



*Nature*  
**HISTORY**  
*Discovery*

*Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
ATV Advisory Committee (ATV-AC)  
**Fall Field Trip Meeting**  
LOCATION in Lakeview/Christmas Valley  
Sunday September 20, 2015*

## **Meeting Minutes – FINAL**

### **OPRD ATV Advisory Committee members present:**

Tim Custer – ATV Advisory Committee Chair  
Wade Bryant – Class I Representative  
Pat Harris – Class II Representative  
Steve Doane – Class III Representative  
Forest Bohall – Class IV Representative

### **OPRD Staff present:**

Ron Price – ATV Grant Coordinator  
Ian Caldwell – ATV Program Field Rep (Eastern OR)  
Mike Law – ATV Program Field Rep (Western OR)  
Jeff Trejo – ATV Safety Education Coordinator  
Terry Bergerson – Outdoor Recreation Planner

### **Planned Topic Review:**

- 1) Discuss New Motorized Trail Plan and Scoring Criteria (Terry Bergerson)
- 2) Senate Bill 192
- 3) House Bill 3455
- 4) 2015-17 Biennium Budget
- 5) New Business
- 6) February 2016 Grant Meeting

---

**Chair Custer called the meeting to order at 8:00am**

### **1) Motorized Trail Plan and Scoring Criteria**

#### **Background**

TB – Terry reviewed Statewide Trails Plan background which is scheduled for completion by the end of year. Survey information was reviewed... the Trail Staff collected feedback on issues, particularly demographic information. Federal agencies were also a part of the effort. The Trail Staff was involved in workshops that focused on issues and funding needs within regions. TB reviewed the Core Planning Components in 11 regions. The Trail Staff reviewed funding need outreach. TB reviewed statewide funding needs – maintaining existing trails, provide more single-track off-road opportunities, and prioritize loop over out-and-back trails. TB reviewed top management issues statewide - closer of trails, closure of unimproved backcountry roads and riding in closed areas.

### **Evaluation Criteria handout review**

TC – Economic Development opportunities should have a higher value. WB – has a big issue with economically distressed cities... wants to make sure Eastern Oregon is covered. Cities that don't have riding opportunities should be removed. TB – this is just one way of looking at economic development. TC – reviewed Oakridge distressed community that's not even on the list. TB – these can be evaluated with more of a sliding scale. General Discussion – to remove table of economically distressed counties & cities. TB – we need to have bullets regarding points of discussion. IC – restate to show... how does your riding area help improve the local economy. Then, the applicant can help better explain the value. TB – discussion of exiting riding areas vs new riding areas... we should mirror grant application criteria. IC – as simple as we can make this... the better. ML – wording should be consistent across grants.

### **Other point scoring options**

TC – reviewed other point scoring options... made recommendation to bump up economic development to 15 points. IC – proposed to remove Project Urgency. TB – Proposed to add Project Urgency to discretionary points. FB – proposed to remove Readiness to Proceed. TB – proposed to move Readiness to Proceed to OPRD criteria vs. ATV. General Discussion – on where to move points. TB – Readiness to Proceed moved to staff instead of committee. ML – reviewed page 5 and page 6 Statewide Issues – question why not break it down to look like a non-sliding scale... either you meet it or you don't. General Discussion on points for section #5... make consistent. TB – proposed points awarded 0 to 12. ML – make easier on Committee and make consistent.

### **Additional riding areas**

WB – questions additional riding areas. When we talk about riding designated and access to public lands, the public doesn't necessarily talk about the same thing. In Eastern Oregon, "Trail" means everything. We need to watch out for additional areas that require high-maintenance. Reviewed example in Deschutes National Forest... signage only and requires no maintenance... encourage more of that... encourage agencies to do more of the same... wants something that rewards agencies that do this. We need additional riding areas not managed trail systems. We need to work on more non-designated trail systems. Example - Utah has been doing this for a while. ML – maybe it should be a sliding scale. WB - we want to reward more identifiable areas on Federal Land. TB – people need to know the riding areas. General Discussion regarding the success of COVHOPS. IC – move from New Development to Operations and Maintenance. TB – add non-designated open to ATV areas into operations and maintenance

### **Letter of Support**

IC – points for letter of support discussion? TC – letters of support need to be reworked... less of the Sheriff's support and more of the public support. IC – letters help the agencies foster communication. TC – proposed to replace #9 Project Urgency with Letters of Support... keeping same 5 points. IC – to provide TB with language used in Letter of Support.

TB – should we move 4 points in Readiness to Proceed to Trail Maintenance?

### **Operations and Maintenance**

TB – let's review Operations and Maintenance. We're open for comments... we're adding non-designated trail systems. TC – would like clarity on Project Support. IC – project need is why this area is important and need to maintain it. There are consequences for not completing the project. IC – sees these more as programs instead of projects. Projects need to be tied to on-the-ground and the user-end of it... if it's not maintained... it's a bad riding experience. ML – education piece regarding the kiosks... COVOPS and Tillamook does this well. Wade – people are more apt to respond/comment by paper vs face-to-face. IC – with our upcoming meeting we can develop Best Practices. TC – do agencies have opportunity for people to comment on issues provide feedback... opportunity to review option? TC – On #2, question... what is the funding match at risk? IC – this one is confusing ... proposed to remove.

ML – how does (instead of is) the project directly relate to Safety of the trail (page 16/2/d). ML then reviewed Project Support point #2 regarding past grants. PH - no letters should be accepted from prior projects.

### **Project Planning**

General Discussion on major work happening over the next year can be written or map plan.

ML – does Sustainable Trail bullets need to be in there under National Park Service. Move to remove as part of criteria.

