition, and short-term changes from historic patterns of use will occur as improved conditions are achieved over time.

Obviously you and some others members of the dog training community are unhappy with management actions on the ground. I believe that the majority of hunters, walkers, wildlife viewers, and users in general, are pleased with the improvements made to the Wildlife Area in just a couple of years. I base this view on conversations with users, phone calls, and is echoed by our customer service staff interactions with users. This agency with many users including wildlife watchers, fish restoration representatives, pheasant hunters, waterfowl hunters, dog walkers, and dog trainers regarding how the various units of the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area are managed. It is difficult to please everyone, but we are doing the very best we can with the limited resources that are available to us.

I don’t really know how to respond to your allegations against Sergeant Chandler. You provided a copy of an internal

email conversation that certainly highlights his personal view of this situation, based on his many years of work on and around the Wildlife Area. It does not reflect the policy of the agency, nor has changed our long term management strategy. I have known Sergeant Chandler for a long time (long before he became the local "Sarge") and know him to be one of the best friends any outdoor enthusiast could hope to have. You and I talked about this as well, and I don't know what else to say about it. You may perceive a conspiracy here, but none exists.

I understand that you and Brian are attempting to schedule a time to meet and discuss plans for next year. I have asked him to accommodate this meeting as early as possible, even if it impacts some work planned during the hunting season. Please be patient and know that this is an assigned priority for him.

I encourage you to continue to work with Brian Boehm on your issues of concern and to engage fully in our CAG. Contact Russell Link (425-775-1311 ext. 110 or Russell.linkl@dfw.wa.gov) for additional information and guidance on how best to do this if needed.

Sincerely,

Bob Everitt, Regional Director
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
16018 Mill Creek Blvd.
Mill Creek, WA 98012
425-775-1311

From: Paul Gilmore [<mailto:paulg@northwestlinings.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2015 11:34 AM
To: Commission (DFW)
Cc: Director (DFW)
Subject: FW: Upcoming meeting?

Gentlemen,

We have been met with continued discouragement regarding the communication, management and maintenance of the Cherry Valley and surrounding units. I am attempting to get a schedule together for volunteer work in the Spring of 2016 as promised by DFW. We had a meeting which gave us some hopes that the DFW attitude had changed and had an openness to working with us to provide more year round recreational opportunities on our public lands(Snoqualmie Valley Units). Myself and many other users are extremely frustrated with the current management and operations. The DFW has been failing the population of King County for many long years. We have the most densely populated area in the State with the most neglected DFW properties. In the past when I was younger, the Stillwater, Cherry Valley, Crescent Lake and Ebey Island all were mowed and maintained on a reasonable schedule. This allowed access for fishing season, upland hunting, waterfowl and most importantly, any type of year round recreation a person choses. This was the reason which funding was provided to DFW in 1974 via the Outdoor Recreation Act. Current management practices are not following the guidelines set for by the Act. (link provided below)

The pheasant release and farming leases appear to be the only priority of the properties and management. Farming plans seem to take up far too much time and negatively affect the maintenance operations on the properties. *"These properties need maintenance, not management."* Is what I've heard over and over by the general public. The property was purchased with funding from the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1962. This act was written into law to provide funding to purchase large open spaces with the interest of increasing the ability of the public to recreation outdoors. (link provided below) The act outlines that roads should connect the public to uninhibited shorelines and water amongst other items. Special interest group projects have removed that ability on the property. Currently, management has minimized parking areas, locked gates and limited access to the point of full restriction. The corn planting was done on all of the most accessible areas. This is unfortunate to one specific

group in particular. A disabled veteran called me to voice his unhappiness. He was given my contact information via another person who knows I am actively trying to regain the ability of the public to use the property for year round recreational purposes. He has apparently contacted ADA and Veterans Admin and wants to further pursue the issue against DFW because of the locked gates and how he cannot access any fields because of the corn plantings next to the only maintained gravel road on the property. There is not a disabled parking near a decent gravel road to allow access for the disabled. The combination of the locked gate at the gravel access and no parking has eliminated his ability to recreate on the property. This is his account of the situation. I have not confirmed he is a disabled veteran however, I do have his phone number and contact information should you like to speak with him directly. He has spoken with Mr. Boehm and feels his comments and concerns were ignored according to the dialog we had last week.

Another major issue which is a detriment to recreational opportunities is the farming practices and locations chosen by management. A couple years prior, I raised money to pay for mowing at Cherry Valley. The property was used by dog trainers, picnickers, dog walkers, people exercising and people exploring the area. I received constant comments on how great it was to have a few large open fields available for recreational opportunities. I saw people flying kites, I saw a falconer, people photographing deer and enjoying the outdoors. All of those areas are now planted in corn and all of those recreational opportunities can no longer occur. The farming(corn) has been planted in the most accessible, usable and high traffic areas. I believe this is intentional to discourage public use of the property. A corn planting makes the property unusable for the entire spring, summer and fall. (see Sergeant Chandlers comments on how to discourage interest in using the property for recreational purposes below in highlighted yellow) Currently, management has chosen to only mow areas specifically for pheasant release and the timing of the mowing coincided with that activity. Pheasant release is just one short duration of time. I believe the management practices of planting corn in the best and most accessible areas are specifically in reaction to our groups unhappiness towards the way management has maintained the property and prioritized improvements while limiting access. We have highlighted the most desirable areas on a map in the past. Now all those areas are planted in corn making them completely unusable year round. Below are Sergeant Chandlers comments I obtained via public information act. Sergeant Chandler needs to re-read the definitions of "commercial use" because nothing short of an actual dog trial constitutes "commercial use" per the written definition in Washington State. I've excluded the email in which Sergeant Chandler calls dog trainers, "pushy and arrogant". This email chain clearly shows DWF's intention of shutting down public recreation on the property. Mr. Boehm appears to be following the direction of Sergeant Chandler who has a long standing chip on his shoulder against dog trainers dating back to the late 1980's when he had many negative interactions with Oly Jackson and Frank Kasheverov. They were both very successful Amateur dog trainers. We do not make money at trials. No monetary prizes are allowed by the AKC. All of Sergeant Chandlers comments are false including the reference to the WAC law on commercial use. I take offense to Sergeant Chandler calling Cherry Valley, "our lands" referring to State (public) owned property. He obviously has a skewed sense of who owns the land, where the money came from to purchase it and who pays his paycheck. Sergeant Chandler needs to pay attention in his training classes in Oly he mentions rather than making sarcastic comments about them in emails to other managers. See email chain below.....

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 9:30 AM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: cherry valley dog groups

Thank you Kim for your comments and additional information. I will add this to the stack of information to consider as I wade through this issue. Much appreciated.

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)

4/6/2018

B

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:26 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: cherry valley dog groups

Brian,

Yeah, just too many things going on last week and I'm in Oly this week for training. Anyway, once again, I'm not real excited about dog training on our lands anyway. What's in it for us? We don't get much of the Discover Pass \$\$ and very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses. If we are going to allow it, it needs to be understood that it's only on the designated, signed area of Cherry Valley. One thing that may discourage them is the fact that the place isn't mowed and the grass gets pretty high. I don't see where we should make a whole lot of effort to mow just for commercial dog training. Commercial training also raises some concerns. These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests and field trials and many times are actually out there on the property with a customer who is interested in buying one of their dogs. Very difficult to prove but something that all of them should be made aware of. They need a commercial use permit from us to do anything of that sort. One guy just out tossing a dummy for his dog from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us. When some of the big outfits move in there, they pretty much take the place over and get pretty testy when anyone else shows up just wanting to walk their dog. That isn't going to be tolerated. If they have a trial permit, it still does not allow for exclusive use according to the wording on the permit.

Just some thoughts. You can email me back today with anything further and I should be able to reply during a break in this VERY exciting training.

K

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*

<image001.jpg>

WDFW

Detachment 10

King County

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 8:20 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: FW: cherry valley dog groups

Good Morning Kim,

I wanted to re-send this email about Cherry Valley and dog training to you. We were going to try to connect to discuss this from an enforcement/historical perspective. We didn't, so I thought you may be able to provide some insight via email instead. My CAG meeting is tomorrow evening, and any information you could provide will be helpful. Much appreciated.

-Brian Boehm

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:46 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: cherry valley dog groups

Greetings Kim,

4/6/2018

B

At my recent CAG meeting, a number of people asked about returning dog trials and training to Cherry Valley. I offered to explore the idea with them, but need a bit of information. I thought you may be able to provide your perspective on this issue, since you have been around awhile. Can you share your concerns and thoughts from an enforcement perspective? I told the folks that due to many changes on the Unit, things may not return as they were in the past.

Any information you can provide is appreciated. If you would rather discuss this, please give me a call or drop in at the Honor Farm office. I will be at MC1 tomorrow afternoon if that is convenient for you. Let me know.

Respectfully;

Brian Boehm
Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Manager
WDFW Region 4, Mill Creek
425-327-4869

In Summation,

I ask each of you read the Outdoor Recreation Act which I have linked below. The DFW made application for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Act. Funding was granted in 1974 for purchase of the Cherry Valley property.
http://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/anps/anps_5d.htm

I'm asking the commission's formal assistance to increase parking, remove locks from gates and specifically, not to allow corn to be planted in accessible and areas highly desirable for year round recreation. I am asking for complete public input on the plan which will be drafted by Mr. Boehm because of a lack of confidence in the DFW's ability to provide public recreation opportunities on our only open spaces in King County. We are asking the corn planting to be moved to the back eastern most region of the property which is least accessible to the general public, people with disabilities and therefore causing the least impact upon people attempting to enjoy public lands. Thank you for your consideration, Feel free to call me if you would like my experience and testimony in person at your next commissioners meetings. I would like to proceed with investigating how to actually make changes on how these properties are managed moving forward immediately. Please give me direction on how to begin any process which may be required.

Best Regards,

Paul Gilmore
Construction Installation Sales and Business Development
Northwest Linings & Geotextile Products, Inc.
21000 77th Ave South
Kent, WA 98032
P: 253-796-0012 Construction Office
D: 253-867-5367 Direct Line
C: 206-851-6326 Cell
F: 253-872-6953
paulg@northwestlinings.com
www.northwestlinings.com
"Helping to Protect the Environment"
Celebrating 41 Years of Service 1973-2014

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW) [<mailto:Brian.Boehm@dfw.wa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 12:06 PM

4/6/2018

B

To: Paul Gilmore
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: Upcoming meeting?

Greetings Paul,

Your enthusiasm for this volunteer project is clearly evident. Your pace and my current work load do not match very well. With pheasant season in peak swing, and waterfowl just ramping up on five hunting Units, and a host of other projects that I am working on, my availability is very limited. As I told you during our last communication, I will contact you when it is pertinent to discuss this.

What I see as the next step is you and I meeting to talk about scope and scale, and how this volunteer effort fits with the other activities I have going on at Cherry Valley. Somewhere in late January or early February. Hunting season goes to March 15, and flood season often extends into May, so we have plenty of time. Meanwhile, I will be working on clearing out a lot of my current priorities, including developing next year's work plan. This includes details on my agricultural plan, drainage issues, and current restoration projects to name a few. All of these will need to be considered as we further develop this action plan.

I have lots of irons in the fire Paul, so please be patient. I will keep in touch.

-Brian Boehm

From: Paul Gilmore [mailto:paulg@northwestlinings.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 9:57 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW); Commission (DFW)
Subject: Upcoming meeting?

Brian,

I would like to get a meeting scheduled which would be open to the key volunteers interested in making the improvements we discussed on the property. I know some people aren't interested in the meeting portions and just want to show up and accomplish tasks. I wanted to get a plan together to complete all of the items we discussed immediately following the wrap up of hunting season. I would like to have a month or more to notify people of a given date of a work start date. I have had an impromptu meeting with a fraction of the volunteers who are ready to make this property a centerpiece of public recreational opportunities for year round use.

Also, will volunteers be required to complete paperwork? If so, I want to distribute the needed forms immediately. I want to do this well in advance of scheduling work parties for the gate installations and other tasks so this all goes smoothly without interruption.

Hunting season will be over soon and everyone will have their decoys back in storage and ready to put on some work boots. What date works good for a meeting to get a plan laid down?

