



A message from the Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

I am pleased to present Oregon Trails 2005-2014: A Statewide Action Plan. This plan is the product of more than two years of consultation and collaboration of recreation trail providers, interest groups and citizens across the state. It is the state's "official plan for recreational trail management" for the next 10 years, serving as a statewide and regional information and planning tool to assist Oregon recreation providers (local, state, federal, and private) in providing trail opportunities and promoting access to Oregon's trails and waterways. It also identifies how the state's limited resources will be allocated for motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects throughout Oregon.

OPRD has taken an innovative approach to statewide trails planning by conducting simultaneous motorized, non-motorized and water trails plans. Each is a comprehensive study and depiction of the state of recreational trail and non-motorized boating use in Oregon. Due to the overall size of the document, in addition to the complete plan, individual motorized, non-motorized and water trails plans have been printed. In an effort to minimize printing and shipping expenses, we are providing you with only those specific type of plan(s) most relevant to your organization (i.e., federal agencies will be sent a full plan while a motorized trail user group will receive a motorized plan only).

Although this Action Plan is completed, it's ultimate success rests on the continued support of stakeholders across the state to actively participate in implementing these strategies. By building on the momentum and collaboration of this planning process, each of us can help to turn this Action Plan into a world-class trail system—one that offers high-quality trail facilities and opportunities that will satisfy users—both Oregonians and visitors to our beautiful state—for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Tim Wood
Director – Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Message From the Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department	i
Acknowledgements	v
Non-motorized Trails Plan Executive Summary	1
A Statewide Action Plan Introduction	10
Non-motorized Trails Plan Introduction	21
Benefits of Non-motorized Trails	24
1. Economic Benefits.....	24
2. Health And Fitness Benefits.....	30
3. Social Benefits.....	31
4. Educational Benefits.....	32
5. Recreation Benefits.....	32
6. Environmental Benefits.....	32
7. Preserving Our History And Culture.....	33
Identification of Regional and Statewide Non-motorized Trails Issues	34
The Public Workshop Process.....	34
List Of Top Regional Non-Motorized Trails Plan Issues.....	35
Determining Top Statewide Non-Motorized Issues.....	38
2004 Oregon Statewide Non-motorized Trail User Survey.....	41
Research Background	41
Survey Results.....	41
Goals, Objectives and Strategies for Top Statewide Trail Issues And Concerns	56
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Issue A: Need For Trail Connectivity.....	56
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Issue B: Need For Trail Maintenance.....	59
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concern 1: Need For More Trails In Close Proximity To Where People Live	61
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concern 2: Need For Additional Non-Motorized Trails	64
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concern 3: Need To Consider Public Ways (Roads, Railroads, Utility Corridors) Proposed For Closure Or Abandonment For Non-Motorized Trail Use	65
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concern 4: Need For Trail Accessibility Information	66
Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concern 5: Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/Cooperation In Trail Management	67
Next Steps.....	68
Recreational Trail Program Evaluation Criteria	71
Technical Review - Application Completeness	71
Project Priority Scoring System.....	71
Recreational Trail Program Evaluation Criteria Point Summary.....	72
OPRD Technical Review	72
Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Member Evaluation Criteria	73
Trail User Groups.....	84
Regional Motorized Trail Issues	88
Regional Non-Motorized Trail Issues.....	90
Regional Water Trail Issues	91
Appendices.....	95
Appendix A: Trail Design, Maintenance And Accessibility Publication List.....	97
Appendix B: Potential Trail Funding Sources In Oregon	119
Appendix C: Non-motorized Trail Benefits Bibliography	129
Appendix D: List Of Regional Non-motorized Trail Issue Comments	141

List of Tables

TABLE 1: Extent of Non-motorized Trail Participation	6
TABLE 2: Information Sources – Non-motorized	6
TABLE 3: Non-motorized Trail Funding Priorities	7
TABLE 4: Trails Plan Steering Committee Meeting Schedule	14
TABLE 5: Regional Trails Issues Workshops.....	16
TABLE 6: Rail-Trail Economic Contribution Estimates.....	25
TABLE 7: Crime Rates: Comparing Statistics For the Nation vs. Rail Trails	28
TABLE 8: Rail-Trails Reporting Minor Crimes	29
TABLE 9: Identification of Key Statewide Non-motorized Trails Issues	38
TABLE 10: Identification of Top Statewide Non-motorized Trail Concerns.....	39
TABLE 11: Non-motorized Demographics	42
TABLE 12: Extent of Non-motorized Trail Participation	43
TABLE 13: Frequency of Non-motorized Trail Participation	43
TABLE 14: Favorite Non-motorized Trail Activity.....	44
TABLE 15: Distance Traveled for Most Frequent and for Favorite Non-motorized Activities.....	45
TABLE 16: Preferred Setting for Most Frequent and Favorite Non-motorized Trail Activities.....	45
TABLE 17: Preferred Non-motorized Trail Type.....	46
TABLE 18: Use Trails as Much As Wanted – Non-motorized	46
TABLE 19: Reasons for Not Using Trails as Much as Wanted – Non-motorized	47
TABLE 20: Satisfaction with Non-motorized Trail Services	48
TABLE 21: Satisfaction with Non-motorized Trail Information.....	49
TABLE 22: Information Sources – Non-motorized	50
TABLE 23: Overall Satisfaction with Trail Experience – Non-motorized.....	51
TABLE 24: Non-Motorized Trail Funding Priorities.....	52
TABLE 25: Primary Use of Non-motorized Trails.....	53
TABLE 26: Preferred Surface Type for Non-motorized Trail Users	53
TABLE 27: Importance of Non-motorized Trail Types.....	54
TABLE 28: Importance of Signage - Non-motorized	55
TABLE 29: Membership in a Club or Group – Non-motorized	55
TABLE 30. RTP Grant Program Evaluation Criteria Point Summary	72

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following individuals developed and prepared Oregon Trails 2005-2014: Non-motorized Trails Plan

PRIMARY OPRD PROJECT STAFF

Terry Bergerson

Project Manager & Primary Author

Sean Loughran

Technical Assistance & Review and
Issues Workshop Facilitation

OTHER OPRD STAFF

Kathy Schutt

Planning Manager

Tammy Baumann

Administrative Support

OPRD MANAGEMENT

Tim Wood

Director

Dave Wright

Assistant Director, Operations

OTHER OPRD CONTRIBUTORS

(Listed in Alphabetical Order)

Kim Baker

Dolly Bullington

Jennifer Deeder

Heather Durant

Chris Havel

MaryAnne Lee

Mike Niss

Richard Walkoski

2004 OREGON STATEWIDE TRAILS INVENTORY PROJECT

Dr. Michael Wing

Oregon State University—Forest
Engineering Department

2004 OREGON STATEWIDE TRAIL USER & NON-MOTORIZED BOATER SURVEY PROJECT

Dr. Woody Carter

Tony Silvaggio

University of Oregon—Oregon Survey
Research Laboratory

NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

(Listed in Alphabetical Order)

Ric Balfour

International Mountain Biking
Association

John Barnes

Oregon Department of Forestry

Dr. Minot Cleveland

Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical
Activity

Ernie Drapela

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

Chuck Frayer

U.S. Forest Service

Mel Huie

METRO Parks, Trails & Greenspaces

David Lewis

Oregon Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory
Committee

Dan Miller

National Park Service, Rivers & Trails
Program

Dr. Jane Moore

Office of Health Promotion & Chronic
Disease Prevention

Mike Reedy

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

Ann Rogers

Oregon Historical Trails Advisory
Council

Bruce Ronning

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

Gail Throop

U.S. Forest Service

Jack Wiles

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department

Margaret Wolf

Bureau of Land Management

**RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM
GRANT CRITERIA SUBCOMMITTEE**

(Listed in Alphabetical Order)

Ernie Drapela

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

Pat Harris

ATV Account Allocation Committee

Mike Reedy

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

Ann Rogers

Oregon Historical Trails Advisory
Council

Bruce Ronning

Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory
Council

NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) was given responsibility for recreation trails planning in 1971 under the "State Trails Act" (ORS 390.950 to 390.990). In general the policy of the statute is as follows: "In order to provide for the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding resident and tourist population and in order to promote public access to, travel within and enjoyment and appreciation of, the open-air, outdoor areas of Oregon, trails should be established both near the urban areas in this state and within, adjacent to or connecting highly scenic areas more remotely located."

The Oregon Recreation Trails Plan has been in place since 1995. Although many of the findings included in this plan are still relevant, considerable change has occurred on Oregon's recreational trails in the last 9 years including a 13% state population increase between 1995 and 2003 and increases in recreational trail use. As a general rule, planning documents of this type have a usable shelf life of 10 years. As a result, there was a need to update the trails plan for non-motorized trail uses.

The purpose of this non-motorized trails planning effort was to provide information and recommendations to guide OPRD and other agencies in Oregon in their management of non-motorized trail resources. The plan is designed to:

- Assess the needs and opinions of Oregon's citizens as they relate to non-motorized trail opportunities and management;

- Establish priorities for expenditures from the Federal Recreational Trails Grant Program;
- Develop strategic directions to guide activities for statewide recreational trails planning;
- Gather additional inventory measurement data for non-motorized trail resources and facilities; and
- Recommend actions that enhance non-motorized trail opportunities to all agencies and the private sector providing trail resources in Oregon.

The plan has been developed as an information resource as well as a planning tool to guide agencies for the next 10 years.

For the purposes of this planning effort, non-motorized trail uses include (but are not limited to) hikers, backpackers, mountain bike riders, equestrians, runners, walkers, bicycle riders, inline skaters and individuals with functional impairments. A non-motorized trail is defined as a regularly maintained recreation pathway typically used by a variety of non-motorized trail users. The designated trail should be purposefully planned and constructed for non-motorized recreation purposes, but in some cases can be used for commuter purposes. Non-motorized trails do not include city streets and sidewalks and bike lanes incorporated into the design of city streets and rural highways.

Summary of Planning Results

This section includes a brief summary of results for the following major components of the statewide non-motorized trails planning effort.

Benefits of Non-Motorized Trails

During the trails issues workshops, public recreation providers and trail interest groups suggested that the non-motorized trails plan include trail benefits information for them to better be able to make the case for proposed trail projects and address some common misconceptions adjacent landowners have about proposed trails. This chapter summarizes the many benefits that non-motorized trails can provide in the state of Oregon.

Across Oregon, non-motorized recreational trails are stimulating tourism and recreation-related spending. Local trail users, vacationers and conference attendees provide direct economic benefits to hotels, restaurants and other businesses from increases in tourist activity and increased spending on durable goods such as bikes or skates, and soft goods such as gasoline, food and drinks. This, in turn, attracts and revitalizes businesses, creates jobs, and increases public revenue.

People owning property bordering a proposed trail sometimes are concerned that developing a trail will lower their property values. However, a rather substantial body of research from across the U.S. demonstrates that proximity to trails and open space has very little impact on the value of property. In many cases, trails often increase the value of residential property and the ability to sell a property. The benefits summary includes research finding specific to trail impacts on property values and the ability to sell and information regarding the relationship between proximity to trails and crime.

Trail activities such as walking, jogging or running, in-line skating, cross-country skiing, and bicycling are well documented to help improve health and fitness when

done on a regular basis. Physical activity need not be unduly strenuous for an individual to reap significant health benefits. Even small increases in light to moderate activity, equivalent to walking for about 30 minutes a day, will produce measurable benefits among those who are least active. Regular, moderate exercise has been proven to reduce the risk of developing coronary heart disease, stroke, colon cancer, hypertension, diabetes, osteoporosis, obesity, and depression.¹ This health benefit accrues to the individual, and, in the form of reduced health-care costs, to society as well.