### **Natural Resource Protection (page 17 & 18)**

TC – needed clarity on point allocations. General Discussion on points awarded. IC – possible need to reword... instead state... maintain, enhance, significantly improve.

### **Discretionary Points**

TB – comments on Discretionary Points #6 on page 18? There haven't been any changes to Discretionary points.

### **Medical and Law Enforcement**

TB – comments on Medical and Law Enforcement. TC – page 23 #4 Planning and Evaluation... would like clarity. IC – we need to separate Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Law Enforcement (LE). EMS is more equipment and LE deals more with personnel. RP – proposed to reward usage of the LE online grant system. ML – are they in touch with what's happening... reward those that work together rather than working independently... needs to be effective. WB – EMS is equipment driven... are we going to separate out equipment? General Discussion – regarding equipment inclusion within grant request.

### **Safety Education**

General Discussion – what is the definition? IC – we do much of this on an administrative level not through the grant system. TB – page 27 to 32 will be removed.

### **Action**

TB – should have updated information to review over the next couple of weeks. TB will need to meet with IC for some updates.

## **2) SB 192 – Operating on State Highways**

SB Bill 192 requires the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department to convene a work group that includes users of all-terrain vehicles, all-terrain vehicle dealers, staff from the Oregon Department of Transportation and other individuals whom the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department deems necessary, for the purpose of examining options for allowing users of all-terrain vehicles to operate on state highways. The timeline for the recommendation report for legislation is due by September 15, 2016.

RP – we will start around the 1<sup>st</sup> of November. There are some dealers we are looking. The biggest concern will be ODOT. WB – provided suggestions for people to be included in the group... focus is on state highways not on county roads. It should be consistent between counties across the state. Ron has some background information and would like to include people from other states that are doing this. WB - Grant and Lake County are the counties that have passed the ordinance. There are some cities that have an ordinance as well. IC – it would be good to gather all the cities and counties that have the ordinance and include this detail in the report. SD – Wallace, Idaho is one of the first to do this... about 15 years ago. WB – will get some information from out-of-state (Utah).

RP – general time-line discussion. Do we need to get in front of the big Advisory Committee. IC – one item to discuss is helmets and the age requirement.

**Action**

RP will continue to receive input from committee members and others to get a group together that will meet during the first week of November.

**3) HB 3455 – New Committee Members (EMS, Fire)**

HB 3455 increases membership of All-Terrain Vehicle Advisory Committee from 14 to 16 members, adding one representative of a rural fire protection district and one representative of emergency medical services providers. Directs Oregon Parks and Recreation Department to establish and operate outreach program to inform law enforcement agencies, rural fire protection districts and emergency medical services providers about the grant process for moneys from the ATV Account. The ATV Grant Program has provided funding to these groups over the years and they often get funded because they tend to be small and provide good services on the ground. Often these groups are volunteers so they tend to need equipment rather than paying staff salaries. OPRD Staff also regularly travels to put on ATV Grant Workshops throughout the state. The bill takes effect on January 1, 2016 and OPRD Staff will be working over the few months to fill these positions.

RP – has a name for EMS but not Fire. He may possibly roll this into the LE Workshop (taking place April of 2016). IC – we will make more of a point to cover during the grant workshops. ML – we can forward information to our contacts for them to distribute. TC – was curious as to the driver for this since we are already doing much of this... we've met all large committee requirements.

**Action**

RP will continue looking for individuals

**Quick review on other bills**

Senate Bill 878 – geared more towards street riding. RP – the bill doesn't differentiate between off-road and on-road. IC – it's now a non-issue.

RP – reviewed failed bills... there wasn't much substance to the bills that failed.

**4) 2015-17 Budget**

RP – Reviewed budget sheet line-items. TC – have the ODOT numbers come through? RP – yes but there is disagreement in the numbers. The survey was flawed and not representative. ML – reviewed IT projects... grant system, system upgrades along with new e-commerce system taking effect the 1<sup>st</sup> week of November. SD – the number one draw through his store is ATV permit sales... it gets people through the door. TC – questioned actual budget numbers and needs clarity on numbers. IC – the thinking is that we are only spending what we have taken in. TC – we're drawing down our reserves... he's going off the Parks Commission budget and comparing to what was provided on the budget sheet.

**Action**

RP & TC to meet with management to review budget numbers and provide clarity

**5) New Business Discussion****Mandatory Youth Training**

WB – questioned mandatory Youth Training... the public doesn't feel the pressure. Law Enforcement is not citing. General Discussion - people are generally unaware of the need for youth training. WB – notes that he (as a trainer) is not being contacted as he has in the past. JT – original estimates were overstated and we're continuing to see the results of that. Training has somewhat tapered off and we're

maintaining needed training. IC – provided clarity that Youth Training is not mandated by Legislation but rather Administrative Rule and that we could change this more easily.

**Action**

JT – to provide numbers regarding Hands-on Youth Training for the next meeting in February

**Law Enforcement Report Review**

TC – reviewed an LE report... covering warnings, citations and contacts.

**Site-visit Opportunity discussion**

ML – we are planning site visits at Huckleberry Flats & Santiam Pass to meet with Jeff Mast (new OHV Coordinator) in early October. Anyone from the committee is welcome to attend.

**6) February 2016 Grant Meeting Plans**

IC - for planning purposes, we are looking at one day of reviewing grants. We are looking at either Thursday February 11<sup>th</sup> or Friday February 12<sup>th</sup>. General discussion – it has been proposed that Thursday February 11<sup>th</sup> is the preferred day.

**Chair Custer adjourned the meeting at 12:02pm**

Submitted by,  
Jeff Trejo  
9/21/15