Cheers,

Paul Gilmore
Construction Installation Sales and Business Development
Northwest Linings & Geotextile Products, Inc.
21000 77th Ave South
Kent, WA 98032

4/6/2018

B

P: 253-796-0012 Construction Office
D: 253-867-5367 Direct Line
C: 206-851-6326 Cell
F: 253-872-6953
paulg@northwestlinings.com
www.northwestlinings.com
"Helping to Protect the Environment"
Celebrating 41 Years of Service 1973-2014

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 10:55 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: FW:C Emailing: Attention All Wildlife Users.docx, Hunting season dog training.docx, Hunting season no dog training.docx

 
Attention All
Wildlife Users.d...

 
Hunting season
dog training.do...

 
Hunting season
no dog training...

Brian Boehm

-----Original Message-----

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2015 11:14 AM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW) (Jennifer.Maurstad@dfw.wa.gov); Powers, Carol E (DFW); Thomas, Ericka N (DFW); Host, Heidi M (DFW)
Subject: Emailing: Attention All Wildlife Users.docx, Hunting season dog training.docx, Hunting season no dog training.docx

Greetings All,

Just to let you know, I will be posting signs like the ones attached at the pheasant release sites today. Please review them in case you get calls. Additional signage will be posted as we get closer to Sept. and the pheasant season. Stay tuned...

Brian Boehm
425-327-4869

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Attention All Wildlife Users.docx
Hunting season dog training.docx
Hunting season no dog training.docx

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

Attention Wildlife Area Users

Hunting season is Sept. 1 – March 15

Keep pets on leash (RCW 232-13-180)

Avoid hunter's activities

Safety orange advised

Dog training allowed in designated area only



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE



Attention Wildlife Area Users

Hunting season opens Sept. 1

Restricted hours Sept. 1 – Nov. 30, 2015

Unit is open from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

No entry during closed hours



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE



Attention Wildlife Area Users

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) regulates dog-activities on Wildlife Areas.

Because of continuous negative interactions between hunters, pedestrians, hunting dogs and pets, and to improve public safety, changes to dog use are coming soon.

Please watch for new signs explaining the changes.



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE

D

Attention Wildlife Area Users

Hunting season is Sept. 1 – March 15

Keep pets on leash (RCW 232-13-180)

Avoid hunter's activities

Safety orange advised

No dog training at this Unit



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE

③
C

Attention Wildlife Area Users

Hunting season is Sept. 1 – March 15

Keep pets on leash (RCW 232-13-180)

Avoid hunter's activities

Safety orange advised

No dog training at this Unit



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE

③
C

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2016 10:04 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: FW: Enforcement: Attention Wildlife Area Users - Dog Use.docx

-Brian Boehm

-----Original Message-----

From: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: Emailing: Attention Wildlife Area Users - Dog Use.docx

That looks good. Actually what I meant was a short paragraph explaining the new dog restriction signs when they do go up. I'm thinking that an explanation of why the changes have been made might cut down on the phone calls. That way when we find folks ignoring the signs, we can also point to the letter.

Sergeant
Kim Chandler

WDFW
Detachment 10
King County

-----Original Message-----

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 12:09 PM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: Emailing: Attention Wildlife Area Users - Dog Use.docx

Greetings Kim,

You suggested I post a note concerning dog-use prior to posting new signs. Please give the attachment a read and provide comments. I would like to post this today as signs are ready on Friday.

Thanks,

Brian Boehm
425-327-4869

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Attention Wildlife Area Users - Dog Use.docx

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

Attention Wildlife Area Users

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) regulates dog-activities on Wildlife Areas.

Because of continuous negative interactions between hunters, pedestrians, hunting dogs and pets, and to improve public safety, changes to dog use are coming soon.

Please watch for new signs explaining the changes.



Washington Department of
FISH and WILDLIFE

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 10:52 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: FW:enf2 signage for dogs

-Brian Boehm

From: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW)
Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2014 10:14 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Subject: RE: signage for dogs

That's a tough one. I hate to prevent folks from walking their dogs at Ebey because it's such a nice/popular place to do so. Most folks are respectful and keep their dogs on a leash. If we did post signs it would be just for the hunting season, right? I would rather allow dog walkers year-round with a sign stating something to the effect: "non-hunters must keep their dogs on leash and walk the dike only."

...I'm not sure Brian, let me give it some thought.

Jennifer

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 12:29 PM
To: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW)
Subject: FW: signage for dogs

Greetings Jennifer,

See the e-trail below concerning dogs on wildlife areas. I have heard numerous complaints from hunters and observed illegal dog behavior on all of the wildlife areas this hunting season. I would like to address these issues with signage targeting certain areas and certain activities.

I did get complaints at Ebey, and last year I recall people with dogs using them to hunt the left-over pheasant. At Ebey, I would like to post signs in the hunting areas that say "No Dogs, Except While Hunting". Further signage will follow for after the hunting season and I will share that with you as well.

Any thoughts on this?

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 1:10 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: RE: signage for dogs

Well, the pamphlet actually says something like year around dog training allowed on "designated portions" of WMA's so I think

4/7/2018

E

if we don't have a designated portion then there is no dog training allowed. Just like the 8-4 signs, when they are there it means 8-4, when we take them down..... If we want a designated area, we can put the signs up when want to and where we want to. Make sense? Might want to type up a little paragraph explaining that so we can post it. There has always been some confusion on the wording "designated portions" and a lot of folks think the whole area is open for training all the time. It make take a little while to get the public used to it. Also if you look on page 15 of the pamphlet you'll see that dog training as of right now is still only 8-4.

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



*WDFW
Detachment 10
King County*

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 1:02 PM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Subject: RE: signage for dogs

Hey Kim,

We have signs saying "Year Round dog training area" that are posted. Is the year-round part tied to WAC or RCW's? The hunting pamphlet also discusses year round training in WLA's. My feeling is that training should be seasonal, and not extend into the hunting season. Can I make that call at the local level or is this tied to law?

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 11:23 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: signage for dogs

You both already know my feelings about dog training on our lands. Off leash areas are certainly limited in King County and rightly so, nobody wants dogs just running around on their property. There are only a few designated off leash areas in some of the parks, otherwise dogs have to be on a leash anywhere in the county. I would think that even though the property is state land, it still would come under the county ordinances. Maybe not but we can certainly post rules.....any rules.....as to what you can and can't do on our property. I too have had complaints of off leash dogs interrupting hunts and just plain being a nuisance. I'm all for your proposal Brian. Dogs on leash OK? Hard to enforce that when an offender looks over and sees a "hunting" dog off leash? I think the "NO DOGS EXCEPT WHEN HUNTING" would probably solve that problem. Since the 8-4 signs have been taken down now, there is lots of room on the sign boards for new signs so I say go for it.

4/7/2018

E

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



*WDFW
Detachment 10
King County*

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 11:12 AM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: signage for dogs

Greetings Kim and Russ,

In response to numerous reports, complaints, and eye witness accounts, about non-hunters walking or training their pets and dogs in hunting areas, I would like to post new signs. Pheasant season is over but there are two months of waterfowl hunting to go as well as increasing numbers of swans at Crescent Lake. Users run their pets off-leash wherever they please disrupting waterfowl, our pheasant release, and hunters.

Last year, at the end of pheasant season I had reports and witnessed people allowing their dogs to "hunt" the remaining pheasants and kill them. I expect the same this season.

The sign would simply state: "No dogs except while hunting". For the training sites, it could read "No dogs except while hunting or training in designated training area", but I am hesitant about this one as I feel training during hunting season should not be allowed.

Also, with the numerous complaints, and our unclear dog-use and training policy, I would like to establish a Snoqualmie WLA dog policy unless there is already one that I don't know about. Every National, state, county and city park has restrictions for dogs except on our wildlife areas. I want to remedy this. As I have seen over the past two years, our WLA's are literally going to the dogs. It's tough to attract wildlife with all of this traffic. Any thoughts?

Brian Boehm

E

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:12 AM
To: Public Disclosure, Wildlife (DFW)
Subject: FW: Ebey Island and Crescent Lake update. 15018

-Brian Boehm

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 11:04 AM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW) (Jennifer.Maurstad@dfw.wa.gov)
Subject: Ebey Island and Crescent Lake update.

Greetings Officers,

I wanted to let you know of a couple things. First, at Ebey Island, I closed the west lobe and parking area as a Nesting Area, no people, no dogs, and locked the entrance gates. There are a lot of waterfowl species starting to breed and nest out there and too many folks are running the place like a dog park. Secondly, cattle are coming into that area on 4-15-2014 and I don't want cow/dog/people issues, and I don't want people leaving gates open without knowing about it. I frequent the area often, but if you could take a peak when you are in the area that would be great.

Secondly, at Crescent Lake, on the weekends there has been frequent and large numbers of dog trainers using the south parking area and working their dogs in an area not specified for dog training. I have heard there are barbeque grills by the old boat launch so it sounds like it's getting out of control. If you are in the area on the weekend, can you keep an eye out for this activity. I really want to keep the dog training in the area that is dedicated for it near the north lot.

Thanks for your assistance in these areas.

Brian Boehm
Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Manager
425-327-4869

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:17 AM
To: Public Disclosure, Wildlife (DFW)
Subject: FW: Crescent Lake 15018

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW); Link, Russell E (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW); Stevens, Lance (DFW); Everitt, Bob (DFW)
Subject: RE: Crescent Lake

Thanks Brian, I don't mind "taking the heat" as that's just part of the job. On a side note, I did check 4 knuckleheads coming out of the corn at 5:10 last night with 5 birds so apparently the hunting wasn't all that bad. They were dealt with appropriately but there were no 8-4 signs posted at the center gate. That center gate at Crescent needs some 8-4 signs. You are probably going to have to get a ladder to post high enough on the tree so they don't get torn down. We'll get there as a team effort. One of the big problems with this area is it's in Snohomish County and anything we cite for has to be air tight or the prosecutor flushes them down the toilet. Signs are sometimes critical for being able to make the case.

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



*WDFW
Detachment 10
King County*

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:25 AM
To: Link, Russell E (DFW); Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW); Stevens, Lance (DFW); Everitt, Bob (DFW)
Subject: RE: Crescent Lake

Greetings All,

I reviewed the contract that I inherited and the harvest date is "no later than October 4" unless authorized by WDFW. Why this

6

4/6/2018

date was selected I do not know as it does overlap the pheasant opener. I have been working with Werkhoven since early September to set the harvest plan. They said they wanted to harvest late last week. With the wet weather, they postponed. I reminded them of the pheasant opener on the 28th. Technically, they are still within the contract date for harvest. There is no mention in the contract of what happens if the date is passed by the way.

I apologize to you Kim for taking the heat because of this recurring event. Future contracts that I draft will address these issues.

Respectfully;

Brian Boehm
Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Manager
WDFW Region 4, Mill Creek
425-327-4869

From: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:44 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW); Stevens, Lance (DFW); Boehm, Brian J (DFW); Everitt, Bob (DFW)
Subject: RE: Crescent Lake

I believe the date in the contract for corn harvest is Sept. 30th. I've asked Brian to provide an update.

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2013 11:22 AM
To: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Cc: Maurstad, Jennifer S (DFW); Stevens, Lance (DFW); Boehm, Brian J (DFW); Everitt, Bob (DFW)
Subject: Crescent Lake

Russ,
I'm sitting in the north lot at Crescent Lake looking at acres and acres of standing corn that has not been harvested. This is unacceptable. This happened last year too, it was long after the pheasant opener that the corn was harvested. These western Washington pheasant permit hunters spend a lot of money to hunt these release sites and it's extremely difficult to hunt corn like this, particularly if you don't have a dog. I was under the impression that the sharecropper, Werkhoven I believe, is under a contract and is required to have the corn harvested prior to the pheasant opener. He needs to get on this and in the future if he pulls this stunt again there needs to be a consequence. It's a nasty day today with wind and rain so there are only three vehicles parked in the lot, but I just talked to two other hunters who drove in, looked at the corn, pitched me a bitch about it and left.