Additional benefits of non-motorized trails include:

- **Social Benefits:** Trail projects help build partnerships among private companies, landowners, neighboring municipalities, local government and advocacy groups. All are able to take pride in having worked together to successfully complete a trail project.
- **Educational Benefits:** People of all ages can learn more about nature, culture or history along trails. Of particular importance, trails provide firsthand experiences that educate citizens about the importance of the natural environment and respect for nature.
- **Recreational Benefits:** Linear corridors offer several benefits over traditional park facilities. These benefits include providing greater perimeter area, multiple visitor experiences, increased access, and

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1996). Surgeon General's Report on Physical Activity and Health, Department of Health and Human Services. July.

lower acquisition and development costs.

- **Environmental Benefits:** Trails can be an integral part of our natural environment and should be used as a tool for conservation. Trails can be planned to assist with preserving important natural landscapes, providing necessary links between fragmented habitats and providing tremendous opportunities for protecting plant and animal species.
- **Preserving our History and Culture:** Trails have the power to connect us to our heritage by preserving historic places and by providing access to them. They can also give people a sense of place and an understanding of the enormity of past events such as Native American trails, the Lewis and Clark expedition, westward migration along the Oregon Trail and accessing historic sites throughout the state.

Key Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Issues

The plan also identifies key non-motorized trail issues that affect the future of recreational trail management in Oregon. During the months of April and May 2003, OPRD staff conducted a series of 9 regional trail issues workshops across the state. Approximately 230 people attended a workshop, including representatives from 56 public-sector recreation provider organizations. Information from these workshops was used in the process of developing top regional and statewide non-motorized trail issues and concerns.

The 2 top statewide non-motorized trail issues include:

Statewide Issue A: Need For Trail Connectivity

As in the SCORP planning effort and the 1971 Trails Act, recreation providers and other workshop attendees consistently reported in issues workshops the need for non-motorized trail connectivity within their regions. According to recreation providers, trail connectivity involves linking urban trails to outlying Federal trail systems; linking neighborhood, community and regional trails; connecting community parks and other recreational and public facilities; and connecting neighboring communities (e.g. Ashland and Medford). Recreation providers strongly felt that increasing non-motorized trail connectivity will result in better use of the state's existing non-motorized trail infrastructure and provide more trail opportunities.

Statewide Issue B: Need For Trail Maintenance

Recreation providers strongly stated that they are struggling to maintain existing trails due to increasing use levels and declining maintenance budgets. At the same time, providers are being asked by user groups to develop more and more new trails. A common argument made across the state was that additional priority should be given to maintain what we currently have before adding additional facilities. According to providers, there always seems to be funding available for trail development—but not for routine day-to-day trail maintenance.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 1: Need For More Trails In Close Proximity To Where People Live

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees in issues workshops across the state voiced a need for more trails in close

proximity to where people live. A recently completed plan entitled, *A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan*, points out that the current epidemic of obesity has hit Oregon hard². At 22%, our state has the highest percentage of adult obesity of any state west of the Rockies. Add that to 38% of Oregon adults who are overweight and we have the startling total of 60% of Oregonians not at a healthy weight. Our youth follow closely behind, with 28% of eighth graders and 21% of eleventh graders currently overweight. The *Statewide Physical Activity Plan* is a call to action for all who can have an impact on promoting daily physical activity to improve the health of Oregonians. The plan has identified the need for more community trails as a top priority.

The Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey³ was conducted over a one-year period from February 2001 to January 2002 by Oregon State University's (OSU) College of Forestry as a part of the Oregon Park and Recreation Department's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) effort. The findings of the survey identified that the most popular everyday activities in Oregon are running and walking for exercise and walking for pleasure. According to the OSU report, these activities are generally engaged in near home, and on a regular basis. These findings help to make the case that neighborhood trails are essential in providing Oregonians with a means to

² Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Fitness (2003). *A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan*.

³Rebecca Johnson (2002). *Oregon's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP): Demand and Needs Analysis*. Department of Forest Resources, Oregon State University.

realize the health and fitness benefits associated with daily exercise.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 2: Need For Additional Non-Motorized Trails

Recreation providers and trail users stated that there is a strong need for additional non-motorized trail opportunities in areas experiencing high population growth and in trail planning regions with current shortages of non-motorized trails of all types. Recreation providers stated that trails are not always seen as top priorities in relation to other community needs or even other recreational needs. As a result, recreation providers must work together to make a stronger case that trails are important to communities and provide a broad range of social and economic benefits to communities and are deserving of a higher position on the city, county, state and federal political agendas.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 3: Need To Consider Public Ways (Roads, Railroads, Utility Corridors) Proposed For Closure Or Abandonment For Non-Motorized Trail Use

Oregon is crossed by thousands of miles of linear facilities such as railroad beds, pipelines, canals, utility rights-of-ways and roads. Public utility and irrigation easements include oil and natural gas pipelines, sewer lines, irrigation ditches, electrical transmission, telephone and television lines, and fiber optic cable. Recreation providers and other workshop attendees stated that there are opportunities to make greater use of such transportation rights-of-ways and public utility and irrigation easements for recreational trail development.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 4: Need For Trail Accessibility Information

Recreation providers in several regions reported a need for improved trail access for people with disabilities. At the same time, these providers stated that not all trails can or should be accessible to all users. There was general agreement that providing key trail type and condition information to users has the potential to increase the usability of existing trails and enable everyone, of all ages and abilities, to enjoy the benefits of recreational trails. To make better use of the existing trail infrastructure, all trail providers need to do a better job informing trail users of the conditions they will encounter on trails to allow each individual to decide if a particular trail is accessible to them.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 5: Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/ Cooperation In Trail Management

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees consistently reported that successful non-motorized trail development, management and planning relies on good coordination and communication between trail organizations, federal, state, and local agencies, tribal governments and other stakeholders.

The 2004 Oregon Statewide Non- Motorized Trail User Survey

The 2004 Oregon Statewide Non-Motorized Trail User Survey was conducted over a four-month period from January to April 2004 by the University of Oregon's Survey Research Laboratory. The purpose of the survey was to assess the needs and

opinions of Oregon's citizens about trail opportunities and management, assess the need for future investment in trail facilities and opportunities and provide trail planners with up-to-date information for local and regional trails planning.

The survey found that thirty three percent of Oregon households have a person reporting non-motorized trail use, amounting to 438,500 households in the state. Hiking (87%) and walking for pleasure (82%) are the most popular activities among non-motorized trail participants, with bicycling (38%) and jogging or running (29%) also having a sizable proportion of participants (see Table 8). Most non-motorized respondents are female (56%), and the median age is 40-49 years old. A sizable majority has some college (83%), with about half being college graduates (49%). Median income is \$40,000 to \$69,000.

Fifty three percent of non-motorized trail users reported that they would like to participate in their activity more than they do. Lack of time is the primary roadblock for non-motorized trail users.

Non-motorized trail users use many information sources in planning for their trail outing (see Table 9). A few favorites stand out: people's advice, printed resources like books, magazines, brochures, and maps, and the internet are the leading sources. Non-motorized trail users were also asked about satisfaction with a variety of information sources, and they report a high level of overall satisfaction. Users reported more dissatisfaction with agency responses, agency websites and route maps.

N = 326	Participated in Last Year	Estimated Oregon Households
Trail hiking or day hiking	87%	381,500
Walking for pleasure	82%	359,500
Bicycling (other than mountain biking)	38%	166,700
Jogging or running	29%	127,200
Backpacking overnight	16%	70,200
Mountain biking (on natural terrain trails)	14%	61,400
Cross-country skiing	12%	52,600
Horseback riding	7%	30,700
Roller blading (in-line skating)	5%	21,900
Hiking with horses, mules, llama	2%	8,800
Competitive trail events	2%	8,800
Other	13%	57,000

Sampling error for the "in last year" question is \pm 4%.

N = 320-325	Use Source	Favorite Source
Advice of people	88%	24%
Books, magazines, newspapers	80%	19%
Brochures, maps	95%	18%
Internet	64%	15%
Visitor information centers	83%	8%
ODOT road signs	80%	3%
Gather information along the way	66%	3%
State highway maps	81%	3%
Sporting goods stores	51%	2%
Phone trail management agencies	39%	2%
Clubs, groups	15%	1%
Phone toll-free numbers	42%	0%
Other	14%	2%

Sampling error for this question is \pm 5%

Overall, non-motorized trail users were “extremely satisfied” with their overall non-motorized trail experience in Oregon. Ninety nine percent of non-motorized trail users reported being either “very satisfied” (79%) or “somewhat satisfied” (20%) with their overall non-motorized trail experience. Only one percent said they are “not at all satisfied”.

Finally, non-motorized trail users were asked to prioritize a variety of funding possibilities related to their sport (see Table 3 below). Routine upkeep of existing trails, repairing major damage, and cleaning up litter and trash are highest ranked priorities, followed by better information and signage, support facilities, enforcement, and acquiring land for new trails.

TABLE 3: Non-Motorized Trail Funding Priorities
(1 = Not That Important, 3 = Very Important)

N = 320-325	Mean	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not That Important	A Top Funding Priority ⁴
Routine upkeep of existing trails	2.7	73%	24%	3%	208
Repairing major damage	2.6	66%	32%	2%	193
Clean up litter and trash	2.6	68%	25%	6%	172
Renovating deteriorated trails	2.5	50%	45%	5%	144
Support facilities	2.3	43%	43%	15%	107
Enforcing rules and regulations	2.3	44%	38%	18%	105
Acquire land for new trails	2.2	39%	41%	21%	104
Acquire access land	2.2	37%	47%	16%	94
Providing education, safety, and trail etiquette information	2.2	35%	48%	17%	83
Developing new trails	2.1	32%	50%	18%	77
Interpretive information	1.9	19%	55%	26%	45
Landscaping along trails	1.4	6%	29%	65%	14

Sampling error for this question is $\pm 5\%$.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Goals, Objectives and Strategies

A set of long-range goals, objectives and strategies were developed for each of the top 2 Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Issues and 5 Trail Concerns based on findings from the non-motorized trails planning effort. These goals, objectives and strategies were developed for use by non-motorized trail decision makers across the state to develop policies and actions for resolving the 2 top statewide non-motorized trail issues and 5 concerns.

Note: Specific strategies are identified in this plan for addressing each objective, but are not included in the following summary. A full listing of statewide non-motorized trail goals, objectives and strategies is included in the non-motorized trails plan.

Top statewide non-motorized trail issues and concerns and accompanying goals and objectives include:

⁴ Number of respondents selecting this answer. Asked only if respondent answered “very important.”

Statewide Issue A: Need for Trail Connectivity

Goal: Identify and encourage key trail linkages between and among local, regional and statewide trails to better use the state's existing non-motorized trail system.

- Objective 1: Collect and disseminate statewide multi-jurisdictional non-motorized trails information.
- Objective 2: Develop a regional approach to non-motorized trails planning.
- Objective 3: Provide technical assistance and outreach for regional non-motorized trails planning.
- Objective 4: Focus resources towards the most significant components of local and regional trail systems.

Statewide Issue B: Need For Trail Maintenance

Goal: Preserve and maintain the public's substantial investment in the existing infrastructure of trails and related facilities.

