From:	Andrea Xaver
To:	PDS comments
Cc:	<u>Lisa Janicki; Ken Dahlstedt; Ron Wesen; Yvette.novarro@DNR.wagov</u>
Subject:	Permitting of non-motorized trails in the Industrial Forest-Natural Resource Lands (IF-NRL) zoning designation
Date:	Tuesday, August 01, 2017 1:25:35 PM
Cc: Subject:	Lisa Janicki; Ken Dahlstedt; Ron Wesen; Yvette.novarro@DNR.wagov Permitting of non-motorized trails in the Industrial Forest-Natural Resource Lands (IF-NRL) zoning designation

My name is Andrea Xaver, and I am against this trails proposal as there is too much risk to resource lands, animals, and people. I worked for the State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for almost 32 years. Along the way, among my other duties, I was a wildfire dispatcher for several years. Trails can create many more risks of forest fires by careless hikers, bikers, campers, smokers and fireworks advocates – not to mention wandering arsonists.

Also, there could be more risks for accidents from logging – curious people hear equipment and wander off the trail to see what is happening, then get hit by heavy equipment or a falling tree. A little over 3 years ago, a lady I used to work with at DNR went to check on some tree removal she wanted done on her property – she was standing in the wrong place at the wrong time – a falling tree hit and killed her.

Trails on Industrial Forest Lands are not land conversions to other uses, so why is the county involved in this in the first place? What's next – change forestry zoning to recreation? Are some people behind the scenes wanting to "save" these lands so only they can use them? Is this plan tying into more eco-tourism or whatever names?

Who is going to build and maintain the trails? Who is going to monitor them for proper use and safety? Would it be county money that may be needed for truly necessary projects?

The Industrial Forest Trails proposal is so broad it doesn't seem to exempt any of these resource lands within Skagit county. Will the trails proposal spill over onto agricultural lands – more than what is being attempted now?

Rumor has it that Darrington is in need financially and that nearby forested lands could become more recreational in use, then leading to more financial benefits for the town. If a trails plan is the financial solution, then why didn't Darrington, Snohomish county, Skagit county, and DNR work out a local, specific strategy for Darrington's needs? Seattle folks will likely come to the area prepared from REI and other popular recreational items places, and may not take time to stop in Darrington for much of anything.

Why the hurry to push this proposal through? Written comments ended for the Planning Department today at 4:30, and public testimony is done tonight. The Forest Advisory Board (FAB) will be meeting tomorrow morning to hear of the proposal. Isn't that a little out of sequence? Where is "Due Process?"

Dangers regarding potential landslide areas, forested properties, and people on them, abound. Why risk more? About 90% of the wildfires are started by humans. Firefighters are put in peril – and some are killed. Over my DNR years, and beyond, I've seen the horrific results of wildfires and heard the anguish in voices of people threatened or affected by these fires – myself included. As I write this, the news keeps reporting yet another wildfire – this one, guess where, near Darrington.