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



WDFW

*Detachment 10
King County*

cindyto

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:15 AM
To: Public Disclosure, Wildlife (DFW)
Subject: FW: cherry valley dog groups 15018

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:26 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)
Subject: RE: cherry valley dog groups

Brian,

Yeah, just too many things going on last week and I'm in Oly this week for training. Anyway, once again, I'm not real excited about dog training on our lands anyway. What's in it for us? We don't get much of the Discover Pass \$\$ and very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses. If we are going to allow it, it needs to be understood that it's only on the designated, signed area of Cherry Valley. One thing that may discourage them is the fact that the place isn't mowed and the grass gets pretty high. I don't see where we should make a whole lot of effort to mow just for commercial dog training. Commercial training also raises some concerns. These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests and field trials and many times are actually out there on the property with a customer who is interested in buying one of their dogs. Very difficult to prove but something that all of them should be made aware of. They need a commercial use permit from us to do anything of that sort. One guy just out tossing a dummy for his dog from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us. When some of the big outfits move in there, they pretty much take the place over and get pretty testy when anyone else shows up just wanting to walk their dog. That isn't going to be tolerated. If they have a trial permit, it still does not allow for exclusive use according to the wording on the permit.

Just some thoughts. You can email me back today with anything further and I should be able to reply during a break in this VERY exciting training.

K

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



*WDFW
Detachment 10
King County*

4/6/2018

H

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 8:20 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: FW: cherry valley dog groups

Good Morning Kim,

I wanted to re-send this email about Cherry Valley and dog training to you. We were going to try to connect to discuss this from an enforcement/historical perspective. We didn't, so I thought you may be able to provide some insight via email instead. My CAG meeting is tomorrow evening, and any information you could provide will be helpful. Much appreciated.

-Brian Boehm

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:46 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: cherry valley dog groups

Greetings Kim,

At my recent CAG meeting, a number of people asked about returning dog trials and training to Cherry Valley. I offered to explore the idea with them, but need a bit of information. I thought you may be able to provide your perspective on this issue, since you have been around awhile. Can you share your concerns and thoughts from an enforcement perspective? I told the folks that due to many changes on the Unit, things may not return as they were in the past.

Any information you can provide is appreciated. If you would rather discuss this, please give me a call or drop in at the Honor Farm office. I will be at MC1 tomorrow afternoon if that is convenient for you. Let me know.

Respectfully;

Brian Boehm
Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Manager
WDFW Region 4, Mill Creek
425-327-4869

H

Paul Gilmore

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 4:08 PM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Subject: RE: cherry valley dog groups

Thanks for your advance thoughts on this Kim. I'll be at the training and pop in on you afterwards. I am also checking in with Kye. Maybe we all can chat together. bjb

-Brian Boehm

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: RE: cherry valley dog groups

Brian,
I have to be at MC tomorrow morning for training from 8-12 so I'll hang around in the afternoon. We can talk then..... One thought that immediately came to mind was the fact that many of the dog trainers quit using Cherry Valley because the grass got too high for them. That was kind of a self-regulating phenomenon that took care of itself. I'm not so sure we would have the \$\$ to be mowing just for them. Also, I was just talking to Kye this morning about dog training on out sites and the commercial use issue came up again. I'll fill you in on that tomorrow.....
K

*Sergeant
Kim Chandler*



*WDFW
Detachment 10
King County*

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:46 AM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: cherry valley dog groups

Greetings Kim,

TH

At my recent CAG meeting, a number of people asked about returning dog trials and training to Cherry Valley. I offered to explore the idea with them, but need a bit of information. I thought you may be able to provide your perspective on this issue, since you have been around awhile. Can you share your concerns and thoughts from an enforcement perspective? I told the folks that due to many changes on the Unit, things may not return as they were in the past.

Any information you can provide is appreciated. If you would rather discuss this, please give me a call or drop in at the Honor Farm office. I will be at MC1 tomorrow afternoon if that is convenient for you. Let me know.

Respectfully;

Brian Boehm
Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Manager
WDFW Region 4, Mill Creek
425-327-4869

Paul Gilmore

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 2:00 PM
To: Chandler, Kim K (DFW)
Subject: RE: Cherry Valley

Thanks for the clarification Kim. I'll relay that to the caller. THE gate was open on Saturday because there was a volunteer planting event. WFC was supposed to lock it after they left. Not sure if they did though. I'll check and remind them that they need to lock the gate when they leave or call me to do it. I don't want to set precedence that the gate is now open for the public. Brian

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: RE: Cherry Valley

Brian,

Good to know about the planting crew, we'll give just about anybody consideration for a while. I did notice that the gate was open this weekend. Will that be open for access to the planting area by these folks or should they be closing the gate behind them?

Yes, hunting is OK year around on our areas and yes, with the restrictions you offered up. The nesting area historically has been closed to all use if it's posted well enough so that there is no confusion. That was mainly to keep dog training out of that center area but actually, if it's a nesting area then all users should have to steer clear.

As we talked this weekend, the "rules" signage on the areas need to be there so we have some teeth in citing someone in the wrong. In looking at them, I noticed that it says "No Trap Shoooung". I'm not sure how many of those signs are still around but I think we need to look at "No Target Shooting" so there is no confusion. While the restriction of rifles and pistols sort of covers that, no target shooting would cover it all.

Kim Chandler



SERGEANT
WDFW
Detachment 10
King County

From: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: RE: Cherry Valley

Greetings Kim,

1

I

X

I wanted to let you know that Wild Fish Conservancy, Sound Salmon Solutions, and Stewardship Partners will have staff and vehicles this week at the Cherry Valley Unit. They are planting approximately 7 acres of the construction zone for Waterwheel Creek (NE corner). The company trucks have parking passes but there may be a couple personal vehicles associated with the groups that do not. All will be parked inside the access gates.

Also, a guy called last week with questions about hunting coyote at Stillwater. They are huntable year-round according to state regulations. His question was could he hunt at Stillwater? I explained the site requirements, (shot gun, non-toxic, within posted hours). Are there other restrictions that I am overlooking? Do we allow hunting on our Units year-round if all rules are followed or do we shut them down so users don't have to be under fire during the year? The reason I question this is I have seen "this area closed to protect nesting waterfowl" signs at Cherry Valley. Is this current, and do we "close" areas off for nesting birds, thus not allowing hunting?

Any guidance you can provide is appreciated. Brian

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 2:53 PM
To: Boehm, Brian J (DFW)
Subject: FW: Cherry Valley

Brian,
Can you get back to this guy and explain our gate opening? I think we were talking about mid-April for drive in use? Once again, some of these dog folks are pretty pushy.

Kim Chandler



SERGEANT
WDFW
Detachment 10
King County

From: Paul E. Zoba [mailto:paul@zoba.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 2:19 PM
To: Chandler, Kim (DFW)
Subject: Cherry Valley

Hi Kim,

I hunt in Cherry Valley and am a WA certified Master Hunter and also a Hunter Education Instructor. You and I met last year at Cherry Valley one time during pheasant season...

I have a new puppy. It's a Verein Deutsch Drathaar, similar to a German Wire Haired Pointer but bred under German performance breeding rules. We have a bit of a training club coming together and we were wanting to spend some training time in Cherry Valley which I believe is allowed for this purpose. Question: Is there anyway to unlock the gates so we can drive into the fields with the training equipment?

Thanks for any assistance or information you can provide.



Best -

Paul Zoba

22209 NE 156th Place, Woodinville
206-920-8388



Comment 143: from Sam Pace

DATE: April 25, 2018

TO: WDFW

DELIVERY: Email to - SEPADesk2@DFW.wa.gov

FROM: Sam Pace, Immediate Past President Sam@SamPace.com
Whistling Wings HRC (253) 630-5541
29839 154th Ave SE
Kent, WA 98042-4557

RE: **SEPA COMMENTS RE: Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas, including but not limited to**
Restoration of Historical Dog Training Uses at Cherry Valley Wildlife Area

Dear WDFW:

I am writing to you in my capacity as the Immediate Past President of Whistling Wings Hunting Retriever Club (WWHRC) to request the Department in its 10 year plan direct the Cherry Valley site in the Snoqualmie Valley be re-opened to dog training in a manner consistent with the historical use of the property that has been allowed for most of the time since the property was acquired in the mid-1970s.

Whistling Wings HRC is a welcoming, non-profit, all volunteer club helping owners develop their family dogs into well-trained retrievers for hunting, home and retrieving field competitions. Whistling Wings HRC is affiliated with the Hunting Retriever Club (HRC) program of the United Kennel Club (UKC).

Whistling Wings HRC is also the oldest, and largest, HRC club west of the Rocky Mountains. Our club was founded in the Snoqualmie Valley, and held its very first competition at Cherry Valley after the property was purchased by the State of Washington.

From October to February, our members go bird hunting. But from February through September we hold monthly training days (and extend invitations to those sessions to approximately 165 families on our distribution list). We also have an additional 300 families (who own retrievers that are trained on a regular basis to be proficient in the field) that we communicate with periodically during the year.

In addition, we typically hold twice-yearly retriever competitions in the Snoqualmie River Valley, and regularly draw dogs and handlers from British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, California and Montana. Last summer we also drew entries from as far away as Alaska and Texas. Those events not only meet the needs of dog owners, they pump tourist dollars (meals, motels, gas, etc.) into the local economies of Duvall, Carnation, Fall City, Issaquah, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Redmond and Monroe.

Whistling Wings got its start at Cherry Valley, and our members and our Board have repeatedly expressed strong interest in using the Cherry Valley site for hunting retriever training as they were previously able, and allowed, to do.

However, in recent years, we have been functionally evicted from being able to use the property for retriever training, and hunting retriever events, due to local WDFW restrictive management practices that:

- 1. Are inconsistent with the historic uses of the property (since it was acquired by the State) that included dog training, which along with hunting was one of the most popular public uses of the property.**
- 2. Constrain the portion of the property available for hunting retriever training to approximately 20 acres, which is far less acreage than is required for the activity, and far less acreage than was previously available for dog training.**

Additionally, the opportunity to train dogs to retrieve waterfowl dispatched on water has been eliminated. We hunt ducks and geese over water, and dogs need to know how to work in both swimming water and running water. Originally, we had access to water on the Cherry Valley property for purposes of dog training, but now there is only access to about 20 acres of land, which is totally inadequate for field dog training and/or field events.

- 3. Refused to mow the property. Refusing to mow is not only inconsistent with DFW's past practice, local DFW staff has expressly acknowledged that refusing to mow renders the property unusable for dog training (see the e-mail on page 3 of these comments regarding not mowing to "*discourage them*" from dog training).**

This practice of not mowing has continued even when money has been raised by the dog training community to cover the cost: When "cost" was offered as a rationalization for not mowing, the dog training community raised \$2,000 in about 24 hours. Mowing – paid for with portions of those funds - was only allowed once, and even though funding remains available to cover the cost, mowing has not been allowed since then. In 2017 members of the sporting dog community mowed the property at their own expense, but the local manager has failed to follow up to ensure the mowing continues, even on a volunteer basis and no marginal expense to the Department.

- 4. Confined limited parking so close to the state highway that egress/ingress results in serious (but artificially DFW-created) safety issues for vehicles entering the parking lot, vehicles leaving the parking lot, and for dogs being loaded on-to and off-of vehicles in the parking lot.**
- 5. Eliminated our access to safer parking areas closer to the center of the property (adjacent to the seasonal water ponds).**
- 6. Effectively deprive less physically capable individuals (and especially the disabled, and too many of our seniors) from being able to make safe use of the property for retriever training as they previously could do.**

To the extent any of the recently implemented local WDFW restrictive management practices that have functionally evicted dog training from the Cherry Valley site are based on the substance of the following e-mail (or to the extent they are based on *local management sentiments* within WDFW that are consistent with the following e-mail) I think it is important that the substance of this agency e-mail be addressed directly. The department has refused to do so since at least 2016. The e-mail I'm referencing states:

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:26 PM

To: Boehm, Brian (DFW)

Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)

Brian,

Yeah, just too many things going on last week and I'm in Oly this week for training. Anyway, once again, I'm not real excited about dog training on our lands anyway. What's in it for us? We don't get much of the Discover Pass \$\$ and very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses. If we are going to allow it, it needs to be understood that it's only on the designated, signed area of Cherry Valley. One thing that may discourage them is the fact that the place isn't mowed and the grass gets pretty high. I don't see where we should make a whole lot of effort to mow just for commercial dog training. Commercial training also raises some concerns. These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests and field trials and many times are actually out there on the property with a customer who is interested in buying one of their dogs. Very difficult to prove but something that all of them should be made aware of. They need a commercial use permit from us to do anything of that sort. One guy just out tossing a dummy for his daughter from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us. When some of the big outfits move in there, they pretty much take the place over and get pretty testy when anyone else shows up just wanting to walk their dog. That isn't going to be tolerated. If they have a trial permit, it still does not allow for exclusive use according to the wording on the permit.