- Objective 1: Inform the public, and state and local leaders, about the importance of maintenance in protecting the long-term viability of Oregon's trail system.
- Objective 2: Increase the amount of resources

available for trail maintenance.

- Objective 3: More effectively engage volunteers as stewards of Oregon's trail system to help preserve the legacy for future generations.

Statewide Concern 1: Need For More Trails In Close Proximity To Where People Live

Goal: Promote daily physical activity by improving local access to trails.

- Objective 1: Inform the public about existing community trails close to where they live.
- Objective 2: Encourage local governments to conduct community trails planning efforts to identify and prioritize local trail needs that will provide close-to-home trail opportunities.
- Objective 3: Encourage local recreation providers to seek innovative funding mechanisms for urban trail development.
- Objective 4: Develop and disseminate information on the personal and societal benefits of trails to a wide variety of local consumers such as policymakers, public works departments, school administrators, planners, business owners and leaders, chambers of

commerce and developers.

- Objective 5: Increase cooperation and communication with community-based health organizations related to trail development.

Statewide Concern 2: Need For Additional Non-Motorized Trails

Goal: Support the development of new trails.

- Objective 1: Increase funding devoted to expanding trail opportunities for all Oregonians.

Statewide Concern 3: Need To Consider Public Ways (Roads, Railroads, Utility Corridors) Proposed For Closure Or Abandonment For Non-Motorized Trail Use

Goal: Ensure trail use is evaluated when roads, railroads and utility corridors are considered for abandonment, change of use, or shared use.

- Objective 1: Develop additional trails along canal and utility easements and transportation rights-of-way.

Statewide Concern 4: Need For Trail Accessibility Information

Goal: Better inform the public about accessible trail opportunities.

- Objective 1: Develop and distribute information related to trail access.

Statewide Concern 5: Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/Cooperation In Trail Management

Goal: Promote coordination and cooperation between public agencies, private organizations and non-motorized trail users.

- Objective 1: Standardize statewide trail management practices.

Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Grant Program Evaluation Criteria

The non-motorized trails plan concludes with a set of project selection criteria for evaluating motorized, non-motorized and water trail grant proposals for the RTP Grant Program. The criteria make the connection between findings from the motorized, non-motorized and water trails planning efforts and how limited RTP grant monies will be allocated.



A STATEWIDE ACTION PLAN INTRODUCTION

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) was given responsibility for recreation trails planning in 1971 under the "State Trails Act" (ORS 390.950 to 390.990). In general the policy of the statute is as follows: "In order to provide for the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding resident and tourist population and in order to promote public access to, travel within and enjoyment and appreciation of, the open-air, outdoor areas of Oregon, trails should be established both near the urban areas in this state and within, adjacent to or connecting highly scenic areas more remotely located."

At the start of this planning effort, the Oregon State Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Study and Oregon Recreation Trails Plan had been in place since 1995. Although many of the findings included in these plans are still relevant, considerable change has occurred on Oregon's OHV areas/trails and recreational trails in the last 9 years including a 13% state population increase between 1995 and 2003 and increases in OHV ownership and recreational trails use. As a general rule, planning documents of this type have a usable shelf life of 10 years. As a result, there was a need to update the trails plans for both OHV and recreational trail uses.

Support for the Plan

During the months of October through December of 2001, OPRD staff conducted a series of regional recreation issues workshops across the state as part of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) planning process. Recreation providers from across the state expressed a strong desire for OPRD to update the Oregon State Off-Highway

Vehicle Study and Oregon Recreation Trails Plan. According to these providers, the plan should examine use of all types of trails (motorized, recreational and water trails) and include the participation of state, federal, county and municipal providers and advocacy groups.

The SCORP planning effort's recreational participation study (Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey) findings also emphasize the importance of trail-related activities in the state. The study estimated statewide resident and non-resident recreation participation for a list of 76 individual outdoor recreation activities. Of these 76 activities, the most popular resident activities are running and walking for exercise (49.2 million estimated annual user days⁵) and walking for pleasure (47.7 million annual user days). For non-residents (from households in Washington, Idaho, and California who lived in counties adjacent to Oregon) recreating in the state of Oregon, running and walking for exercise (10.5 million annual user days), RV/Trailer Camping (6.2 million annual user days), and walking for pleasure (5.1 million annual user days) were the most popular.

Based on information gathered during the SCORP issues workshops and the Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey, the SCORP Advisory Committee identified the development of a concurrent statewide motorized and non-motorized trails plan as a key objective in order to provide an adequate supply of quality trail facilities and opportunities to satisfy a growing number

⁵ A user day is one instance of participation in a single outdoor recreation activity by one person.

of motorized and recreational trail users throughout the state of Oregon.

In addition to OPRD having a current SCORP to receive and obligate Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) under Section 206(d) of the Recreational Trails Program legislation, the state is also required to have a recreational trails plan (motorized and non-motorized) in order to be eligible to receive and obligate Federal Recreation Trails dollars.

Finally, the U.S. Center for Disease Control (CDC), the Oregon Department of Human Services, Health Services, and the Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity (OCPPA) are currently promoting physical activity and the health benefits associated with participation in recreational trail activities.

The OCPPA has recently completed a plan entitled the Oregon Plan for Physical Activity⁶, which states that, "Physical inactivity together with poor eating habits contributes significantly to the development of obesity, high blood pressure, heart disease, cancer, and diabetes, which are the leading causes of disease and death among Oregonians. The current epidemic of obesity in the United States has hit Oregon particularly hard. At 22%, our state has the highest percentage of adult obesity of any state west of the Rockies. Our youth follow closely behind, with 28% of eight graders and 21% of eleventh graders currently overweight." Close-to home non-motorized trails provide a safe, inexpensive avenue for regular exercise for people living in rural, urban and suburban areas.

⁶ Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity (2003). A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan.

Additional Information from Issues Workshops

Public recreation providers in 8 of the 11 SCORP planning regions voted the "Need For Recreational Trails and Trail Connectivity" as a top LWCF issue. As a result, this need was identified as one of three top statewide LWCF issues for inclusion in the 2003-2007 Oregon SCORP plan.

Recreation providers reported a need for additional recreational trails including walking, hiking, bicycling and equestrian multiple-use trails. In addition, the concept of trail connectivity was supported throughout the state. Trail connectivity involves:

- linking urban trails to outlying Federal trail systems;
- linking neighborhood, community and regional trails;
- connecting community parks and other recreational and public facilities; and
- connecting neighboring communities (e.g., Ashland to Medford).

Recreation providers also felt the trails plan should address a growing interest in canoe, rafting, and kayak routes (water trails) throughout the state. Although the state enjoys a variety of high-quality paddling opportunities, additional recreational infrastructure is needed to satisfy a growing demand for paddling sports. Necessary resources/facilities/services needed for water trail development include water access sites and support facilities, overnight camping facilities, directional signage, maps, brochures and other marketing tools to properly market new water trail opportunities and paddling clinics.

Although OHV riding continues to grow in Oregon and nationally, riding areas have closed as public land managers are faced with increasingly complex decisions related to balancing recreation use with resource protection. Recreation providers report that cross-country OHV travel is damaging the state's natural resource base. In addition, the growing use of OHVs has prompted the U.S. Forest Service to revise its management of motorized forest use so that the agency can better sustain and manage National Forest System lands and resources.

The state needs to take a proactive approach by exercising leadership in shaping a long-term vision for OHV recreation to include:

1. changing riding patterns to avoid impacts,
2. resolving use conflicts and resource degradation, and
3. creating more designated OHV riding areas in the state.

Needed OHV facilities and services include:

- OHV trail riding areas, All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV), motorcycle and 4x4) including trails, parking areas, restrooms, tow vehicles, camping facilities, communication links to emergency services and law enforcement,
- OHV parks in reasonably close proximity to metropolitan areas, and
- designated motocross and challenge courses for motorcycles, ATV's, 4-wheel drive vehicles and truck pulling.

There is a concern that such riding areas be thoroughly separated from hikers, kayakers, campers, cyclists and other human-

powered users of public lands and that environmental impacts be closely managed and monitored.

Because of the role federal lands play in serving OHV riding – planning clearly requires a state/federal partnership.

A Concurrent State Motorized and Non-motorized Trail and Water Trails Planning Process

There are considerable benefits associated with a concurrent State Motorized and Non-Motorized Trail and Water Trails planning process including:

- providing user groups with comparative information to emphasize areas of common ground and understanding;
- packaging three plans into one volume, providing a one-stop planning document for recreational planners who often work on motorized, non-motorized trails/riding area planning and water trails;
- cost savings from a combined motorized, non-motorized & water trails user survey; and
- administrative and travel cost savings with conducting concurrent but separate regional issues workshops.

The purpose of the planning process is to provide information and recommendations to guide OPRD and other agencies in Oregon in their management of motorized and non-motorized trail/riding resources. Early in the planning process, OPRD established separate motorized, non-motorized and water trails steering

committees to guide the statewide planning effort.

The plans are written primarily for recreation planners and land managers. In its component parts, it provides background on trail users and on current trends affecting OHV, and recreational trail and water trail opportunities. The plans are designed as an information resource as well as a planning tool to guide agencies for the next 10 years.

Specific planning objectives include:

1. Assessing the needs and opinions of Oregon's citizens as they relate to trail recreation opportunities and management (motorized, non-motorized and water);
2. Establishing priorities for expenditures from the Oregon ATV Grant Program, Federal Recreational Trails Program and other applicable sources;
3. Developing strategic directions to guide activities for the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department's ATV Program, statewide recreational trails planning and water access goals;
4. Gathering additional inventory measurement data for motorized and non-motorized trail resources and facilities to add to information gathered for the "2001 Oregon Statewide Outdoor Recreational Resource/Facility Inventory Bulletin;"
5. Conducting a systematic inventory of existing and potential water trails and facilities, identifying priority needs and potential funding sources; and
6. Recommending actions that enhance motorized, non-motorized

and water trail opportunities to all agencies and private sector entities providing trail resources in Oregon.

The results of the concurrent statewide motorized, non-motorized and water trails planning effort are presented in the following chapters of Oregon Trails 2005: A Statewide Action Plan.



Major Planning Components

The following section includes a brief description of the major planning components of the concurrent trails planning effort. If a planning component is a part of the motorized, non-motorized and water trails plan, it will be identified as a “Common” component. Planning components unique to one trail plan are identified by the specific trail planning type.

1. Trails Plan Steering Committees (Common)

Early in the trails planning effort, OPRD established 3 separate steering committees (motorized, non-motorized, and water) to assist with the concurrent planning process. Steering committee members were selected to ensure adequate agency/organizational and geographic coverage and trail-user group representation.

OPRD asked Steering Committee Members to assist with the following tasks for their specific planning effort:

- reviewing the basic planning framework;
- determining the basic plan outline;
- identifying significant statewide trails issues and solutions;
- recommending actions that enhance motorized, non-motorized and water trail opportunities in the state;
- reviewing survey methodology and instruments;
- reviewing draft planning materials;
- recommending a set of project evaluation criteria for the OPRD administered All-Terrain Vehicle

Grant Program (Motorized Trail Committee Members Only) and Recreational Trail Grant Program (Non-Motorized Trail Committee Members Only); and

- assisting in the development of a proposed state-administered water trails program (Water Trail Committee Members Only).

Three rounds of steering committee meetings were held during the 2-year planning process as shown in the following table.

Trails Planning Type	Round 1 Meeting Dates	Round 2 Meeting Dates	Round 3 Meeting Dates
Motorized	2/25/03	9/16/03	10/12/04
Non-Motorized	3/5/03	9/23/03	10/14/04
Water	3/12/03	9/24/03	10/25/04

Meeting objectives for each round of meetings were as follows.

