



IDENTIFICATION OF REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE NONMOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUES

The Public Workshop Process

During the months of April and May 2003, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) staff conducted a series of 9 regional trails issues workshops across the state. Table 1 (below) includes the locations of each of the workshops and the specific trails planning region to which the issue comments were assigned. Please note that some regions had more than one workshop.

Table 1. Regional Trail Issues Workshops

Trails Planning Region	Workshop Location
Northwest Region	Lincoln City
	Portland
	Eugene
Southwest Region	Bandon
	Grants Pass
North Central Region	Bend
South Central Region	Klamath Falls
Northeast Region	LaGrande / Union
Southeast Region	Burns

Each workshop included an afternoon session open to all public recreation providers (including federal and state agencies, county, municipal, port and special district recreation departments, and American Indian Tribes) and an evening session open to the general public (including interested members of the public, trail user groups or clubs, commercial organizations or other organizations). Trails issues were defined as high-impact issues related to recreational trail opportunities in the region. Trail issues could be related to outdoor recreation areas, programs and projects. At the conclusion of each workshop, each participant was given 3 colored dots to assist in prioritizing the importance of issues gathered. Participants placed their colored dots on those issues they felt were of most important in the planning region.

Approximately 230 people attended a workshop, including representatives from 56 public-sector recreation provider organizations. During the workshops, 281 motorized trails issue comments were gathered and recorded.

Next, all comments gathered at the regional public recreation provider and general public workshops were posted on the trails planning website for a comment period from March 19 to July 16, 2003. The site was developed for electronic submittal of comments. A letter was sent out to all workshop participants requesting that they review the website comments list to ensure that their comment(s) had been recorded properly. In addition, a letter was sent to trail user groups or clubs and commercial organizations across the state requesting additional comments through the website.

A complete listing of all issues gathered at the workshops and through the website can be found on the trails planning website at http://www.prd.state.or.us/trailsplanning_regional_issues.php

Identification of Top Regional Issues

Following the issue collection process, OPRD staff developed an issue summary paper to assist the Nonmotorized Steering Committee members in the process of identifying top regional issues. This issues summary paper was distributed to each steering committee member on August 19, 2003.

A regional issues analysis section in the issue summary paper included a prioritized issues list from each of the regional workshops with separate listings for public provider and general public workshops. An additional section included a summary of the combined prioritization results of all workshops held in the region (including all workshop locations and sessions). Those issues receiving the highest total accumulation of dots from all public provider and general public workshops held in the region were shown in bold.

During the September 23, 2003 Nonmotorized Steering Committee Meeting, committee members used a voting process to identify top regional motorized issues to include in the plan.

List of Top Regional Nonmotorized Issues

The following is a list of the top 3 Nonmotorized Trails issues in their respective region.

Northwest Trails Planning Region

(Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn and Benton Counties)

A. Need for trail connectivity within the region providing access from urban to rural trails, connections between public facilities, parks and open space and connections from state and regional trails to community trails.

B. Need for additional non-motorized trails (for all user types)—especially in close proximity to where people live.

C. Need for additional funding for non-motorized trail acquisition and development. Potential strategies include allocating a certain portion of the state's lottery fund; acquisitions of fee title, easements and land exchanges; and ways to allow users to pay for trail facilities and services.



Southwest Trails Planning Region

(Includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson and Douglas Counties)



A. Need for trail connectivity in the region including making trail connections within urban areas and to trails in adjacent public lands to connect communities with nearby parks and open spaces and connect land-based trails with water trails.

B. Need for funding and technical assistance for easements, permitting fee title, and acquisitions for trail projects. Population growth has increased the cost of land acquisition and easements and reduced the supply of available land acquisition opportunities.

C. Need for additional funding for trail maintenance within the region. Increased grant funding priority should be given to maintaining what we currently have before adding additional trail facilities.

Northcentral Trails Planning Region

(Includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson,

Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties)

A. Need for additional funding for trail maintenance and development.

B. Need to develop and extend a regional trails system within the region. The system should connect urban parks and open space, including connections to recreational opportunities on outlying public lands.

C. Need for trail access opportunities that do not require user fees or permits. Such trail opportunities should include minimal levels of improvements.



Southcentral Trails Planning Region

(Includes Klamath and Lake Counties)



A. Need for connectivity of trail systems within the region linking parks, public facilities and communities. There is also an opportunity to build connections between urban and wilderness areas.

B. Need for dedicated funding for trail operation and maintenance. Potential funding sources include taxes on the purchase of recreational equipment or franchise fees (utility fees) on trail corridors.

C. Need for better education/information on the sharing of multi-use trails within the region.

Northeast Trails Planning Region

(Includes Wallowa, Union, Grant and Baker Counties)

A. Need to secure long-term funding for non-motorized trail maintenance within the region. This issue is particularly relevant with U.S. Forest Service trail maintenance.

B. Need for connectivity between community trail systems, greenways, outlying state parks and forestlands within the region.