Just some thoughts. You can email me back today with anything further and I should be able to reply during a break in this VERY exciting training.

K

Sergeant

Kim Chandler

As the agency no doubt observed in the e-mail, Mr. Chandler acknowledges his assertions are "*very difficult to prove...*" which is not at all surprising to me, because (with all due respect) they are largely inaccurate.

Other portions of this DFW staff e-mail are not only inaccurate, but also pretty offensive. I trust those disappointing items are immediately obvious to the Commissioners when reading the e-mail, such that it is not necessary for me to detail those items for you here.

However, I think it's important to begin to set the record straight, especially if the Commission's corrective decisions (or the Director's decisions) regarding the management of Cherry Valley are based, or would be based, on the kinds of inaccurate information in Mr. Chandler's e-mail.

Let's begin with the notion that pro trainers participate in training to sell puppies. The allegation is completely unfounded as regards our club, and generally. In my experience, most trainers don't want to be in the puppy business.

For example: We have three professional trainers who are members of our non-profit, all volunteer, dog training club. In the last 5 years, only one of the three trainers has had a litter of puppies. That trainer had a single litter of puppies in order to perpetuate "the line" of her own aging dog that she hunts with. Then, the dog (that had that single litter of puppies) was spade.

The Snoqualmie River Valley has a long-standing, and storied, international reputation for great hunting dogs that have been trained here. In fact, the only two *UKC/HRC International Grand Champion Hunting Retrievers* in history that were whelped west of the Rocky Mountains are current members of our local club (two female Labrador Retrievers: one black, one yellow).

HRC was created “*by hunters, for hunters*” and both of those International Grand Champions are hunting dogs owned by local “non-pro” families who regularly hunt waterfowl and upland birds here in Washington. Neither dog has ever had a litter, and neither competes in conformation/show events.

Please Note: This observation is *not* intended to disparage confirmation dogs whose owners also enjoy training their retrievers for the field, competing in retriever events, and strengthening the breeds of dogs to be proficient at performing the purposes for which they were bred.

It’s also not intended to convey an impression that our club is mostly about Labrador Retrievers. We invite you to come to our events where you’ll likely see not only black, yellow and chocolate Labrador Retrievers, but also Golden Retrievers, Chesapeake Bay Retrievers, Boykin Spaniels, Labradoodles, Irish Water Spaniels, Standard Poodles, Cocker Spaniels, Flat Coated Retrievers, and even an occasional Norwegian Duck Toller. Although only registered dogs are able to earn titles for their pedigree, any dog capable of learning to do the work of a hunting retrieving is welcome to train with us, to compete at our events, and to earn ribbons when they are successful.

However, the observation above about the International Grand Champions is intended to take serious issue with the statements in the DFW e-mail that appears to be from staff member Sgt. Kim Chandler to DFW staff member Brian Boehm that, “*very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses...I don’t see where we should make a whole lot of effort just to mow for commercial dog training.*”

As you’ll recall from the 4th paragraph of this email:

From October to February, our members go hunting. But from February through September we hold monthly training days (and extend invitations to those sessions to approximately 165 families on our distribution list). We also have an additional 300 families (who own retrievers that are trained on a regular basis to be proficient in the field) that we communicate with periodically during the year.

My wife and I typically hunt waterfowl and upland birds 30 to 40 days per year, and almost all of those days are spent hunting on public lands here in Washington State.

There is very little public land available for the kind of dog training that has historically been welcomed at Cherry Valley. As one of our members recently stated, “*95% of the bird hunting I do is on public land, but I’m not able to do any of my dog training on public land.*”

In fact, JBLM – which requires a very lengthy drive - is the only other public area available that has the acreage and physical characteristics needed for training. But JBLM has no water available most of the year.

So, Cherry Valley is unique in its suitability for several recreational uses: hunting, dog training and wildlife viewing. I am advised that DFW’s enforcement records indicate that conflicts between these users groups are minimal: Not a single such conflict was noted in DFW enforcement records that were requested (via public records request to DFW) for Cherry Valley.

While there are a number of improvements to the Cherry Valley property (and management practices) that should be included in the future 10-year Management Plan for Cherry Valley to accommodate dog training - and we will address those separately in greater detail during the planning process - **there are several actions the Commission should take in the immediate future** (prior to completion of the management planning process) **to restore historical access, and to re-open Cherry Valley to dog training, (and to initiate opportunities for dog training at Stillwater) consistent with the historical uses of the Cherry Valley property previously facilitated by the state**, including the following (each of which is being addressed in greater detail in other materials Commissioners/WDFW have been receiving since 2016 and are continuing to receive):

1. Immediately re-establish the historical dog training area within the boundaries of the Cherry Valley Wildlife Area: At a minimum this accommodation should be consistent with the provisions of the *2006 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Cherry Valley Management Plan* which clearly indicates that Cherry Valley will be available for "Hunting Pheasant and Waterfowl" and "**Recreational and Organized Dog Training and Trials**" (emphasis added).

The 2006 plan notes that hunting and dog trials were the most popular uses of these grounds. In fact, the plan notes that dog training usage at Cherry Valley had increased 27% in recent years leading up to 2006.

2. Unlock the gates during the non-nesting season: Leave both gates unlocked for the entire period when pheasant and waterfowl seasons are closed (traditionally the gates were open other than hunting season). If locked, provide all clubs with the gate code for distribution to members. Do not restrict access with a "call in" system; instead, (if locked) have access available any time with a code-type padlock. Agency promises regarding unlock access have not been kept, and the agency has reneged on its word. Great agencies, like great men, should keep their word.
3. Allow access to the Cherry Valley property from both the north and south roads
4. Allow parking at the interior parking lot adjacent to the water ponds.
5. Mow/remove the canary grass, even if it is necessary to condition the mowing on funding availability from dog training groups. The mowing should be done with input from the various dog training groups (retrievers, pointers, flushers, trackers, etc.) who will help fund the cost of mowing. Ensure the 10-year plan includes replanting canary grass with native grasses.
6. Keep non-native plants from encroaching on the ponds. Keep the trees and shrubs cleared from around the ponds (as was previously done) so that the ponds can be used for water retriever training; and
7. Actively enforce restrictions on pesticides use on the farmed portions of the property.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments.

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam Pace, Immediate Past President

sam@sampace.com (253) 630-5541

Comment 144: from Sam Pace

TO: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)

In care of SEPADesk2@DFW.wa.gov & Director@DFW.wa.gov

With a "Courtesy Copy" to the following individuals:

Leslie.Connelly@ofm.wa.gov, Jim.Cahill@ofm.wa.gov, Jim.Crawford@ofm.wa.gov, Scott.Merriman@ofm.wa.gov, Roselyn.Marcus@ofm.wa.gov,
Patricia.Lashway@ofm.wa.gov, Pat.Lashway@ofm.wa.gov, David.Schumacher@ofm.wa.gov, Drew.Shirk@gov.wa.gov, David.Postman@gov.wa.gov,
Andi.Smith@gov.wa.gov, Keith.Phillips@gov.wa.gov

The "Courtesy" copies are provided in consideration of

(1) Potential adverse political, financial, administrative and policy related impacts both inside and outside DFW which have the potential to affect the work of the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the Governor's Office (GOV), and

(2) Because the potential adverse impacts could likely be avoided by early action NOW.

FROM: Sam Pace

RE: SEPA # 18016 - Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan

A. Introduction

I am writing to share some personal thoughts and observations in the hope that doing so may be helpful to DFW, OFM and GOV in avoiding a political conflagration (later this year, and early next year) in connection with the Legislature's consideration of DFW's budget.

There is a fast-growing movement of outdoor enthusiasts (specifically Sporting Dog owners who hunt with their dogs, and to a lesser degree equestrians) migrating away from repeated largely unsuccessful efforts to work with DFW on concerns involving management of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas.

Those stakeholders (now numbering in the hundreds) are beginning to focus on the Legislature in an experienced and well-organized way that has the potential to create enormous new high-profile political challenges for DFW, especially if literally hundreds of stakeholders show up at the legislature to testify in opposition to DFW's budget in connection with the agency's efforts next session to obtain:

A. Continued funding for the operation of DFW's Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas (386 acres at Cherry Valley, 456 acres at Stillwater, and 360 acres at Crescent Lake), and

B. New sources of revenue the agency has been seeking from the legislature for at least a couple of years now.

In addition, DFW could encounter citizen-action efforts at the Legislature this fall and next session to restrict its use of *Pittman-Robertson* revenues, additional constraints (in the capital budget) on DFW capital construction, and diversion to other agencies (i.e., Parks) of funding historically allocated to DFW.

I previously submitted written comments to DFW on two occasions (in 2016, and again last month in connection with SEPA #18016) on behalf of Whistling Wings Hunting Retriever Club regarding concerns about DFW's management of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas. I believe there is significant merit to those concerns. The most recent of those comments are attached below in order to help explain the substance of wide-spread concerns with the agency's management of Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area assets.

These personal “**additional**” SEPA comments I am submitting are not on behalf of any organizations or persons, but instead are an entirely personal effort on my part to try to minimize the potential for DFW, OFM and GOV to be blindsided at the legislature later this year, and during the 2019 Legislative session(s).

As someone with an affinity for natural resources, earlier in my life I worked on natural resources issues for the Oregon Fish Commission, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and as a licensed and federally-permitted commercial fishing guide.

So, I hope it is understandable that I would prefer that DFW, OFM and GOV not be subjected to an avoidable “Battle-Royale” over DFW’s budget if there is leadership within DFW, OFM or GOV willing to step-in and address meritorious concerns NOW before a fight at the legislature is the only remaining alternative available for the public to obtain redress of grievances.

It may seem somewhat unusual for these kinds of financial/political comments to be included in the above-referenced SEPA process, so please allow me to offer this explanation (which admittedly stretches a bit outside the box):

I’ve chosen to take this opportunity to share these personal “additional” SEPA comments because I believe successful citizen-action efforts at the Legislature to constrain DFW’s funding (in response to significant leadership failures, and citizen disenfranchisement by Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area DFW staff members) could constrain DFW’s management options in a way that would create a need to modify this and other SEPA analyses for both Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area lands/waters managed by DFW, and for other assets managed by DFW.

B. Why DFW Funding Is Likely to Be “A Magnet” For Well-Organized Opposition

At the Legislature if DFW Doesn’t Address Concerns Satisfactorily Before November

In 2016 DFW began a “planning process” which the local DFW Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas manager appeared intent on using to institutionalize a number of new use restrictions that he had been attempting to impose unilaterally at “Cherry Valley” (386 acres just north of Duvall on the eastside of Highway 203). Those restrictions have the effect of eliminating decades-long historical uses, disenfranchising sporting dog owners, increasing safety hazards, and functionally evicting both disabled dog owners and the Sporting Dog Community’s long-standing use of the property for hunting/tracking dog training, and hunting/tracking dog competitions. The de minimis dog training areas remaining were so incredibly small as to amount to a functional eviction of the historical accommodation of dog training and dog trials.

As part of that planning process, on April 11, 2016, DFW held a meeting at its Mill Creek office to receive public comment regarding management of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas. More than 60 Sporting Dog enthusiasts showed-up in order to express their objections to the lack of functional access to, and their functional eviction from, Cherry Valley for hunting dog training, and hunting dog hunt tests/trials.

Individuals also attended the April 11, 2016 meeting to express their disappointment and objections to the fact that DFW’s Snoqualmie Valley manager Brian Boehm had assembled a hand-picked “advisory committee” but replaced individuals on the advisory committee who dared to express pointed concerns or disagreement regarding Boehm’s management of the properties, especially as regards disenfranchisement and functional eviction of the Sporting Dog Community.