Round 1:

- Bring committee members up-to-date on statewide trails planning progress;
- Review proposed trails planning framework; and
- Identify potential problems/weaknesses and improvements to the proposed planning framework.

Round 2:

- Review trails planning progress;

- Identify the top 3 issues in each of the 6 trails planning regions;
- Identify the top statewide trails issues; and
- Develop a set of proposed goals, objectives and strategies for addressing the top statewide trails issues.

Round 3:

- Review trails planning progress;
- Review 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey results;
- Review Oregon Statewide Trail Inventory Project results; and
- Review and finalize (in the appropriate meeting) the ATV grant program criteria (Motorized Trail Committee), RTP grant program criteria (Non-Motorized Trail Committee) or the Proposed State-Administered Water Trails Program For Oregon (Water Trail Committee).

During the second round meetings, the motorized and non-motorized trail steering committee members recommended that OPRD establish separate ATV and RTP Grant Program Subcommittees for addressing the technical aspects of developing specific evaluation criteria. As a result, OPRD selected a five-member motorized and four-member non-motorized subcommittee to develop a final set of grant criteria for inclusion in the respective trails plans. Members were selected based on prior experience with the administration of grant funding in Oregon.

Two subcommittee meetings were held (Motorized on 9/28/04 and Non-Motorized on 9/30/04) to determine the final set of grant criteria for inclusion in the plans. During these meetings, each subcommittee assisted OPRD staff in the development of a draft set of grant evaluation criteria. Subcommittee members were provided a final review and comment period before the criteria were finalized.

Finally, each member of the Motorized and Non-Motorized Trails Plan Steering Committees was given an opportunity to review their respective criteria before inclusion in the final trails plan.² Benefits of Trails (Common)

During the trails issues workshops, public recreation providers and trail interest groups suggested that the trails plan include trail benefits information to help them to better make the argument for proposed trail projects and address some common misconceptions adjacent property owners have about proposed trails (e.g. increases in crime and decreases in property values). They also asked that the plan provide information in a variety of ways including brief summaries and bibliography lists for those interested in conducting additional research on their own.

The plan includes information on the benefits of motorized, non-motorized and water trails. In addition, separate bibliographies are available for each of the three trail types in Appendices G, H, and I. Direct web links are included in each bibliography for those reports/articles currently available online.

3. Regional Planning Approach (Common)

After a discussion of potential regional boundaries, OPRD planning staff identified a total of 6 regions for the trails planning effort. Each region is of sufficient geographic area to have a unique set of

issues and associated management concern. The 6 planning regions are identified in the figure below.



4. Regional Trails Issue Workshops (Common)

During the months of April and May 2003, OPRD staff conducted a series of 9 regional trails issues workshops across the state. Table 5 (at right) 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 5: Regional Trails 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, participants were given 3 colored dots to assist in prioritizing the importance of the issues gathered. Participants placed their colored dots on those issues they felt were of most importance in the planning region.

Approximately 230 people attended a workshop, including representatives from 56 public-sector recreation provider organizations. During the workshops, 733 trails issue comments were gathered and recorded including 281 motorized, 292 non-motorized and 160 water trail issue comments.

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.

Complete listings of all issues gathered at the workshops and through the website are included in Appendices J, K and L.

5. Identification of Top Regional and Statewide Trail Issues (Common)

Following the issue collection process, OPRD staff developed a set of issue summary papers (separate sets for motorized, non-motorized and water trails issues) to assist members of the three steering committees in the process of identifying top regional issues. The appropriate set of issue summary papers were distributed to each of the three steering committee members prior to the Round 2 meetings.

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 Round 3 meetings, steering committee members used a voting process to identify top regional motorized, non-motorized and water trails issues to include in the plan.

After the regional voting was completed, the committee members reviewed the number of times a particular issue was voted as a top regional issue. In addition, OPRD staff further refined and summarized all regional 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 is a description of this analysis:

- Categorical analysis for trail 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 trail 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 trail 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 this categorical analysis. This statewide issues summary paper was distributed to each steering committee member on August 19, 2003.

During the Round 2 steering committee meetings, OPRD staff provided each of the three steering committees with an opportunity to vote for a set of top statewide trail issues. Those issues receiving the highest number of votes were determined by the steering committees to be the top statewide trail issues.

6. The 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey (Common)

The 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey was conducted over a four-month period from

January to April 2004 by the University of Oregon's Survey Research Laboratory. The survey randomly screened over 15,000 Oregon telephone households to identify respondents reporting trail and non-motorized boat use in the past year. Statistically reliable results are reported for each of three distinct user groups (motorized and non-motorized trail users and non-motorized boaters) at the state level.

The purpose of the survey was to assess the needs and opinions of Oregon's citizens about trail opportunities and management, assess the need for future investment in trail facilities and opportunities and provide trail planners with up-to-date information for local and regional trails planning. The survey report includes a separate set of results for each of the three user groups.

7. Oregon Statewide Trails Inventory Project (Common)

The Oregon Statewide Trails Inventory Project provides a systematic review and inventory of the entire public trail system in Oregon. The overall goal of the project was to create databases containing trail information that can be accessed by government agencies, libraries, and the general public for management and trip planning purposes. The databases are designed to be compatible with geographic information systems (GIS) and allow agencies and other users to identify and map resources and characteristics for public lands in Oregon.

During a 11-month period from September 2003 to July 2004, Oregon State University collected inventory data for existing and proposed motorized, non-motorized and water trails from recreation providers across the state. In total, trail specific attribute

information was collected and entered into a database for 735 trails. In addition GIS map files were collected for 147 trails. A final trails inventory report is included on the trails plan website at:

http://egov.oregon.gov/OPRD/PLANS/trails_planning_newsletters.shtml

8. Statewide Goals, Objectives and Strategies for Top Statewide Issues (Common)

A set of goals, objectives and strategies have been developed for each of the top 4 statewide motorized trail issues, top 2 non-motorized trail issues and 5 non-motorized trail concerns, and top 6 statewide water trails issues based on findings from the trails planning effort. Brainstorming sessions were held during the Round 2 steering committee meetings to develop initial drafts. Committee members were also asked to review and comment on a draft set of goals, objectives and strategies for each of the three plans.

This planning effort recognizes that in Oregon there are finite resources to satisfy the demands of a growing number and diversity of trail users. The increased sharing of resources sometimes creates friction between the diverse types of user groups competing for limited trail space. Rather than focusing on individual user groups, the plans goals, objectives and strategies are designed to optimize the use of limited trail resources in ways that benefit all users and their appropriated trail uses. Decisions on how to best allocate resources for specific user groups are more appropriately addressed in local and regional planning efforts.

9. All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Grant Program Project Selection Criteria (Motorized)

To allocate ATV Grant Program funds in an objective manner, a set of Project Selection Criteria were developed for evaluating motorized trail grant proposals. A substantial number of the total evaluation points available are tied directly to findings from the motorized trails planning effort.

10. Recreational Trail Program (RTP) Grant Program Project Selection Criteria (Non-Motorized)

To allocate RTP Grant Program funds in an objective manner, a set of Project Selection Criteria were developed for evaluating motorized, non-motorized and water trail grant proposals. A substantial number of the total evaluation points available are tied directly to findings from the trails planning effort.

11. A Proposed Water Trail Program For Oregon (Water)

The water trails planning effort has identified three critical factors which pose a serious threat to long-term non-motorized boating access to waterways in Oregon including a rapid increase in participation in non-motorized boating, a lack of legal clarity and understanding of the public's right to Oregon's waterways for recreational purposes and an increasing potential for conflicts between non-motorized boaters and waterfront property owners. To address these concerns, the plan proposes an OPRD-administered Water Trails Program intended to develop a statewide system of water trails carefully designed to minimize conflicts between non-motorized boaters and waterfront property owners.

12. Creating Connections: The Oregon Recreational Trails How-To Manual (Common)

Members of the Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Plan Steering Committee believe that evidence of sound trails planning should be a critical factor to consider in evaluating requests for OPRD administered trail-related grant funding. As a result, the steering committee requested that the trails planning effort include a manual to encourage citizens, civic organizations, governments and private enterprise to collaborate more effectively on trail development.

To satisfy this request, OPRD staff developed a document entitled Creating Connections: The Oregon Recreational Trails How-To Manual. The manual provides information and resources specific to Oregon for trail planning, acquisition, construction and management. The document is a modified version of the original publication, Creating Connections: The Pennsylvania Greenways and Trails How-To Manual, published in 1998 by the Pennsylvania Greenways Partnership—a cooperative effort of the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Pennsylvania Environmental Council, Pennsylvania Field Office of the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, and the Conservation Fund. The state of Oregon and OPRD gratefully acknowledges the Pennsylvania Greenways Partnerships' permission to use their publication.

Due to the size of the document, it is not included in this trails plan. The Creating Connections: The Oregon Recreational Trails How-To Manual document is now available in an electronic format at <http://www.prd.state.or.us/trailsplanning-manual.php> or hardcopy by contacting Tammy Baumann at OPRD by phone:

503.986.0733 or email:
tammy.baumann@state.or.us.

13. Trails Planning Website (Common)

Early in the planning process, OPRD staff developed a trails planning website for people across the state to access current information about the trails planning process. One of the primary objectives of the website was to build interest in the trails plan through the course of the 2-year planning effort. The website was also useful in disseminating major planning results, gathering issue comments, and the review of preliminary draft materials. The website address is:

<http://egov.oregon.gov/OPRD/PLANS/trailsplanning.shtml>



Non-motorized Trails Plan Introduction

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) was given responsibility for recreation trails planning in 1971 under the “State Trails Act” (ORS 390.950 to 390.990). In general the policy of the statute is as follows: “In order to provide for the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding resident and tourist population and in order to promote public access to, travel within and enjoyment and appreciation of, the open-air, outdoor areas of Oregon, trails should be established both near the urban areas in this state and within, adjacent to or connecting highly scenic areas more remotely located.”

In 1971, the Oregon legislature created the Oregon Recreation Trails Program and the Oregon Recreation Trails Advisory Council (ORTAC). This seven-member council, appointed by the Parks and Recreation Commission, advises the Department and the Commission on statewide trail matters that come before the department. They also make recommendations to other trail managing agencies and non-governmental groups. In 1979 the Council approved the first state trails plan. Eight years later, in 1987, the Council adopted the following Mission and Goals Statement:

The Advisory Council will:

- Take the lead in establishing a statewide system of interconnected trails;
- Provide a public forum for trail issues;
- Publicize the value of trails and the need for public involvement in planning, developing, and maintaining trails;

- Work with land management agencies at the inception of trail plans as well as at the review of final drafts;
- Contribute information to state and federal budgeting plans for trails, and monitor the budgeting process;
- Promote private funding, development, and maintenance of public trails;
- Coordinate trails plans with adjacent states;
- Support volunteer groups. Help them coordinate trail development and maintenance with trail management agencies;
- Promote use of trails by providing maps and information to the public; and
- Periodically revise the Oregon Recreational Trails Plan.

The Oregon Recreation Trails Plan has been in place since 1995. Although many of the findings included in this plan are still relevant, considerable change has occurred on Oregon’s recreational trails in the last 9 years including a 13% state population increase between 1995 and 2003 and increases in recreational trail use. As a general rule, planning documents of this type have a usable shelf life of 10 years. As a result, there was a need to update the trails plan for non-motorized trail uses.