C. Need for greater cooperation between state and federal agencies in providing trail opportunities within the region.



Southeast Trails Planning Region

(Includes Harney and Malheur Counties)



A. Need for non-motorized trails in the region.

B. Lack of good information on existing non-motorized trail opportunities within the region.

C. Need to consider non-motorized use of roads proposed for closure or abandonment and to review recreational use on roads previously closed or abandoned.

Determining Top Statewide Nonmotorized Issues

After the regional voting was completed, the committee members reviewed the number of times a particular issue was voted as a top regional issue. The following table includes a listing of those issues voted as a "Top 3 Regional Issue" in more than one Trails Planning Regions. Based on this information, the two highlighted issues included in Table 2 were identified by the steering committee as Key Statewide Nonmotorized Trails Issues.

Table 2. Identification of Key Statewide Nonmotorized Trails Issues

Nonmotorized Trails Issue	# of Regions Issue Was Voted A Top 3 Regional Trail Issue
Need for trail connectivity	4 Regions
Need for trail maintenance	4 Regions
Need for more trails	2 Regions
Need for funding for trail acquisition	2 Regions

In addition, OPRD staff further refined and summarized all regional motorized issue comments into a set of statewide issue categories. The number of issue comments collected in a given category provided a measure of the relative importance of the issue category to workshop and internet participants. The following tables included the results of this categorical analysis:

- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all public provider workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of public provider comments.
- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all general public workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of general public comments.
- Categorical analysis for motorized issue comments gathered at all public provider and general public workshops across the state. Key issues were identified based on the total number of public provider and general public comments.

Finally, a matrix was developed to summarize results from these tables. This statewide issues summary paper was distributed to each steering committee member on August 19, 2003

During the September 23, 2003 steering committee meeting, OPRD staff used a sheet including information presented in the first 2 columns of Table 3 (below) to provide steering committee members an opportunity to vote for a set of top Statewide Nonmotorized Trail Concerns. Table 3 includes the total number of committee member votes each issue received. Those issues with the highest number of votes (shown in bold in Table 3) were determined by the steering committee to be 5 Statewide Nonmotorized Trail Concerns.

Table 3. Identification of Top Statewide Nonmotorized Trail Concerns

Nonmotorized Trail Issue	Total # of Comments From Issue Scoping	# of Committee Votes
Need For Adequate & Consistent Information Resources	32	
Need For Trail Connectivity	22	
Need To Address User Conflict/Multiple Use/Shared Use	20	
Need For Trail Maintenance/Funding For Maintenance/Volunteers	19	
Need For A State Administered Funding Source For Trail Acquisition & Development	19	4
Need For Additional Non-Motorized Trails	17	8
Need For User Education & Training (Regulatory & Safety)	14	1
Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/ Cooperation In Trail Planning & Management	13	5
Need For Trailheads & Support Facilities (restrooms, parking, camping, etc.)	13	4
Need To Better Manage Environmental Impacts	12	
Need For Increased Law Enforcement Presence (particularly at trailheads)	11	
Need For More Trails In Close Proximity To Where People Live	11	10
Need For Information on the Social & Economic Benefits of Trails	11	4
Need For More Equestrian Trails & Trailheads	9	1
Need For Trail Planner Toolbox and Trail Planning Assistance	6	1
Need To Explore Recreation Opportunities on Private Timberlands	6	
Need For Long-Distance Hiking Opportunities	5	2
Need To Prepare For Emerging Technologies (e.g. Segways, Geocaching)	5	
Need For Statewide Trail Design & Construction Standards - Particularly at Railroad Crossings	5	
Need For Improved Public Access To Trails	5	7
Need For a Simpler Trail Fee Collection System	4	
Need For Local Trail Planning & Environmental Assessment	4	
Need For Inventory of Railroad Rights-Of-Ways & Other Potential Trail Development Opportunities	4	3
Need For Additional Trail-Related Interpretation/Education Opportunities	4	
Need For Better Management Of Dogs & Other Pets On Trails	4	
Need For A Wider Variety Of Challenge Opportunities (experience, technology advancements)	4	
Need To Consider Public Ways (roads, railroads, utility corridors) proposed For Closure or Abandonment For Non-Motorized Use	4	8

The final set of Top Statewide Nonmotorized Trail Issues for the 2005-2014 Nonmotorized Trail plan are as follows:

- **Statewide Trail Issue A: Need for trail connectivity**
- **Statewide Trail Issue B: Need for trail maintenance**

The final set of Top Statewide Nonmotorized Trail Concerns for the 2005-2014 Nonmotorized Trail plan are as follows:

- **Statewide Trail Concern 1: Need for more trails In close proximity to where people live**
- **Statewide Trail Concern 2: Need for additional nonmotorized trails**
- **Statewide Trail Concern 3: Need to consider public ways (roads, railroads, utility corridors) proposed for closure or abandonment for nonmotorized trail use**
- **Statewide Trail Concern 4: Need for improved public access to trails**
- **Statewide Trail Concern 5: Need for regional interagency coordination/ cooperation in trail planning and management**