The attendees who showed up at the April 11, 2016 meeting are members of numerous local dog clubs in the Central Puget Sound Region that are affiliated with the American Kennel Club (AKC), the United Kennel Club (UKC), North American Hunting Retriever Association (NAHRA), Irish Water Spaniel Club of Puget Sound (IWSCOPS), American Pointing Labrador Association (APLA), Northwest Boykin Spaniel Club (NWBCS), etc.

Even before the April 11, 2016, meeting in the Mill Creek office concluded, DFW immediately recognized the hornets' nest it had created was not going to disappear quickly or quietly without the concerns of attendees being addressed substantively and satisfactorily. So, in June 2016, DFW convened a very small stakeholders' group of approximately a dozen representatives from the Sporting Dog Community to attend a "closed, by invitation only" series of meetings regarding the Sporting Dog Community's concerns.

With the benefit of hindsight, it is now apparent the small group process simply attempted to mollify and wear-out stakeholder participants. Each time the shortcomings in the manager's practices were laid bare by stakeholders, the process returned to the beginning point in what was a seemingly endless circular process that went nowhere.

For example: The DFW local manager attempted to rationalize some administrative decisions by claiming conflicts existed among different groups of users. A public records request process demonstrated the claim to be unfounded. But rather than setting the discredited claim aside and moving forward to address the specific concerns and concrete proposals that had been offered-up in writing by stakeholders, the stakeholder process once again returned to the point of the beginning for another trek around the endless circle.

Another example: When the DFW local manager attempted to rationalize some administrative decisions (that have disenfranchised the Sporting Dog Community) by claiming his decisions were based on, and consistent with, two weekends of on-site surveys of Cherry Valley users, members of these stakeholder group were able to quickly demonstrate the survey methodology was fundamentally and fatally-flawed because it was structured in a way that circumvented the possibility of input from hunting dog owners who hunt waterfowl and upland birds:

- The survey was conducted on weekends during the summer. Those summer weekends are when the hunting dog competitions occur, and the dog owners were at those competitions, not at Cherry Valley. The local manager's selection of the four sampling days worked to completely exclude the interests of the Sporting Dog Community from the survey results.
- Moreover, even though such hunting dog test/trials have historically occurred at Cherry Valley (for literally decades), the local DFW manager unilaterally decided to no longer allow those hunting dog tests/trials to occur on the property, which compounded the exclusion of the opinions of the Sporting Dog Community from the survey results.

But again, rather than engaging on the proposals stakeholders had put forward to restore long-standing historical uses at Cherry Valley, the stakeholder process once again returned to the point of the beginning for another trek around the endless circle.

When DFW continued to fail to engage on proposals the stakeholders had put forward to restore decades-old historical uses at Cherry Valley, the stakeholders' group pressed DFW to quit running in circles and instead bring to the table concrete proposals DFW was willing to pursue to address the concerns of the recently disenfranchised Sporting Dog Community.

On September 15, 2016, DFW did so. But then on December 9th DFW did an unexpected reversal of its position and without explanation “took back” their proposals, leaving almost nothing on the table except more circuitous process. Then, at a “short notice” stakeholder meeting three days later (on December 12th) DFW did even more “take-backs” above and beyond the items that had been removed from consideration on December 9th. Especially disappointing was the fact that stakeholders pointedly requested a substantive explanation for the action, DFW offered no substantive or comprehensible explanation for doing so.

Thereafter, on December 14, 2016, on incredibly short notice, DFW Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas manager Brian Boehm held a meeting of his personally hand-picked “Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Advisory Committee” for the purposes of having them participate in the wildlife area planning process. There was no meeting notice available for the public (regarding the meeting date, time, location or agenda), and members of the Sporting Dog Community (including myself) who sought to obtain timely information to be able to attend the meeting were unable to do so. The working document for the meeting that was later produced by DFW staff gave little attention to dog training, except for two items involving **“manage dog training areas...to minimize impacts”** and potentially **“explore further restricting dogs.”**

On January 24, 2017, more senior managers (including Brian Boehm’s immediate supervisor Russell Link, and DFW North Puget Sound Region 4 Manager Bob Everitt) interceded and met with a small handful of representatives from the Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA), without Brian Boehm present.

They were able to reach consensus quickly - that day - on a possible path forward that could include:

At the 386-acre Cherry Valley Property

- • Making 65 of the 386 acres at Cherry Valley available for dog training forthwith, except from approximately September 15th to January 31st (during hunting season).
- • Provide vehicular access to the interior of the property (including vehicular access to ponds and parking)
- • Allow mowing around the edge of the ponds, so long as there was no unpermitted excavating of the ponds
- • The Sporting Dog Community would maintain approximately 50 acres of the property - including mowing as needed - pursuant to a “Volunteers Agreement” form to be developed. (As noted in the attachment to these “additional” comments, the Sporting Dog Community both raised money for mowing, and also brought in equipment and did the mowing, as an off-budget, in-kind, non-profit contribution to DFW.)
- • Provide 24/7 access through an open North Road gate, together with signage indicating the property was closed from dusk to dawn, and
- • Prohibiting Brian Boehm from attempting to restrict access between February 1st and September 14th (for example, by trying to claim it is not safe to drive on the property).

At the 456-acre Stillwater Property

- Add access to not less than 10 additional acres of property at the Stillwater site for dog training (in response to DFW's unmet obligation that accompanied the source of funds for the state's original acquisition of the Stillwater property). In the WDFW's property acquisition documents (obtained via a Public Records Request under RCW 42.56), the wildlife biologist indicated that Stillwater had plenty of land for pointing dog trials. So, one of the questions not resolved at this particular meeting was, "Why limit dog training to just 10 acres?"
- DFW indicated that it would add a bullet point (specific wording not yet completed) that would give the Sporting Dog Community the possibility of doing hunt tests/field trials etc. on the Stillwater property.
- DFW cautioned that in order for the Sporting Dog Community to be able to make use of the Stillwater site as WSDTA desired, dog training volunteers may have to be the ones mowing and clearing because DFW was having problems getting sharecroppers to take-on some of the DFW's projects. WSDTA advised DFW that the organization is still growing rather quickly and that WSDTA could begin additional fund raising soon, in which case WSDTA may be able to take care of both mowing at Cherry Valley, and some of the mowing at Stillwater.

At the 360-acre Crescent Lake Property

- At this meeting, DFW and WSDTA did not address specifics regarding the items involving Crescent Lake.

Additional Items of Concern for DFW

- *Bird/Hunting Dogs vs. Sporting Dogs*: DFW wants to ensure that "sporting dogs" (for purposes of allowing dog training and hunt tests/trials on Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area properties) is limited to dogs with a hunting focus. DFW wanted to be clear that the goal of the use/agreement will not be expanded to include broader non-hunting-related dog training categories, such as "agility, etc."
- "Tracking" dogs: DFW indicated that if WSDTA wants to train dogs to "track" a scent on the property that would be fine, but at this time they will not allow tracking tests.

DFW and WSDTA began moving forward to implement the agreement, including WSDTA undertaking to mow Cherry Valley as an in-kind, non-profit, contribution to DFW, and to clear access to the ponds: The Sporting Dog Community raised the funding necessary to mow the property, secured mowing equipment and volunteers, volunteers went through agency-approved training, and got the property mowed. And for a time, there was some improvement in access to the property.

But that too fell apart. When personnel changes in DFW occurred, the local manager of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas seized upon those personnel changes as an excuse to disavow the agency's commitments to work collaboratively with the Sporting Dog Community, claim those changes were only for 2017, and announced he would return to managing Cherry Valley consistent with what many stakeholders perceive to be his personal peccadilloes.

Subsequently, on April 24, 2018, DFW held a second meeting at its Mill Creek office to take additional public comment, this time in connection with SEPA review required as part of the agency's planning process for the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas managed by DFW.

Having seen the agency try to lead the stakeholder group around in circles beginning in June 2016, and the refusal of the local DFW Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area office staff to carry-through on the commitments of more senior agency managers, more than 100 Sporting Dog enthusiasts endured peak-rush-hour traffic through Seattle to show up at the meeting on April 24 at DFW's Mill Creek office to register their objections. To put the attendance at the April 24th meeting in context, the number of people from the Sporting Dog Community showing up to express their opposition increased by 66% for this second meeting at the Mill Creek office. (60+ on 4/11/2016, then 100+ on 4/24/2018 = 66% increase.)

The new managers in DFW's North Puget Sound Region 4 appear to be sympathetic to the legitimate concerns of the Sporting Dog Community. Accordingly, they might be tempted to believe that it will be sufficient to merely work to address the Sporting Dog Community's concerns in the ongoing 10-year planning process. They might even be tempted to assume that because they are new players who have not personally broken faith, that they have a fresh start. From what I know, I believe that would be a serious misreading of the tea leaves.

The reason I believe that to be the case is that DFW's local manager of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas has torched whatever equity had been created when more senior managers had stepped-in to try to work in good faith with the representatives from the Sporting Dog Community whose members had been endeavoring to work cooperatively and collaboratively with the agency for more than a year.

So now, with DFW continuing to allow its local Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas manager to...

- Effectively repudiate the agreement and progress that had been made, and
- Once again act unilaterally to functionally evict the Sporting Dog Community from Cherry Valley, and
- Once again fail to address the legitimate concerns of the well-organized Sporting Dog Community...

...hundreds of stakeholders in the Sporting Dog Community appear to be concluding very quickly that their best option is a well-organized, concerted, citizen-action ground game at the Legislature to go after DFW's financial jugular in a way that will produce a political reckoning unlike anything DFW has experienced in decades.

Otherwise, they face the possibility of being frozen-out of dog training opportunities for the next decade by the local DFW manager mis-using the planning process to disenfranchise and functionally evict them from the Snoqualmie Valley.

I believe a firestorm at the Legislature can be avoided, but it will take senior leadership from DFW, OFM and GOV to:

- Make and keep firm substantive commitments on behalf of DFW and GOV to approve and immediately restore decades-old historical use of Cherry Valley, and
- Do so before November, and
- Provide iron-clad (preferably actionable) assurances that the shenanigans emanating from local staffers in DFW's Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area office cannot, and will not, be repeated.

I believe two other important observations are worth adding here:

(1) In envisioning the possibilities for successfully avoiding a firestorm engulfing DFW's budget (in a way that prevents the "forum" in which these conflicts will be resolved from migrating out of DFW and over to the Legislature) I believe it's worth remembering that a whole lot of progress was made between DFW and WSDTA in a single day on these very issues. Reasonable people of good faith have demonstrated they can work together and are willing to do so, even though restoring trust may be a bit of a challenge for DFW because the agency continues to allow its local Snoqualmie Valley office manager to unilaterally eviscerate the commitments made "more-senior" managers in Region 4 of DFW.

(2) It occurs to me that leadership in OFM and GOV may be wondering *"Even if folks are upset, what is the substantial aggravating factor that would be sufficient to motivate literally hundreds of members of the Sporting Dog Community to venomously target DFW's budget at the legislature with well-organized citizen-action?"*

Candidly, there is enormous deep-seeded disrespect of the Sporting Dog Community in the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas office. Members of the Sporting Dog Community believe such animosity is verified and reflected in the following e-mail exchange between the DFW Snoqualmie Valley enforcement officer (Sgt. Kim Chandler) and the DFW Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas manager (Brian Boehm):

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:26 PM

To: Boehm, Brian (DFW)

Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)

Brian,

Yeah, just too many things going on last week and I'm in Oly this week for training. Anyway, once again, I'm not real excited about dog training on our lands anyway. What's in it for us? We don't get much of the Discover Pass \$\$ and very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses. If we are going to allow it, it needs to be understood that it's only on the designated, signed area of Cherry Valley. One thing that may discourage them is the fact that the place isn't mowed and the grass gets pretty high. I don't see where we should make a whole lot of effort to mow just for commercial dog training. Commercial training also raises some concerns. These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests and field trials and many times are actually out there on the property with a customer who is interested in buying one of their dogs. Very difficult to prove but something that all of them should be made aware off. They need a commercial use permit from us to do anything of that sort. One guy just out tossing a dummy for his daughter from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us. When some of the big outfits move in there, they pretty much take the place over and get pretty testy when anyone else shows up just wanting to walk their dog. That isn't going to be tolerated. If they have a trial permit, it still does not allow for exclusive use according to the wording on the permit.