The purpose of this non-motorized trails planning effort was to provide information and recommendations to guide OPRD and other agencies in Oregon in their management of non-motorized trail resources. The plan is designed to:

- Assess the needs and opinions of Oregon’s citizens as they relate to non-motorized trail opportunities and management;
- Establish priorities for expenditures from the Federal Recreational Trails Grant Program;
- Develop strategic directions to guide activities for statewide recreational trails planning;
- Gather additional inventory measurement data for non-motorized trail resources and facilities; and
- Recommend actions that enhance non-motorized trail opportunities to all agencies and the private sector providing trail resources in Oregon.

The plan has been developed as an information resource as well as a planning tool to guide agencies for the next 10 years.

For the purposes of this planning effort, non-motorized trail uses include (but are not limited to) hikers, backpackers, mountain bike riders, equestrians, runners, walkers, bicycle riders, inline skaters and individuals with functional impairments. A non-motorized trail is defined as a regularly maintained recreation pathway typically used by a variety of non-motorized trail users. The designated trail should be purposefully planned and constructed for non-motorized recreation purposes, but in some cases can be used for commuter purposes. Non-motorized trails do not include city streets and sidewalks and bike lanes incorporated into the design of city streets and rural highways.

The non-motorized trails plan includes the following chapters:

Chapter 1. Benefits of Non-Motorized Trails

During the trails issues workshops, public recreation providers and trail interest groups suggested that the non-motorized trails plan include trail benefits information for them to better make the case for proposed trail projects and address some common misconceptions adjacent landowners have about proposed trails. This chapter summarizes the many benefits that non-motorized trails can provide in the state of Oregon.

Chapter 2. Identification of Top Regional and Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Issues

This chapter includes a list of the 3 top regional non-motorized trail issues in each of the 6 trails planning regions and the 2 top statewide non-motorized trail issues and 5 top statewide trail concerns identified during the planning process.

Chapter 3. The 2004 Oregon Statewide Non-Motorized Trail User Survey

This chapter presents key findings from the 2004 telephone survey of Oregon non-motorized trail users. The purpose of the survey was to assess the needs and opinions of Oregon’s citizens about trail opportunities and management, assess the need for future investment in trail facilities and opportunities and provide trail planners with up-to-date information for local and regional non-motorized trail planning.

Chapter 4. Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Goals, Objectives and Strategies

This chapter focuses on a set of long-range goals, objectives and strategies for the top 2 Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Issues and 5 top Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concerns as identified through the non-motorized trails planning effort. These goals, objectives and strategies were

developed for use by non-motorized recreation decision makers across the state to develop policies and actions for resolving the 2 top statewide non-motorized trail issues and 5 non-motorized trail concerns.

Chapter 5. Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Evaluation Criteria

The non-motorized trails plan concludes with a set of project selection criteria for evaluating non-motorized, motorized and water trail grant proposals for the Federal Recreational Trails Program. The criteria make the connection between findings from the 2005-2014: A Statewide Action Plan effort and how limited RTP grant monies will be allocated.



Benefits of Non-Motorized Trails

During the trails issues workshops, public recreation providers and trail interest groups suggested that the trails plan include trail benefits information for them to better make the case for proposed trail projects and address some common misconceptions adjacent landowners have about proposed trails (e.g. increases in crime and decreases in property values).

Trails positively impact individuals and improve communities by providing not only recreation opportunities and health and fitness benefits, but also by influencing economic and community development. The following is a summary of the many benefits that non-motorized trails can provide in the state of Oregon.

1. Economic Benefits.

a. Money spent in communities by trail users.

Across Oregon, non-motorized recreational trails are stimulating tourism and recreation-related spending. Local trail users, vacationers and conference attendees provide direct economic benefits to hotels, restaurants and other businesses from increases in tourist activity and increased spending on durable goods such as bikes or skates, and soft goods such as gasoline, food, and drinks. This, in turn, attracts and revitalizes businesses, creates jobs, and increases public revenue.



Evidence from economic studies include:

- Events associated with the Oregon Trail Sesquicentennial celebration in 1993⁷ (coordinated by the nonprofit Oregon Trail Coordinating Council) included the "Official Oregon Trail Sesquicentennial Wagon Train" (joined by over 10,000 people along its route and 20,000 for evening programs), the "Oregon Trail Fest" kickoff event (a two-day event in Portland involving nearly 100,000 people), "Company's Coming" (a statewide clean-up day), and "Trail's End Finale" (with over 5,000 participants). Also, considerable commemorative merchandise including license plates, rifles, pins, blankets, checks, coins, traveler's journals, and wine were produced and marketed. The Council raised over \$4.5 million in federal, state, and private funds estimated to have leveraged another \$19.8 million in additional revenues in the form of contributions. Preliminary estimates of visitor spending generated by the Oregon Trail Interpretive

⁷ Renner, J. (1994). Making a Case for the Economic Benefits of Historic and Heritage Tourism. Paper Presented at the 12th. National Trails Symposium. Anchorage, AK. September 28-October 1, 1994.

Center near Baker City, OR, for example, recorded 672,555 visitors from May 23, 1992 through July 1994.

- A study conducted by the National Park Service Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program⁸ examined the economic impact of three rail-trails from May 1990 to February 1991. The trails included two suburban/rural trails—the Heritage Trail in Iowa and the St. Marks Trail in Florida, and an urban trail—the Lafayette/Moraga Trail in California. Estimates for average user expenditures and total economic activity resulting from trail use are included in Table 6.

Trail Name/Length	Average User Expenditures	Annual Economic Contribution
Suburban/Rural Trails		
Heritage Trail (IA) 26 mi.	\$9.21	\$1.2 million
St. Marks Trail (FL) 16 mi.	\$11.02	\$1.9 million
Urban Trail		
Lafayette/Moraga (CA) 7.6 mi.	\$3.97	\$1.5 million

The more rural trails had average expenditures significantly larger than the urban trail (but the urban trail had significantly more users). The study found that auto-related expenditures were the largest trip-related expenditures, and visitors staying at least one night in the area generated the largest average expenditures. Trail-related equipment, such as bicycles and skates, represented the single largest source of expenditures for all three trails.

- Users of the Sugar River Trail in southwestern Wisconsin were surveyed during a period from 1979 through 1985.⁹ Analysis of this survey data showed a low average in 1979 of \$5.20 per person and a high average in 1984 of \$10.99 being spent per trail user. Based on these estimates and amount of trail use, the total annual contribution of the trail to the local economy ranged from \$158,704 to \$522,025.
- A study of trail users of the Northern Central Rail Trail (NCRT)¹⁰ near Baltimore, reported that trail visitation grew from under 10,000 visitors per year in 1984 to over 450,000 in 1993. The value of goods purchased because of the NCRT for 1993 was estimated in excess of \$3.4 million. Trail users who had purchased goods for use on the trail spend on average \$203 in 1993. Similarly, users who purchased soft goods (food, etc.) before

⁸ National Park Service. (1992). The Impacts of Rail-Trails, A Study of Users and Nearby Property Owners From Three Trails. Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program.

⁹ Lawton, K. (1986). The Economic Impact of Bike Trails: A Case Study of the Sugar River Trail. Unpublished Manuscript. New Glarus, WI: Sugar River State Trail Corp.

¹⁰ PKF Consulting. (1994). Analysis of Economic Impacts of the Northern Central Rail Trail. Prepared for the Maryland Greenways Commission, Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

or after using the trail spent an average of \$6.30 per visit. Additionally, the study estimated that the trail supports 264 jobs statewide.

- A study of visitors to Wisconsin's Elroy-Sparta State Trail¹¹ found that suburban and rural trails with historic or natural characteristics that encourage vacation-style trips generate more revenue per use than urban and suburban trails used for light recreation and commuting. Half of all trail users to the Elroy-Sparta State Trail were identified as out-of-state visitors who bring new money into the state. Total expenditures in 1988 were over \$1.2 million. The study reported that spending by out-of-state visitors for lodging, bike rentals, bus shuttle service, and restaurant meals was roughly twice as high as for in-state visitors. The study also reported that peak-season hotel rooms along the Elroy-Sparta Trail were booked up a full year in advance.
- The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources analyzed survey data gathered on six rail-trails from 1980 through 1988 and found that trip-related expenditures varied greatly depending upon which trail was visited and how far users traveled to get to the trails¹². Users who traveled less than 25 miles to get to the trails spend an average of \$.61 to \$2.86 per day, depending on the trail visited. Those traveling 25 miles and farther spent up to \$53.20 per day on average.

b. Impacts on property values and ability to sell.

People owning property bordering a proposed trail sometimes are concerned that developing a trail will lower their property values. However, a rather substantial body of research from across the U.S. demonstrates that proximity to trails and open space has very little impact on the value of property. In many cases, trails often increase the value of residential property and the ability to sell a property. Research findings include:

- In a survey sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders¹³ recent homebuyers 55 years and older were asked to identify amenities that would seriously influence their decision to purchase a home. According to study results, walking and jogging trails are the most desirable amenity, with roughly half of active adults and older seniors (52%) saying the presence of trails would seriously influence the home buying decision. This number increases substantially with annual incomes greater than \$75,000 (65%). Outdoor spaces (especially parks) were second on the list at 51%, followed by public transportation at 46%.

¹¹ Schwecke, Sprehn, Hamilton and Gray. (1989). A Look at Visitors on Wisconsin's Elroy-Sparta Bike Trail. University of Wisconsin Extension, Madison, WI.

¹² Regnier, C. (1989). Minnesota Off-Road Bike Trail Use: 1980-1988. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Trails and Waterways Unit. Unpublished paper.

¹³ Wylde, M. (2000). Boomers on the Horizon: Housing Preferences of the 55+ Market. Survey Sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders.

- A study in Salem, Oregon¹⁴ found that proximity to greenbelt parcels (privately owned in this case) added a premium of \$1,200 per acre, in comparison to similar properties 1,000 feet or more from the greenbelt.

- A study of property values in Eugene, Oregon¹⁵ examined the effects of the South Ridgeline Trail on the property values of nearby homes. The study found that distance to the nearest trailhead was strongly significant in the sale price of a home. The study concluded that the value of a home increased \$6.77 for every foot of decrease in this distance.



- A study of real estate agents with experience along Seattle's 12.1 mile Burke-Gilman Trail¹⁶ found the trail had increased the value of homes near, but not on, the trail by 6.5%. The trail has had no significant effect on the value of homes immediately adjacent to the trail. In addition, the study showed homes and condominiums near and adjacent to the trail are easier to sell because of their proximity to the trail.
- A study of property values in Boulder, Colorado¹⁷ noted that housing prices declined an average of \$4.20 for each foot of distance from a greenbelt up to 3,200 feet. In one neighborhood, this figure was \$10.20 for each foot of distance. The study determined that, other variables being equal, the average value of property adjacent to the greenbelt would be higher than those 3,200 feet away.

c. Attracting businesses.

Many communities want to attract new, expanding, or relocating businesses to their area in order to increase their employment and tax bases. The importance of "quality of life" is increasingly cited as a major factor in corporate and business location decisions. As an amenity that plays an important role in increasing a community's "quality of life", trails are becoming more and more attractive to businesses and their employees¹⁸.

- The City of Pueblo, Colorado attributes the investment in trails and parks along the Arkansas River and Fountain Creek as one of the most important components in the economic revitalization efforts of this industrial city.¹⁹

¹⁴ Nelson, A. (1986). Using Land Markets to Evaluate Urban Containment Programs. *APA Journal*, Spring, pp. 156-171.