Just some thoughts. You can email me back today with anything further and I should be able to reply during a break in this VERY exciting training.

K

Sergeant

Kim Chandler

As OFM and GOV will no doubt observe, Kim Chandler acknowledges his assertions are *"very difficult to prove..."* which is not at all surprising to me, because (with all due respect) they are largely inaccurate.

Other portions of this DFW staff e-mail are not only inaccurate, but also pretty offensive. I trust those disappointing items are immediately obvious to OFM and GOV such that it is not necessary for me to detail those items for you here. Even so, if necessary to do so, members of the Sporting Dog Community are prepared to detail them for legislators in every hearing on DFW's budget.

The email has been widely-circulated among hundreds of members of the Sporting Dog Community.

Since at least May 2016, DFW's Commissioners and the top managers (at the time) have been aware of the contents of the email. Rather than being willing to discuss the email publicly, the regional manager responded in writing (on behalf of the then-Director) that they did not believe it would be "beneficial." To be fair to the Acting Director, I'm not aware that any such comments have been made by Joe Stohr.

It's not difficult to imagine that some legislators might have some pointed questions about the email if DFW's budget becomes the subject of highly-politicized hearings leading up to, and during, the 2019 session. It is my understanding that there were meetings last month with at least three well-placed legislators, although that information is second-hand because I was not personally present at those meetings.

C. When and How Might a Well-Organized Citizen-Action Ground Game at the Legislature Unfold if DFW, OFM and GOV Fail to Take Advantage of the Existing Opportunity To Formally Remedy the Situation Prior to November?

During the current legislative interim - most likely in November and December after the General Election - the Legislature will likely begin considering a two-year budget for each state agency.

Legislators could begin that process by holding "work sessions" on individual agency budgets. Those work sessions will be open to the public, and if past-practice is any guide will likely include opportunities for legislators to hear from the public by taking public testimony.

I anticipate that in addition to renewal of historical funding, WDFW may once again seek approval of one or more new revenue sources that the legislature has declined to approve in prior sessions.

In the past, the early hearing on the WDFW budget usually hasn't taken more than an hour or so. In 2017, DFW was largely able to "fly under the public's radar" in connection with its budget.

But the 2019 session could be more difficult for the agency for four reasons:

1. There is considerable angst among voting taxpayers about "more money for government" at any level - especially in connection with recent property tax hikes approved by legislators in 2017 to fund McCleary, and recent action by the Seattle City Council on an unrelated head tax and unlawful income tax. There may be an effort to deflect some of the outcry regarding property taxes by considering other replacement taxes, such as new tax on energy and a capital gains tax. It does not appear there are sufficient votes in the Senate Democratic Caucus to pass a capital gains tax next session.

WDFW could have trouble getting new revenue sources approved in that kind of a tax-hostile environment.

2. Much more directly relevant to WDFW is the leadership crisis (and recent scandals) that has plagued the Department. The Governor may be lucky to find anybody possessing the chops for the Director's job who is willing to take it. Hopefully Joe Stohr would be open to the possibility, but it is not difficult to imagine that adding new volatility to the Department's finances might be a source of reservations for any potential candidate.

3. A significant contingent of salmon anglers remains more than disappointed in connection with last year's lack of a timely salmon season, especially since native fishers began fishing before there was a commitment to a season for Washington's sport anglers. It remains to be seen whether or not those frustrated anglers will target DFW's budget during the 2019 session; but if the agency's budget becomes controversial for other reasons, some anglers may view the development as creating a new target of opportunity.

4. All of those challenges to the agency getting a budget approved ARE BEFORE Sporting Dog owners enter the fray. **Ideally, it should not be necessary for them to do so.**

But if Sporting Dog Owners have no other effective option, NO ONE should be surprised to see them move to a new forum by making a concerted effort to reach out directly to legislators in a way that is intended to put the agency's ENTIRE BUDGET through the political and budgetary wringer, not just the appropriations for the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas, and not just new revenue sources.

The organize Sporting Dog Community has a demonstrated history of possessing considerable political chops:

- When King County considered using zoning to restrict Sporting Dog training in the Snoqualmie Valley some years ago, County Councilmembers quashed the idea immediately after receiving hundreds of phone calls in less than 2-hours.
- The owners of these Sporting Dogs compete in AKC and UKC competitions, and success in those competitions is reflected on each dog's formal registration papers/pedigree.

In addition to competing in national and international events, these sporting dogs are used as conservation tools for hunting ducks, geese, pheasants, quail, chucker, grouse, etc.

That said, sporting dog owners know that they are also an "upstream source" of dog pedigrees, dog training and dog trainers relied upon by United States Customs, the Department of Defense, ATF, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, etc. for activities that span everything from drug dogs, to bomb dogs, to IED dogs, to the dogs that recently sniffed out illegal ivory imports. In fact, some of the handlers of those dogs, and the dogs themselves, are introduced to the basics at our club training days for retrievers. Not surprisingly then, sporting dog owners also have a wide variety of relationships with federal agencies, federal officials and members of Congress.

- For purposes that are relevant here, the demographic characteristics of the owners of these dogs tend to be typified by the following:
 - o These dog owners possess Discretionary Income

- o These dog owners possess a measure of Discretionary Time

- Many of these dog owners have personal relationships with elected decision-makers at every level of federal, state and local government, which is why candidates for office often "seek them out" when running for office, and
 - A considerable number of these dog owners do not have children. They are euphemistically referred to as "Pet Parents." If someone starts messing with their pets, it's a bit like the person is messing with their children, which helps to explain why in such situations these dog owners combine their access to discretionary time, their discretionary income, their disquiet at being disrespected, and their political contacts, to vindicate their family members.
-
- Sporting Dog owners have demonstrated they can and will engage, especially on issues that affect them directly, personally and negatively...as this issue does. That's reflected in the following:
 - When the DFW small group stakeholder process began to go in circles with no real hope of the agency stepping forward to substantively address their concerns, they organized a new formal statewide **Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA)** that has now brought together the various sporting dog clubs across the state to present a united front to DFW, legislators and the public.
 - The first time they had the opportunity to engage with DFW on this specific issue was on short notice in 2016 when 60+ of them drove to Mill Creek to meet with the agency to express their concerns regarding the mismanagement of Cherry Valley (the DFW site located just north of Duvall on Hwy 203) ...and that was before they got really ticked-off because of actions taken by DFW's Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area local manager subsequent to that 2016 meeting held in Mill Creek.
 - That's why more than 100 people showed up for the meeting at the WDFW Mill Creek office on April 24, 2018, which was a 66% increase over the number that showed up at the prior meeting in Mill Creek.
 - They are tenacious, and they are not going away.
 - If you obtain and look through the written comments that were submitted to DFW in 2016 and 2018, you will see that the great bulk of work to prepare for the 2019 legislative session and budget hearings has already been done by the Sporting Dog Community. It's "in the can" and ready to go.

So, imagine twice that many people (200+) showing up to testify at the Legislature's work session on the WDFW budget in November/December 2018, and that the number grows to something closer to 500 activists once the Legislature convenes in January.

Why do I believe the organized Sporting Dog Community is likely to do that if things don't change before November? Four reasons (actually, five reasons if you include the content of that email between DFW staffers Chandler and Boehm):

1. They have experienced extreme frustration at having no real ability to directly affect the decisions of a very small handful of agency personnel who have chosen to disenfranchise them

2. They understand that members of the public have direct access to legislators who control the agency's budget
3. They know legislators (and legislative candidates) who are campaigning right now to be elected in November are willing to take as much time as needed to listen whenever large well-organized, politically-active voters want to talk to them, and
4. Compared to asking legislators to solve property tax rage, homelessness, and transportation congestion, the Sporting Dog owners know they would be asking for something simple: Get tough with an agency that has not only harmed them directly, but also been a bit of an ineffective embarrassment to legislators on both sides of the aisle, and both sides of the "Cascade Curtain."

Making a promise to take-on DFW for failing to reign-in rogue operators is an easy promise for a legislator to make. And, it will be a promise that legislators would likely decide to keep if hundreds of Sporting Dog owners show up to testify against DFW's budget during the 2019 session.

Putting 500 dog owners in the hearing room in Olympia for a legislative hearing on the WDFW budget would be achievable with a modicum of effort, especially given the broad-based circulation of the staff email. Ugly, loud, pointed, messy and with long-lasting impact. But definitely doable.

If the Cherry Valley shenanigans are not definitively resolved this summer, come this fall it won't be just "new revenue sources" that could be in jeopardy, there could also be an all-out frontal assault at the Legislature on the agency's entire budget.

I don't have a crystal ball that allows me to know what an "ask" of legislators might be at a hearing on the DFW budget, but it doesn't take a lot of imagination to envision what some of the low-hanging fruit might be for agency opponents seeking to send a "*Never to Be Forgotten*" message to the agency:

- • Include a proviso in the 2019-2021 budget that reduces the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area local manager staffing from 1.0 FTE down to 0.4 FTEs (a reduction of 0.6 FTEs), and
- • Include a proviso in the 2019-2021 budget that reduces the Region 4 enforcement sergeant position serving the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area from 1.0 FTEs down to 0.25 FTEs (a reduction of 0.75 FTEs) and increase non-supervisory enforcement staffing in Region 4 by the amount saved from reducing that specific sergeant position to 0.25 FTEs.
- • Authorize no new revenue sources for WDFW for the 2019-2021 biennial budget cycle
- • Allow no increases in the price of licenses or tags, especially in the wake of large increases previously approved
- • Shift to Parks: ○ All Discover Pass revenues that would normally/traditionally have been allocated/appropriated to DFW in the 2019-21 budget cycle, and
- ○ All boat launch-related revenues/fees that normally/traditionally would have been allocated/appropriated to DFW in the 2019-2021 budget cycle
-
- • Require that all *Pittman-Robertson* revenues be held in a non-appropriated restricted reserve account until the later of: ○ Appropriation of the 2021/2023 budget, or
-

○ The Legislature’s approval of a formal budget proviso declaring the agency has cleaned up the management mess in the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas.

- • Include such items in a subsection of the budget that contains other “must-have” items (in order to minimize the potential for a GOV line-item veto).

D. Leadership Capable of Making Binding Substantive Commitments NOW Could Solve/Prevent This

If the disenfranchised Sporting Dog owners take their fight to Olympia, things will likely get a whole lot more difficult and messy for WDFW.

Fortunately for DFW, OFM and GOV, the Sporting Dog Community is well-organized under the umbrella of the **Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA)**, thereby giving OFM and GOV an entity to work with. Even though the local manager of the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas appears intent upon attempting to unwind the progress that was made when more senior DFW managers stepped into the small stakeholders group process and took reasonable positions, I believe the fact that such (now largely eviscerated) progress was achieved is a clear indication that:

- • WSDTA is an entity that OFM and GOV (and perhaps DFW) senior managers can work with, productively and efficiently, and
 - • There is a significant likelihood of being able to reach a substantive firm agreement this summer as long as:
 - Stakeholders in the Sporting Dog Community do not ask for more than simply ✦ (a) reinstatement of pre-2012 historical uses of 386 acres at Cherry Valley, 456 acres at Stillwater, and 360 acres at Crescent Lake
 - ✦ (b) physical access to the properties consistent with decades-long prior practice, and
 - ✦ (c) on-site property conditions – such as mowed fields and mowed access to ponds, recognizing as indicated below that this may necessitate WSDTA agreeing to do some mowing
 - ○ Stakeholders continue to offer financial and in-kind support at historical levels to assist with mowing Cherry Valley (in order to minimize mowing costs for the Department), and
 - ○ Stakeholders have actionable assurances that eliminate concerns the current local manager will be allowed to ignore or interpret the plain language of the decisions and commitments of more senior decision-makers in DFW, GOV and OFM regarding the management of Cherry Valley and other Snoqualmie Valley DFW assets.

...all of which DFW and GOV ought to be able to commit to NOW, and (because it represents a return to the status quo) also fully including in the DFW 10-year plan that is the subject of this pending SEPA process), and

The WSDTA point of contact is Cindy Olson. Cindy’s e-mail is: cindyto@q.com.

I am persuaded that **RIGHT NOW** is an opportune time for the **OFM, GOV** and **DFW agency leaders** to maintain control of DFW's destiny and funding by dealing decisively with a couple of agency rogue operators in the Snoqualmie Valley who are not only setting the stage for a very contentious fight in the legislature over funding for the Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas, but also are placing a gigantic target on the entire agency budget. The agency will go into this next budget cycle with leadership issues, a tarnished reputation, and an unfavorable political climate with regard to new taxes and fees, even with the legislative and executive branches under Democratic control. Those challenges are plenty large without adding unnecessary and avoidable burdens to the lift, including a conflagration that encompasses the agency's budget. Legislators may also be unimpressed if DFW, OFM and GOV ignore or squander the opportunity available right now to avoid an unnecessary fight over DFW's budget later this fall and during the 2019 session. There is an additional reason to act NOW, which has the potential to impact the future leadership of the agency: Everyone knows it's not a lot of fun to be the superintendent of a school district that has trouble passing its levy. For similar reasons, folks with chops to be DFW Director might not be excited about leading an agency whose financial jugular is exposed to passionate opposition from agency stakeholders. My hope is that sharing my personal thoughts directly and pointedly NOW gives the agency, OFM and GOV notice of the opportunity to manage human and capital resources in a way that could avoid a fiscal and political conflagration this winter, and beyond. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. I hope they will be helpful by giving you an early heads-up to a potential - and increasingly likely - messy situation that in my view can, and should be, avoided by addressing it Now!

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com
253-569-2663

EARLIER "INITIAL" SEPA COMMENTS REFERENCED ABOVE

Whistling Wings

Hunting Retriever Club

Affiliated with the United Kennel Club,
America's Oldest Major Dog Registry

PAGE: 1/5

DATE: April 25, 2018

TO: WDFW

DELIVERY: Email to - SEPADesk2@DFW.wa.gov

FROM: Sam Pace, Immediate Past President Sam@SamPace.com

Whistling Wings HRC (253) 630-5541

29839 154th Ave SE

Kent, WA 98042-4557

RE: SEPA COMMENTS RE: Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Areas, including but not limited to Restoration of Historical Dog Training Uses at Cherry Valley Wildlife Area

Dear WDFW:

I am writing to you in my capacity as the Immediate Past President of Whistling Wings Hunting Retriever Club (WWHRC) to request the Department in its 10-year plan direct the Cherry Valley site in the Snoqualmie Valley be reopened to dog training in a manner consistent with the historical use of the property that has been allowed for most of the time since the property was acquired in the mid-1970s.

Whistling Wings HRC is a welcoming, non-profit, all volunteer club helping owners develop their family dogs into well-trained retrievers for hunting, home and retrieving field competitions. Whistling Wings HRC is affiliated with the Hunting Retriever Club (HRC) program of the United Kennel Club (UKC).

Whistling Wings HRC is also the oldest, and largest, HRC club west of the Rocky Mountains. Our club was founded in the Snoqualmie Valley, and held its very first competition at Cherry Valley after the property was purchased by the State of Washington.

From October to February, our members go bird hunting. But from February through September we hold monthly training days (and extend invitations to those sessions to approximately 165 families on our distribution list). We also have an additional 300 families (who own retrievers that are trained on a regular basis to be proficient in the field) that we communicate with periodically during the year.

In addition, we typically hold twice-yearly retriever competitions in the Snoqualmie River Valley, and regularly draw dogs and handlers from British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, California and Montana. Last summer we also drew entries from as far away as Alaska and Texas. Those events not only meet the needs of dog owners, they pump tourist dollars (meals, motels, gas, etc.) into the local economies of Duvall, Carnation, Fall City, Issaquah, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Redmond and Monroe.

Whistling Wings got its start at Cherry Valley, and our members and our Board have repeatedly expressed strong interest in using the Cherry Valley site for hunting retriever training as they were previously able, and allowed, to do.

However, in recent years, we have been functionally evicted from being able to use the property for retriever training, and hunting retriever events, due to local WDFW restrictive management practices that:

- 1. Are inconsistent with the historic uses of the property (since it was acquired by the State) that included dog training, which along with hunting was one of the most popular public uses of the property.**
- 2. Constrain the portion of the property available for hunting retriever training to approximately 20 acres, which is far less acreage than is required for the activity, and far less acreage than was previously available for dog training.**

Additionally, the opportunity to train dogs to retrieve waterfowl dispatched on water has been eliminated. We hunt ducks and geese over water, and dogs need to know how to work in both swimming water and running water. Originally, we had access to water on the Cherry Valley property for purposes of dog training, but now there is only access to about 20 acres of land, which is totally inadequate for field dog training and/or field events.

- 3. Refused to mow the property. Refusing to mow is not only inconsistent with DFW's past practice, local DFW staff has expressly acknowledged that refusing to mow renders the property unusable for dog training (see the e-mail on page 3 of these comments regarding not mowing to "discourage them" from dog training).**

This practice of not mowing has continued even when money has been raised by the dog training community to cover the cost: When "cost" was offered as a rationalization for not mowing, the dog training community raised \$2,000 in about 24 hours. Mowing – paid for with portions of those funds - was only allowed once, and even though funding remains available to cover the cost, mowing has not been allowed since then. In 2017 members of the sporting dog community mowed the property at their own expense, but the local manager has failed to follow up to ensure the mowing continues, even on a volunteer basis and no marginal expense to the Department.

- 4. Confined limited parking so close to the state highway that egress/ingress results in serious (but artificially DFWF-created) safety issues for vehicles entering the parking lot, vehicles leaving the parking lot, and for dogs being loaded on-to and off-of vehicles in the parking lot.**
- 5. Eliminated our access to safer parking areas closer to the center of the property (adjacent to the seasonal water ponds).**
- 6. Effectively deprive less physically capable individuals (and especially the disabled, and too many of our seniors) from being able to make safe use of the property for retriever training as they previously could do.**

To the extent any of the recently implemented local WDFW restrictive management practices that have functionally evicted dog training from the Cherry Valley site are based on the substance of the following e-mail (or to the extent they are based on *local management sentiments* within WDFW that are consistent with the following e-mail) I think it is important that the substance of this agency e-mail be

addressed directly. The department has refused to do so since at least 2016. The e-mail I'm referencing states:

From: Chandler, Kim (DFW)

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 12:26 PM

To: Boehm, Brian (DFW)

Cc: Link, Russell E (DFW)

Brian,

Yeah, just too many things going on last week and I'm in Oly this week for training. Anyway, once again, I'm not real excited about dog training on our lands anyway. What's in it for us? We don't get much of the Discover Pass \$\$ and very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses. If we are going to allow it, it needs to be understood that it's only on the designated, signed area of Cherry Valley. One thing that may discourage them is the fact that the place isn't mowed and the grass gets pretty high. I don't see where we should make a whole lot of effort to mow just for commercial dog training. Commercial training also raises some concerns. These guys make a lot of \$\$ from winning hunt tests and field trials and many times are actually out there on the property with a customer who is interested in buying one of their dogs. Very difficult to prove but something that all of them should be made aware off. They need a commercial use permit from us to do anything of that sort. One guy just out tossing a dummy for his daughter from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us. When some of the big outfits move in there, they pretty much take the place over and get pretty testy when anyone else shows up just wanting to walk their dog. That isn't going to be tolerated. If they have a trial permit, it still does not allow for exclusive use according to the wording on the permit.

Just some thoughts. You can email me back today with anything further and I should be able to reply during a break in this VERY exciting training.

K

Sergeant

Kim Chandler

As the agency no doubt observed in the e-mail, Mr. Chandler acknowledges his assertions are "very difficult to prove..." which is not at all surprising to me, because (with all due respect) they are largely inaccurate.

Other portions of this DFW staff e-mail are not only inaccurate, but also pretty offensive. I trust those disappointing items are immediately obvious to the Commissioners when reading the e-mail, such that it is not necessary for me to detail those items for you here.

However, I think it's important to begin to set the record straight, especially if the Commission's corrective decisions (or the Director's decisions) regarding the management of Cherry Valley are based, or would be based, on the kinds of inaccurate information in Mr. Chandler's e-mail.

Let's begin with the notion that pro trainers participate in training to sell puppies. The allegation is completely unfounded as regards our club, and generally. In my experience, most trainers don't want to be in the puppy business.

For example: We have three professional trainers who are members of our non-profit, all volunteer, dog training club. In the last 5 years, only one of the three trainers has had a litter of puppies. That trainer had a single litter of puppies in order to perpetuate “the line” of her own aging dog that she hunts with. Then, the dog (that had that single litter of puppies) was spade.

The Snoqualmie River Valley has a long-standing, and storied, international reputation for great hunting dogs that have been trained here. In fact, the only two *UKC/HRC International Grand Champion Hunting Retrievers* in history that were whelped west of the Rocky Mountains are current members of our local club (two female Labrador Retrievers: one black, one yellow).

HRC was created “*by hunters, for hunters*” and both of those International Grand Champions are hunting dogs owned by local “non-pro” families who regularly hunt waterfowl and upland birds here in Washington. Neither dog has ever had a litter, and neither competes in conformation/show events.

Please Note: This observation is *not* intended to disparage confirmation dogs whose owners also enjoy training their retrievers for the field, competing in retriever events, and strengthening the breeds of dogs to be proficient at performing the purposes for which they were bred.

It’s also not intended to convey an impression that our club is mostly about Labrador Retrievers. We invite you to come to our events where you’ll likely see not only black, yellow and chocolate Labrador Retrievers, but also Golden Retrievers, Chesapeake Bay Retrievers, Boykin Spaniels, Labradoodles, Irish Water Spaniels, Standard Poodles, Cocker Spaniels, Flat Coated Retrievers, and even an occasional Norwegian Duck Toller. Although only registered dogs are able to earn titles for their pedigree, any dog capable of learning to do the work of a hunting retrieving is welcome to train with us, to compete at our events, and to earn ribbons when they are successful.

However, the observation above about the International Grand Champions is intended to take serious issue with the statements in the DFW e-mail that appears to be from staff member Sgt. Kim Chandler to DFW staff member Brian Boehm that, “*very few of them actually are hunters and buy our licenses...I don’t see where we should make a whole lot of effort just to mow for commercial dog training.*”

As you’ll recall from the 4th paragraph on page 1 of this letter:

From October to February, our members go hunting. But from February through September we hold monthly training days (and extend invitations to those sessions to approximately 165 families on our distribution list). We also have an additional 300 families (who own retrievers that are trained on a regular basis to be proficient in the field) that we communicate with periodically during the year.

My wife and I typically hunt waterfowl and upland birds 30 to 40 days per year, and almost all of those days are spent hunting on public lands here in Washington State.

There is very little public land available for the kind of dog training that has historically been welcomed at Cherry Valley. As one of our members recently stated, “*95% of the bird hunting I do is on public land, but I’m not able to do any of my dog training on public land.*”

In fact, JBLM – which requires a very lengthy drive - is the only other public area available that has the acreage and physical characteristics needed for training. But JBLM has no water available most of the year.

So, Cherry Valley is unique in its suitability for several recreational uses: hunting, dog training and wildlife viewing. I am advised that DFW’s enforcement records indicate that conflicts between these

users groups are minimal: Not a single such conflict was noted in DFW enforcement records that were requested (via public records request to DFW) for Cherry Valley.

While there are a number of improvements to the Cherry Valley property (and management practices) that should be included in the future 10-year Management Plan for Cherry Valley to accommodate dog training - and we will address those separately in greater detail during the planning process - **there are several actions the Commission should take in the immediate future** (prior to completion of the management planning process) **to restore historical access, and to re-open Cherry Valley to dog training, (and to initiate opportunities for dog training at Stillwater) consistent with the historical uses of the Cherry Valley property previously facilitated by the state**, including the following (each of which is being addressed in greater detail in other materials Commissioners/WDFW have been receiving since 2016 and are continuing to receive):

1. Immediately re-establish the historical dog training area within the boundaries of the Cherry Valley Wildlife Area: At a minimum this accommodation should be consistent with the provisions of the *2006 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Cherry Valley Management Plan* which clearly indicates that Cherry Valley will be available for "Hunting Pheasant and Waterfowl" and **"Recreational and Organized Dog Training and Trials"** (emphasis added).