¹⁵ Jensen, D., and Durham, J. (2003). The Property Value Effects of the South Ridgeline Trail. University of Oregon Economics. Department Undergraduate Honor Papers. Faculty Advisor: Harbaugh, B.

¹⁶ Seattle Engineering Department (1987). Evaluation of Burke-Gilman Trail's Effect on Property Values and Crime. Seattle, WA. Office for Planning.

¹⁷ Correll, Lillydahl and Singell. (1978). The Effects of Greenbelts on Residential Property Values: Some Findings on the Political Economy of Open Space, *Land Economics*.

¹⁸ National Park Service. (1995). Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenway Corridors. *Rivers Trails and Conservation Assistance*, National Park Service. Fourth Edition (Revised).

¹⁹ Federal Highway Administration (1992). Transportation Potential and Other Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 7. Publication No. FHWA-PD-92-040.

- The River Walk is often visited by prospective businesses looking to relocate to the San Antonio, Texas area. A business location along the River Walk is considered very desirable because the pedestrian system provides a retreat for employees during lunch and access to valuable green space within the central business district.²⁰
- A survey of 71 economists rated factors for Arizona's attractiveness as a place to live, work, vacation, retire, and locate future plants and corporate headquarters. The strongest factors contributing to Arizona's positive image were climate, job opportunities, and open space including abundant outdoor recreation opportunities. Seventy firms relocated or expanded their businesses in Arizona, creating 27,800 jobs and \$970 million in indirect salaries and wages²¹. Chief executive officers of these firms said they chose Arizona for its "outdoor lifestyle and recreation opportunities."²²

d. Proximity to Trails and Crime.

People owning property bordering a proposed trail often are concerned that developing a trail will increase crimes such as muggings, assault, rape, trespass, burglary and vandalism. However, studies from across the U.S. consistently report no increase in crimes against people or against property that can be attributed to a specific trail, and that support by property owners for trails generally increases over time²³. Research findings include:

- A comprehensive study sponsored by the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy examined the incidence of crime at 372 rail-trails across the United States²⁴. Overall, the study shows that rail-trails are safe places for people to recreate (see Table 7 below). In 1995, only eleven of 372 rail-trails experienced any type of major crime, such as mugging, assault, rape and murder. When contrasted with general major crime statistics in urban, suburban and rural areas, rail-trails have experienced very low major crime rates.

TABLE 7: Crime Rates: Comparing Statistics For the Nation vs. Rail Trails ²⁵ (Rates from 1995 per 100,000 population/users)						
Crime	Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	U.S.	Rail-Trails	U.S.	Rail-Trails	U.S.	Rail-Trails
Mugging	335	0.53	102	0.00	19	0.00
Assault	531	0.58	293	0.02	203	0.01
Forcible Rape	43	0.04	29	0.00	26	0.01
Murder	11	0.04	4	0.01	5	0.01

²⁰ Federal Highway Administration (1992). Transportation Potential and Other Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 7. Publication No. FHWA-PD-92-040.

²¹ National Park Service. (1995). Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenway Corridors. Rivers Trails and Conservation Assistance, Fourth Edition (Revised).

²² Valley National Bank. (1980). Arizona's Favorable Image Spurs Economic Growth. Arizona Progress November. Phoenix, AZ: Economic Research Department.

²³ Florida Department of Environmental Protection (1998). Thinking Green. A Guide to the Benefits and Costs of Greenways and Trails. Office of Greenways and Trails, Tallahassee, FL.

²⁴ Tracy, T., and Morris, H. (1998). Rail-Trails and Safe Communities: The Experience on 372 Trails. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service.

²⁵ FBI Uniform Crime Reports. (1995). Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.

The study also reported incidents of minor crimes at the 372 rail-trails (see Table 8). It also cites several local law enforcement agencies that state heavy trail usage acts as a deterrent in formerly isolated areas.

Crime	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Burglary	0%	.01%	.01%
Trespassing	5%	3%	4%
Graffiti	26%	17%	12%
Littering	24%	24%	25%
Sign damage	22%	22%	23%
Unauthorized motorized use	18%	14%	23%

A total of 36 urban, 82 suburban and 254 rural rail-trails were surveyed in 1995.

- A 1978 study of the Lafayette/Moraga Trail near San Francisco²⁷ found that over 60% of property owners surveyed reported no problems due to the presence of the trail. The problems most commonly related by property owners were trespass and motor vehicle use of the trail. The study concluded that most property owners believed there were fewer problems after creation of the trail than before, and 92% felt the trail had either improved or had no effect on the quality of their neighborhoods. A follow-up study by the National Park Service in 1992²⁸ reported that neighborhood perceptions of problems due to crime and/or nuisances were largely unchanged from the 1978 report.
- A similar result was observed in a 1990 USDA Forest Service study²⁹ of 19 trails in Illinois. While the study found that typical users did not perceive problems, respondents from urban settings reported slightly greater perception of problems than did those from suburban and rural greenways.
- A study of the Burke-Gilman Trail in Seattle³⁰ reported that homes bordering the trail actually had lower rates of burglary and vandalism than the neighborhood average.

²⁶ Tracy, T., and Morris, H. (1998). Rail-Trails and Safe Communities: The Experience on 372 Trails. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service.

²⁷ Correll, Lillydahl, and Singell. (1978). The Effects of Greenbelts on Residential Values: Some Findings on the Political Economy of Open Space. Land Economics, 54(2), pp. 207-217.

²⁸ National Park Service. (1992). The Impacts of Rail-Trails, A Study of Users and Nearby Property Owners From Three Trails. Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program.

²⁹ Gobster, P. (1990). The Illinois Statewide Trail User Study. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. Chicago, U.S. Forest Service.

³⁰ Seattle Engineering Department (1987). Evaluation of Burke-Gilman Trail's Effect on Property Values and Crime. Seattle, WA. Office for Planning.

2. Health and Fitness Benefits.

Trail activities such as walking, jogging or running, in-line skating, cross-country skiing, and bicycling are well documented to help improve health and fitness when done on a regular basis³¹. Physical activity need not be unduly strenuous for an individual to reap significant health benefits. Even small increases in light to moderate activity, equivalent to walking for about 30 minutes a day, will produce measurable benefits among those who are least active. This health benefit accrues to the individual, and, in the form of reduced health-care costs, to society as well.

Many people realize exercise is important for maintaining good health in all stages of life, however many do not regularly exercise. The U.S. Surgeon General estimates³² that 60% of American adults are not regularly active and another 25% are not active at all. In communities across the country, people do not have access to trails, parks, or other recreation areas close to their homes. Non-motorized trails provide a safe, inexpensive avenue for regular exercise for people living in rural, urban and suburban areas.

Exercise derived from trail-related activities lessens health related problems and subsequent health care costs. Regular, moderate exercise has been proven to reduce the risk of developing coronary heart disease, stroke, colon cancer, hypertension, diabetes, osteoporosis, obesity, and depression. This kind of exercise is also known to protect against injury and disability because it builds muscular strength and flexibility, which

³¹ State of Indiana. (2000). Indiana Trails Plan 2000.

³² Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse.

helps to maintain functional independence in later years of life³³.

A nationwide study on the cost of obesity³⁴ concluded that increasing participation in the amount of regular moderate activity by the more than 88 million inactive Americans over age 15 could reduce annual national medical costs by \$76 billion in 2000 dollars. A recently completed plan entitled, A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan, points out that the current epidemic of obesity has also hit Oregon hard³⁵. At 22%, our state has the highest percentage of adult obesity of any state west of the Rockies. Add that to 38% of Oregon adults who are overweight and we have the startling total of 60% of Oregonians not at a healthy weight. Our youth follow closely behind, with 28% of eighth graders and 21% of eleventh graders currently overweight. The Statewide Physical Activity Plan is a call to action for all who can have an impact on promoting daily physical activity to improve the health of Oregonians. The plan has identified the need for more community trails as a top priority.

The Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey was conducted over a one-year period from February 2001 to January 2002 by Oregon State University's (OSU) College of Forestry as a part of Oregon Parks and Recreation's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation planning effort. The

³³ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1996). Surgeon General's Report on Physical Activity and Health. Department of Health and Human Services. July 1996.

³⁴ Pratt, M., Macera, C., and Wang, G. (2000). Higher Direct Medical Costs Associated With Physical Inactivity. *The Physician and Sports Medicine* 28(10).

³⁵ Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Fitness (2003). A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan.

findings of the Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey³⁶ identified that the most popular everyday activities in Oregon are running and walking for exercise and walking for pleasure. According to the OSU report, these activities are generally engaged in near home, and on a regular basis. These findings help to make the case that neighborhood trails are essential in providing all Oregonians with a means to realize the health and fitness benefits associated with daily exercise.

Finally, every year, premature deaths cost American companies an estimated 132 million lost workdays at a price tag of \$25 billion. Each year, finding and training replacements costs industry more than \$700 million. In addition, American businesses lose an estimated \$3 billion every year because of employee health problems (National Park Service, 1983). Providing close-to-home access to trails can encourage regular exercise, improve overall employee health and help to reduce these work-related costs.

3. Social Benefits.

Trail projects help build partnerships among private companies, landowners neighboring municipalities, local government, and advocacy groups. Each trail contains elements of local character and regional influence, and reflects the hard work, enthusiasm, and commitment of individuals, organizations, elected officials, and agencies. All are able to take pride in having worked together to successfully complete a trail project³⁷. In

addition, when residents are encouraged to become involved in a trail project, they feel more connected to the community³⁸.

Because of their linear design, trails act as a meeting place for the community. As a result, trails promote family unity as well as strengthen friendships and neighbor relations. They are places where entire families, friends and neighbors can gather and recreate together safely.

Neighborhood trails can improve pride in a community in other ways as well. A trail that runs through a community often leads to the residents and business owners showing their "best side" by cleaning or fixing up their property. A popular and well-managed trail can also serve as a focal point for a community for special events and a gathering place. These activities can lead to greater interaction between residents and improve the cohesion of a community³⁹.



³⁶ Johnson, R. (2002). Oregon's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan: Demand and Needs Analysis. Oregon State University, Department of Forest Resources.

³⁷ National Bicycle and Pedestrian Clearinghouse (1995). The Economic and Social Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. NBPC

Technical Brief. Technical Assistance Series, Number 2.

³⁸ Warren, N. (1998). Nova Scotia Hiking Trails Study. Nova Trails Federation.

³⁹ State of Indiana (2000). Indiana Trails 2000.

4. Educational Benefits.

Trails present a unique opportunity for education. People of all ages can learn more about nature, culture or history along trails. Of particular importance, trails provide firsthand experiences that educate citizens about the importance of the natural environment and respect for nature. This education can be accomplished using comprehensive trail guides, signage, public outreach, and informative classes to encourage awareness of the natural, cultural, and historical attributes of the trail.

Restricted budgets in schools across the nation have heavily affected transportation and have reduced educators' abilities to provide away-from-the-classroom learning experiences⁴⁰. As a result, trails are becoming more and more valuable as real-life outdoor laboratories for learning about the natural environment. Trails can provide a perfect classroom for the teaching biologist, botanist, and ecologist, both amateur and professional. Educators, naturalists, rangers and scoutmasters—all can demonstrate and illustrate their lessons along the trail⁴¹.

5. Recreation Benefits.

Linear corridors offer several benefits over traditional park facilities⁴². These benefits include providing greater perimeter area,

⁴⁰ Federal Highway Administration (1992). Transportation Potential and Other Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 7. Publication No. FHWA-PD-92-040.

⁴¹ North American Water Trails, Inc. Why Water Trails?

⁴² Federal Highway Administration (1992). Transportation Potential and Other Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 7. Publication No. FHWA-PD-92-040.

multiple visitor experiences, increased access, and lower acquisition and development costs. Many trails have multiple recreation benefits such as providing access to fishing, vista points for photography, picnic areas for socializing, and camping areas. They also provide access to areas for enjoying solitude, observing wildlife and experiencing the natural environment⁴³. Finally, multiple-use trails serve a wide range of recreationists including bicyclists, walkers, joggers, equestrians, in-line skaters, people in wheelchairs, hikers, bird-watchers, parents with strollers, picnickers, and people who just want to sit in the sunshine.



6. Environmental Benefits.

Trails can be an integral part of our natural environment and should be used as a tool for conservation. Trails can be planned to assist with preserving important natural landscapes, providing necessary links between fragmented habitats and providing tremendous opportunities for protecting plant and animal species. Increased development has contributed to the creation of habitat "islands"—isolating wildlife, reducing their natural habitats and survival. Trails with sufficiently wide corridors of natural area can provide that

⁴³ State of California. (2001). California Recreational Trails Plan. Department of Parks and Recreation.

important link between these island populations and habitats and increase the available land to many wildlife species⁴⁴.

In addition, trails can help improve air and water quality. Trails provide enjoyable and safe options for transportation, which helps reduce air pollution⁴⁵. They can also improve air quality by protecting the plants that naturally create oxygen and filter out air pollutants. By protecting land along rivers and streams, trails prevent soil erosion and filter pollution caused by surface runoff.

7. Preserving our History and Culture.

Trails have the power to connect us to our heritage by preserving historic places and by providing access to them⁴⁶. They can give people a sense of place and an understanding of the enormity of past events, such as Native American trails, the Lewis and Clark expedition, westward migration along the Oregon Trail and accessing historic sites throughout the state. Special events such as the previously mentioned Oregon Trail Sesquicentennial celebration help to point out the importance of historic trails to all Oregonians. In addition, other trails preserve transportation corridors. Rail-trails along historic rail corridors (e.g. the OC&E-Woods line Trail in Klamath Falls) provide a glance at the importance of this mode of transportation.



⁴⁴ San Diego County. Five-Year Strategic Plan. Appendix C.

⁴⁵ Practical Horseman (2002). Ride Where Trains Once Rolled.

⁴⁶ Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse. Benefits of Trails and Greenways.

IDENTIFICATION OF REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS ISSUES

Public involvement played a central and recurring role throughout the Oregon statewide trails planning process. OPRD conducted a series of 9 regional public workshops across the state during 2003 to discuss the major issues that affect the provision of non-motorized trail opportunities in Oregon.

The Public Workshop Process

During April and May of 2003, OPRD staff completed a series of 9 regional trail issues workshops across the state. Each workshop included an afternoon session open to all public recreation providers and an evening session open to the general public.

The widest possible range of “public” was invited to participate in the process. For the afternoon sessions, an invitation letter was sent to all public-sector recreation providers in the state requesting participation in their respective regional trails issues workshops. For the general public workshops (evening sessions), ads were placed for each workshop in local and regional newspapers. In addition, press releases were sent out to media outlets prior to each workshop. In keeping with the plan’s regional approach and to maximize input and participation, 9 sites were selected from around the state for the issues workshops (a table of meeting locations is included in Table 5 on page 16).

Both afternoon and evening workshops included a brief description of the trails planning region, workshop process, and how the regional issues information was to be used in the plan. Next, participants listened to a 20-minute presentation on the statewide planning effort. Each workshop included a separate issues gathering process for motorized, non-motorized, and water trails issues.

Trail issues were defined as any high-impact issue related to providing recreational trail opportunities within the region. Issues could be related to trail facilities, management (e.g. user conflicts), programs, projects and funding. At the conclusion of daytime and evening workshop each workshop attendees were 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.

A thorough description of how top regional issues were determined is included under the Major Planning Component heading on page 14.



List of Top Regional Non-Motorized Trails Plan Issues

The following list includes those issues identified as top regional non-motorized trails issues.

Northwest Trails Planning Region

(Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Lincoln, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lane 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.

North Central 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.



South Central 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 multiple-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 Non-Motorized 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 9 were identified by the steering committee as Key Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Issues.

TABLE 9: Identification of Key Statewide Non-Motorized Trails Issues	
Non-Motorized 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

During the September 23, 2003 steering committee meeting, OPRD staff used a sheet including information presented in the first 2 columns of Table 10 (below) to provide steering committee members an opportunity to vote for a set of top Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concerns. Table 10 includes the total number of committee member votes each issue received. Those issues with the highest number of votes (shown in bold) were determined by the steering committee to be the 5 top Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concerns. Although not as critical as the 2 top Statewide Issues, resolution of these 5 top Statewide Trail Concerns is a priority during the plan's 10-year planning horizon.

TABLE 10: Identification of Top Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concerns		
Non-Motorized 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 Non-Motorized Issues are:

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

The final set of Top Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concerns are:

- Statewide Trail Concern 1: Need for more trails in close proximity to where people live
- Statewide Trail Concern 2: Need for additional non-motorized trails
- Statewide Trail Concern 3: Need to consider public ways (roads, railroads, utility corridors) proposed for closure or abandonment for non-motorized trail use
- Statewide Trail Concern 4: Need for trail accessibility information (such as key trail type and condition information allowing individuals to decide whether a particular trail is accessible to them or not)
- Statewide Trail Concern 5: Need for regional interagency coordination/ cooperation in trail planning and management



2004 Oregon Statewide Non-Motorized Trail User Survey

by Woody Carter and Tony Silvaggio
University of Oregon, Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

Research Background

This chapter presents key findings from the 2004 telephone survey of Oregon non-motorized trail users. The project was part of the Oregon Trails 2005-2014: A Statewide Action Plan effort, funded by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. The survey randomly screened over 15,000 Oregon telephone households to identify respondents reporting trail and non-motorized boat use in the past year. Separate questionnaires were administered for motorized trail users, non-motorized trail users, and non-motorized boaters.

The survey employed a random digit dial methodology to identify Oregon residents who reported qualifying trail or non-motorized boating use in the last year. Data collection was conducted in two waves. An initial list of 9,500 telephone numbers was called to identify motorized trail users, non-motorized trail users, and non-motorized boaters. At the end of this data collection sufficient motorized trail users and non-motorized boaters were not achieved, so an additional 5,950 telephone numbers were called in association with another survey. This additional screening resulted in quotas for trail and water users being achieved that permit a sampling error for each group of \pm 5-6%. The random telephone design and low sampling errors contribute to making this one of the most scientifically rigorous studies of trail users conducted to date for Oregon.

Non-Motorized Trail Users

The following section provides survey results specific to non-motorized trail users.

Non-Motorized Trail User Demographic Information

Thirty three percent of Oregon households have a person reporting non-motorized trail use, amounting to 438,500 households in the state. Screening procedure asked first for any motorized trail user or non-motorized boaters in the household, and those persons, if present, were interviewed about those usage patterns. If neither usage type was present in the household, a non-motorized trail user was interviewed if present. The results reported here thus relate to households without any motorized trail user or non-motorized boater present, and thus will not reflect the views of non-motorized trail users who live in such households. The biases introduced due to this sampling design are negligible.

Basic demographics of non-motorized trail users are provided in the following table:

TABLE 11: Non-Motorized Demographics N = 326	
Gender:	
Male	44%
Female	56%
Age:	
18 – 29	14%
30 – 39	22%
40 – 49	27%
50 – 59	20%
60 – 69	12%
70+	4%
Education:	
Less than high school	3%
High school graduate	14%
Some college	34%
Bachelors	31%
Masters	14%
Doctorate	4%
Income:	
Less than \$18,000	13%
\$18,000 - \$24,999	7%
\$25,000 - \$39,999	19%
\$40,000 – \$69,999	32%
\$70,000 - \$99,999	17%
\$100,000+	13%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 4%	

Most non-motorized respondents are female, and the median age is 40 – 49 years old. A sizable majority has some college (83%), with about half being college graduates (49%). Median income is \$40,000 to \$69,999.

Non-Motorized Trail Participation

The survey asked non-motorized trail users about the frequency of their participation in different activities. The following table reports the percentage participation in each activity, and the estimated number of Oregon households that this represents⁴⁷:

⁴⁷ The survey did not ask how many in the household participated in each activity, so no figure for total participation can be estimated.

TABLE 12: Extent of Non-Motorized Trail Participation

N = 326	Participated in Last Year	Estimated Oregon Households
Trail hiking or day hiking	87%	381,500
Walking for pleasure	82%	359,500
Bicycling (other than mountain biking)	38%	166,700
Jogging or running	29%	127,200
Backpacking overnight	16%	70,200
Mountain biking (on natural terrain trails)	14%	61,400
Cross-country skiing	12%	52,600
Horseback riding	7%	30,700
Roller blading (in-line skating)	5%	21,900
Hiking with horses, mules, llama	2%	8,800
Competitive trail events	2%	8,800
Other	13%	57,000

Sampling error for the "in last year" question is $\pm 4\%$.

The survey also asked how often the respondent engaged in each activity in the last year:

TABLE 13: Frequency of Non-Motorized Trail Participation

N = 326	In Last Year	Of Participants in Last Year, How Often?			
		Weekly	2-3 a Month	Once a Month	Less Often
Trail hiking or day hiking	87%	11%	23%	20%	46%
Walking for pleasure	82%	28%	21%	20%	32%
Bicycling (other than mountain biking)	38%	29%	22%	17%	31%
Jogging or running	29%	43%	24%	12%	22%
Backpacking overnight	16%	0%	6%	11%	83%
Mountain biking (on natural terrain trails)	14%	15%	17%	17%	50%
Cross-country skiing	12%	13%	10%	18%	60%
Horseback riding	7%	21%	17%	17%	46%
Roller blading (in-line skating)	5%	13%	6%	25%	56%
Hiking with horses, mules, llama	2%	0%	14%	43%	43%
Competitive trail events	2%	20%	20%	0%	60%
Other	13%	14%	10%	26%	50%

Sampling error for the "in last year" question is $\pm 4\%$. Sampling errors for the frequency questions are from $\pm 5\%$ for the most common activity to $\pm 44\%$ for the least common.

Non-motorized trail users report frequent participation in their trail activities. Hiking and walking for pleasure lead the group, with bicycling and jogging or running also having a sizable proportion of participants. Joggers and runners are the most likely to engage in their

activities weekly, followed by bicyclers, walkers, horseback riders, and participants in competitive trail events. Among the “other” activities cited are snow shoeing, camping, and hunting.

When asked to select their favorite non-motorized trail activities, respondents answered as follows:

TABLE 14: Favorite Non-Motorized Trail Activity N = 326	
Trail hiking or day hiking	41%
Walking for pleasure	24%
Bicycling (other than mountain biking)	10%
Jogging or running	5%
Backpacking overnight	4%
Mountain biking (on natural terrain trails)	4%
Horseback riding	4%
Cross-country skiing	2%
Roller blading (in-line skating)	1%
Hiking with horses, mules, llama	0%
Competitive trail events	0%
Other	6%
Sampling error for these questions is $\pm 4\%$	

Trail hiking and walking for pleasure lead the list, with all others garnering smaller percentages, led by bicycling.