The 2006 plan notes that hunting and dog trials were the most popular uses of these grounds. In fact, the plan notes that dog training usage at Cherry Valley had increased 27% in recent years leading up to 2006.

2. Unlock the gates during the non-nesting season: Leave both gates unlocked for the entire period when pheasant and waterfowl seasons are closed (traditionally the gates were open other than hunting season). If locked, provide all clubs with the gate code for distribution to members. Do not restrict access with a "call in" system; instead, (if locked) have access available any time with a code-type padlock. Agency promises regarding unlock access have not been kept, and the agency has reneged on its word. Great agencies, like great men, should keep their word.

3. Allow access to the Cherry Valley property from both the north and south roads

4. Allow parking at the interior parking lot adjacent to the water ponds.

5. Mow/remove the canary grass, even if it is necessary to condition the mowing on funding availability from dog training groups. The mowing should be done with input from the various dog training groups (retrievers, pointers, flushers, trackers, etc.) who will help fund the cost of mowing. Ensure the 10-year plan includes replanting canary grass with native grasses.

6. Keep non-native plants from encroaching on the ponds. Keep the trees and shrubs cleared from around the ponds (as was previously done) so that the ponds can be used for water retriever training; and

7. Actively enforce restrictions on pesticides use on the farmed portions of the property.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments.

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam Pace, Immediate Past President

sam@sampace.com

(253) 630-5541

Comment 145: from Sam Pace

Greetings,

The Sporting Dog Community in the Central Puget Sound Region consists primarily of local non-profit dog clubs affiliated with the American Kennel Club [AKC] and United Kennel Club [UKC].

They have been working with WDFW since April 2016 - without success - to restore the decades-old dog training opportunities in the Snoqualmie Valley that were recently and unilaterally eviscerated by a small contingent of WDFW employees in the agency's Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area office.

As a result, WDFW is now facing the very real prospect that if the Sporting Dog Community's concerns are not resolved before November, they will elect to change the "Forum" for addressing their dissatisfaction as stakeholders: They will likely move from trying to work with WDFW, to going after WDFW's 2019-2021 budget in the Legislature.

The purpose and objective in "Changing "Forums" would be to mount a well-organized, experienced and aggressive citizen-action campaign against WDFW's 2019-2021 budget later this year during preliminary budget hearings, and continuing that effort throughout the 2019 legislative session(s).

As someone with a great affinity for natural resources who has worked for the Oregon Fish Commission, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the National Marine Fisheries Service (as well as owning a commercially licensed and federally permitted recreational fishing and whitewater rafting guide company) earlier in my life, I would hate to see that happen.

But I understand the Sporting Dog Community's concerns are real, and have merit.

As a result, I am submitting the attached "additional" SEPA comments (in connection with DFW SEPA #18016) for two reasons:

1. A reduction in DFW funding in the agency's 2019-2021 budget would limit the agency's management options, and that in turn could affect operations and capital projects in ways that would be of consequence and importance in connection with this and other DFW SEPA analyses, and
2. More importantly, I believe these concerns can be resolved before November in a way that will largely eliminate unnecessarily exposing DFW's financial jugular during the Legislature's 2019 budgeting activities.. For reasons explained in the attached (very detailed) comments, that will likely require intervention by top managers at DFW, OFM and/or GOV.

I submitted earlier comments on behalf of Whistling Wings HRC, a nonprofit local dog club affiliated with the international nonprofit Hunting Retriever Program of the United Kennel Club. These "additional" comments are my own "personal" comments and are not offered on behalf of any organization, or on behalf of any other person.

The attached comments are very detailed for a reason - information is power. I believe you have in these comments the information that can help to empower senior managers to neutralize and resolve this situation quickly, efficiently, and with finality.

That was almost achieved once last year, but when senior personnel changes occurred recently in DFW's Region 4, the DFW local Snoqualmie Valley manager seized upon those changes as an opportunity to repudiate the commitments and progress made by more senior personnel, claiming the changes were for 2017 only.

In the time this situation has been festering, the number of members of the organized Sporting Dog Community showing up at DFW "stakeholder" meetings to object to what has been happening has increased by 66% - and at the

last meeting more than 100 members of the public drove through peak-rush-hour Seattle traffic to get to Mill Creek by 600 PM in order to register their objections.

In addition, largely in response to the frustrations with the manager of DFW's Snoqualmie Valley office, hunting dog owners formed a new statewide organization to present a united front to the Legislature and the public: The ***Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA)***.

Literally 200+ people seeking to testify later this year in opposition to the DFW budget, and more than twice that many during the 2019 session, is a very real possibility, in part because of incredibly offensive and widely-distributed emails between staff members in the Snoqualmie Valley office (obtained via a Public Records Request).

That communication between staff members - now publicly disclosed - has enraged an already passionate group of dog owners who have a demonstrated history of political engagement, and unwavering tenacity when rogue operators start messing with their dogs.

This could get very ugly, very fast. It doesn't need to.

There is a clear path forward that was acceptable to both DFW senior managers and dog owners.

I've included those specifics in these comments.

In these comments I've tried to share everything I know - including the specifics of what everyone (except the most junior involved employee at DFW) was willing to agree to - in the hope that you will be as eager as I am to avoid a conflagration consuming DFW's efforts to get a 2019-2021 budget.

I am hopeful you will find the attached comments to be of value in that effort.

Best regards,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com

253-569-2663

Comment 146: from Sam Pace

Greetings,

Late this evening (on May 24, 2018) I noticed a typo in the comments and additional comments I submitted to DFW in connection with SEPA #18016. The typo is located on page 7 of the additional comments in what I believe is the 12th sentence of the June 03, 2013, email from Sgt. Kim Chandler to Brian Boehm.

The typo involves the word “daughter” in the following (incorrect) sentence which instead should have included the word “dog”:

“One guy just out tossing a dummy for his daughter from time to time, although technically training, probably isn’t of much concern to us.”

The corrected sentence, without the typo, should read:

“One guy just out tossing a dummy for his dog from time to time, although technically training, probably isn’t of much concern to us.”

I apologize for the error, for not catching that typo in the original SEPA comments, and for replicating the mistake in my additional SEPA comments.

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com

253-569-2663

----- Original Message -----

Subject: SEPA # 18016 - Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan

From: <sam@sampace.com>

Date: Thu, May 24, 2018 8:12 pm

To: SEPADesk2@DFW.wa.gov

Greetings:

Attached are additional comments I'm submitting for the record in connection with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife SEPA #18016 for the Snoqualmie Wildlife Area Management Plan.

These comments are submitted on behalf of me personally, and not on behalf of any other organization, or any other person.

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com

Comment 147: from Sam Pace

Greetings,

Late this evening (on May 24, 2018) I noticed a typo in the comments and additional comments I submitted to DFW in connection with SEPA #18016. The typo is located on page 7 of the additional comments in what I believe is the 12th sentence of the June 03, 2013, email from Sgt. Kim Chandler to Brian Boehm.

The typo involves the word "daughter" in the following (incorrect) sentence which instead should have included the word "dog":

"One guy just out tossing a dummy for his daughter from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us."

The corrected sentence, without the typo, should read:

"One guy just out tossing a dummy for his dog from time to time, although technically training, probably isn't of much concern to us."

I apologize for the error, for not catching that typo in the original SEPA comments, and for replicating the mistake in my additional SEPA comments.

Sincerely,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com

253-569-2663

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Major - But Avoidable - Opposition to WDFW 2019-2021 Budget Is Forming

From: <sam@sampace.com>

Date: Thu, May 24, 2018 9:41 pm

To: SEPADesk2@DFW.wa.gov, Director@DFW.wa.gov

Cc: Leslie.Connelly@ofm.wa.gov, Jim.Cahill@ofm.wa.gov,

Jim.Crawford@ofm.wa.gov, Scott.Merriman@ofm.wa.gov,

Roselyn.Marcus@ofm.wa.gov, Patricia.Lashway@ofm.wa.gov,

Pat.Lashway@ofm.wa.gov, David.Schumacher@ofm.wa.gov,

Drew.Shirk@gov.wa.gov, David.Postman@gov.wa.gov, Andi.Smith@gov.wa.gov,

Keith.Phillips@gov.wa.gov

Greetings,

The Sporting Dog Community in the Central Puget Sound Region consists primarily of local non-profit dog clubs affiliated with the American Kennel Club [AKC] and United Kennel Club [UKC].

They have been working with WDFW since April 2016 - without success - to restore the decades-old dog training opportunities in the Snoqualmie Valley that were recently and unilaterally eviscerated by a small contingent of WDFW employees in the agency's Snoqualmie Valley Wildlife Area office.

As a result, WDFW is now facing the very real prospect that if the Sporting Dog Community's concerns are not resolved before November, they will elect to change the "Forum" for addressing their dissatisfaction as stakeholders: They will likely move from trying to work with WDFW, to going after WDFW's 2019-2021 budget in the Legislature.

The purpose and objective in "Changing "Forums" would be to mount a well-organized, experienced and aggressive citizen-action campaign against WDFW's 2019-2021 budget later this year during preliminary budget hearings, and continuing that effort throughout the 2019 legislative session(s).

As someone with a great affinity for natural resources who has worked for the Oregon Fish Commission, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the National Marine Fisheries Service (as well as owning a commercially licensed and federally permitted recreational fishing and whitewater rafting guide company) earlier in my life, I would hate to see that happen.

But I understand the Sporting Dog Community's concerns are real, and have merit.

As a result, I am submitting the attached "additional" SEPA comments (in connection with DFW SEPA #18016) for two reasons:

1. A reduction in DFW funding in the agency's 2019-2021 budget would limit the agency's management options, and that in turn could affect operations and capital projects in ways that would be of consequence and importance in connection with this and other DFW SEPA analyses, and
2. More importantly, I believe these concerns can be resolved before November in a way that will largely eliminate unnecessarily exposing DFW's financial jugular during the Legislature's 2019 budgeting activities.. For reasons explained in the attached (very detailed) comments, that will likely require intervention by top managers at DFW, OFM and/or GOV.

I submitted earlier comments on behalf of Whistling Wings HRC, a nonprofit local dog club affiliated with the international nonprofit Hunting Retriever Program of the United Kennel Club. These "additional" comments are my own "personal" comments and are not offered on behalf of any organization, or on behalf of any other person.

The attached comments are very detailed for a reason - information is power. I believe you have in these comments the information that can help to empower senior managers to neutralize and resolve this situation quickly, efficiently, and with finality.

That was almost achieved once last year, but when senior personnel changes occurred recently in DFW's Region 4, the DFW local Snoqualmie Valley manager seized upon those changes as an opportunity to repudiate the commitments and progress made by more senior personnel, claiming the changes were for 2017 only.

In the time this situation has been festering, the number of members of the organized Sporting Dog Community showing up at DFW "stakeholder" meetings to object to what has been happening has increased by 66% - and at the last meeting more than 100 members of the public drove through peak-rush-hour Seattle traffic to get to Mill Creek by 600 PM in order to register their objections.

In addition, largely in response to the frustrations with the manager of DFW's Snoqualmie Valley office, hunting dog owners formed a new statewide organization to present a united front to the Legislature and the public: The ***Washington Sporting Dog Training Association (WSDTA)***.

Literally 200+ people seeking to testify later this year in opposition to the DFW budget, and more than twice that many during the 2019 session, is a very real possibility, in part because of incredibly offensive and widely-distributed emails between staff members in the Snoqualmie Valley office (obtained via a Public Records Request).

That communication between staff members - now publicly disclosed - has enraged an already passionate group of dog owners who have a demonstrated history of political engagement, and unwavering tenacity when rogue operators start messing with their dogs.

This could get very ugly, very fast. It doesn't need to.

There is a clear path forward that was acceptable to both DFW senior managers and dog owners.

I've included those specifics in these comments.

In these comments I've tried to share everything I know - including the specifics of what everyone (except the most junior involved employee at DFW) was willing to agree to - in the hope that you will be as eager as I am to avoid a conflagration consuming DFW's efforts to get a 2019-2021 budget.

I am hopeful you will find the attached comments to be of value in that effort.

Best regards,

Sam Pace

Sam@SamPace.com

253-569-2663