Distance Traveled and Preferred Setting for Non-Motorized Activities

To reach their most frequent non-motorized trail activity, trail users travel a median of only one to ten miles (one way).⁴⁸ The median is the number that reflects the answer given by a cumulative 50% of respondents; half travel farther, and half not as far. Non-motorized trail users travel only a bit further, 11 to 20 miles, to reach their favorite activity:

⁴⁸ Since the top category for this question went above 200 miles, the mean distance would be higher.

TABLE 15: Distance Traveled for Most Frequent and for Favorite Non-Motorized Activities⁴⁹
N = 316

Miles Traveled (One Way)	Most Frequent Activity		Favorite Activity	
	Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage	Cumulative
1 – 10	51%	51%	44%	44%
11 – 20	10%	62%	13%	57%
21 – 30	11%	72%	9%	66%
31 – 40	6%	78%	4%	70%
41 – 50	7%	85%	8%	78%
51 – 75	6%	92%	9%	87%
76 – 100	5%	96%	7%	93%
Over 100 miles	4%	100%	7%	100%

Sampling error for this question is $\pm 5\%$

For both their most frequent and favorite non-motorized activities, respondents prefer trails in remote areas followed by a rural area or park. For their most frequent activities, non-motorized trail users prefer urban and suburban settings (combined 38%) more than they do for their favorite activities (combined 28%). Non-motorized trail users prefer remote areas for their favorite activities, as the following table reveals:

TABLE 16: Preferred Setting for Most Frequent and Favorite Non-Motorized Trail Activities
N = 325

	Most Frequent Activity	Favorite Activity
Remote area	33%	45%
Rural area or park	29%	28%
Urban setting	23%	18%
Suburban setting	15%	10%

Sampling error for this question is $\pm 4\%$

Comparing the last two tables, it is interesting to note that although 33% of respondents feel their most frequent activity is in a remote area, 85% report this activity is within 50 miles of their home. This suggests that users feel they are having a “remote” experience when they may actually be very close to a rural or a suburban setting.

Respondents were presented with six types of trails, such as day-use, loop, or multi-day trails, and asked, “How likely is it you would use each of these trail types?” The following table presents the results:

⁴⁹ Respondents were not restricted to destinations in Oregon.

TABLE 17: Preferred Non-Motorized Trail Type			
N = 312-325	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not as Likely
Short, day-use trail	75%	21%	4%
Trail to specific destinations	69%	26%	5%
Loop trail	68%	25%	6%
Interpretive or nature trail	59%	33%	8%
Interconnected network of trails	54%	33%	13%
Multi-day trail	26%	26%	48%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 5%			

Day use trails, trails to specific destinations, and loop trails are most preferred. Only overnight backpacking trails are unlikely to be used by a sizable proportion of non-motorized trail users, but even for these, more than half the respondents say they are at least somewhat likely to use such a trail.

Reasons Non-Motorized Trails Not Used as Much as Desired

Over half of non-motorized trail users report they would like to participate in non-motorized trail activities more than they do. This reflects a large reservoir of unmet need.

TABLE 18: Use Trails as Much As Wanted – Non-Motorized	
N = 324	
Want to use trails more	53%
Use trails as much as want to	47%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 4%	

The survey asked for constraints to non-motorized trail use:

TABLE 19: Reasons for Not Using Trails as Much as Wanted – Non-Motorized 1 = The Major Reason, 4 = Not an Important Reason					
N = 171-172	Mean	The Major Reason	An Important Reason	A Somewhat Important Reason	Not an Important Reason
Lack of time	1.7	59%	25%	11%	6%
Lack of information	3.4	3%	11%	30%	56%
None close by	3.5	4%	8%	24%	65%
No one to go with	3.5	4%	9%	22%	65%
User fees	3.5	2%	12%	17%	69%
Lack of money	3.6	5%	3%	14%	78%
Overcrowding	3.6	2%	5%	23%	70%
Health	3.7	6%	3%	9%	81%
Hard to get to	3.7	2%	5%	12%	81%
Personal safety	3.7	2%	4%	14%	81%
Conflicts with other user groups	3.8	1%	3%	17%	80%
Too challenging	3.9	1%	1%	4%	94%
Poor maintenance	3.9	0%	2%	11%	87%
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 7\%$					

Lack of time is the overwhelming roadblock for non-motorized trail users; all other reasons lag far behind. Lack of information, lack of trails nearby, overcrowding, user fees, conflicts with other groups, and no one to go with score a bit higher than others as a “somewhat important” reason.

Almost a quarter of respondents (22%) offer other reasons they are not on the trail as much as they would like, among them family responsibilities, lack of transportation to the trailhead, and laziness. Verbatim comments include:

I don't have a car, so sometimes it's hard to get out of town. I have to get a ride. I don't think a bus runs by Spencer's Butte. Without a bus I can't go on my own.

I take care of my disabled daughter who needs 24 hour care, so I have to have a caregiver to go anywhere without her.

Limited parking at very popular sites makes trails hard to get to.

Satisfaction with Non-Motorized Trail Services

Next, non-motorized trail respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with five measures of trail service. The following table present that data, listed in order of a decreasing “very satisfied” evaluation.

Non-motorized trail users report a high degree of satisfaction with trail services. In such satisfaction rankings, a combined total “not at all/not very” satisfied score above 10% is usually justification for attention by planners. Only support facilities (combined 12% dissatisfaction) and information (10%) surpass this threshold, and only barely, suggesting that trail planning might prioritize addressing these two user group concerns.

TABLE 20: Satisfaction with Non-Motorized Trail Services (4= Very Satisfied, 1 = Not at All Satisfied)					
N = 282-325	Mean	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Very Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied
Access to trails	3.6	68%	29%	2%	1%
Enforcement	3.4	48%	44%	6%	2%
Maintenance	3.4	45%	47%	7%	2%
Support facilities	3.3	44%	44%	10%	2%
Information	3.3	38%	53%	8%	2%
Sampling error for these questions ranges from $\pm 4\%$ to $\pm 5\%$					

Not included in the figures above, 11% responded “don’t know” to the question about enforcement, suggesting they are not very aware of efforts being made in this area. Another seven percent answered “don’t know” to the question about information.

Satisfaction with Information Sources

Non-motorized trail users were asked about satisfaction with a variety of information sources, and they report a high level of overall satisfaction. As the figure and table below show, dissatisfaction passed the ten percent threshold for agency responses (13%), agency websites (11%), and route maps (11%).

Only respondents able to rate the information sources were included. Respondents answering “Don’t Know,” excluded from the table, amounted to 22% of non-motorized trail respondents for agency websites, 21% for government agency responses, 11% for guidebooks, and 10% for route maps, suggesting considerable lack of familiarity with these sources.

N = 154-312	Mean	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Very Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied
Interpretive	3.5	60%	36%	4%	1%
Level of difficulty	3.5	57%	35%	7%	2%
Rules and regulations	3.5	55%	40%	5%	1%
Agency responses	3.3	49%	38%	7%	6%
Agency websites	3.3	46%	44%	8%	3%
Signage	3.3	42%	50%	6%	2%
Route maps	3.3	42%	47%	10%	1%
Guidebooks	3.3	41%	49%	9%	1%
Sampling error for this question ranges from ± 5 to $\pm 7\%$					

A number of respondents suggest additional information needs not currently being met, especially those of handicapped and of dog owners:

Fewer people at the campgrounds next to where I want to hike, because I just won't go to those. They seem overcrowded, loud, noisy, and my husband being handicapped I have to take two kinds of trips. The ones I take with him because he can't hike, but I'm stuck. The rules are too confining about where I can park my van and spend the night. There are not enough places for that. I just want an obscure, lonely parking spot. My handicapped husband can be happy at the van, while I hike. I want to be able to park along the side of the stream. I would be willing to pay user fee for closer access.

I think that it's very under-reported how many dog owners there are. And with my job there is less and less time to get my dog outside. I would be very inclined to use more of the parks if there were better guides about their availability for dog use.

Information Sources for Non-Motorized Trail Users

The survey asked non-motorized trail respondents for the information sources they use and for their one favorite source. The results are listed below, ranked in order of most favorite to least favorite source:

TABLE 22: Information Sources – Non-Motorized		
N = 320-325	Use Source	Favorite Source
Advice of people	88%	24%
Books, magazines, newspapers	80%	19%
Brochures, maps	95%	18%
Internet	64%	15%
Visitor information centers	83%	8%
ODOT road signs	80%	3%
Gather information along the way	66%	3%
State highway maps	81%	3%
Sporting goods stores	51%	2%
Phone trail management agencies	39%	2%
Clubs, groups	15%	1%
Phone toll-free numbers	42%	0%
Other	14%	2%
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 5\%$		

A majority of respondents have used many of the information sources. Favorite information sources are more evenly divided than for other user types, with people’s advice, printed resources like books, magazines, brochures, and maps, and the internet the leading sources. Clubs and groups rank low on both lists, probably because only seven percent of respondents report membership in a non-motorized trail organization or club. “Other” answers provided include television shows, bookstores, and AAA (American Automobile Association).

Overall Satisfaction with Non-Motorized Trail Experience

Non-motorized trail users were asked for their overall evaluation of the non-motorized trail experience in Oregon, and almost 80% select the highest category of “very satisfied.” This is the highest level of satisfaction of the three user groups surveyed. Less than one percent reports a combined not very satisfied/not at all satisfied rating.

TABLE 23: Overall Satisfaction with Trail Experience – Non-Motorized N = 325	
Very Satisfied	79%
Somewhat Satisfied	20%
Not Very Satisfied	0%
Not at All Satisfied	1%
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 4\%$	

When asked how their overall non-motorized trail experience might be improved, respondents had a variety of responses and ideas. Some are reproduced below:

If we felt a little more safe with the parking and cars. I don't know how to do that. We have had car broken into twice in an urban area near the arboretum in Portland, near the Zoo, while we were using a trail.

The whole vehicle stuff is a downer for me, when trying to bird, when you have people dune bugging. It just shows we need more open spaces and green spaces to enjoy it as we want to.

My biggest suggestion is to let users know what a trail's main use is – if it is mainly motorized, let people know so they don't end up sharing the trail with ATVs while on foot. Once you get out on trail with kids, you don't want to turn around to find another one.

Some of us who are blind don't even read Braille because of our learning disabilities. There needs to be other media than just print, needs to be for, if it's supposed to be there for people, for everybody and not just the elite who are able bodied. How much harder would it be to have something in raised print, if you're going to put it in print anyways so both people would benefit from it? Not only that, have it on tape for people who can't read the print. For people who are physically disabled have things elevated for them.

Creating a guide book for dog owners which explains which parks are friendly and what rules you have to observe.

I guess just, knowing more about where trails are located. Whenever I look online, it pops up with a lot of websites that don't necessarily deal with hiking. I'd like the information all in one place.

Downloadable maps on the web for specific trails. Maybe a little more on what interpretation is available, and maybe actual better enforcement for people that are using trails inappropriately.

Non-Motorized Trail Funding Priorities

Non-motorized trail users were asked to prioritize a variety of funding possibilities related to their sport. Routine upkeep of existing trails, repairing major damage, and cleaning up litter and trash are highest ranked priorities, followed by better information and signage, support facilities, enforcement, and acquiring land for new trails.

The complete distribution of answers is provided in the following table:

N = 320-325	Mean	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not That Important	A Top Funding Priority ⁵⁰
Routine upkeep of existing trails	2.7	73%	24%	3%	208
Repairing major damage	2.6	66%	32%	2%	193
Clean up litter and trash	2.6	68%	25%	6%	172
Renovating deteriorated trails	2.5	50%	45%	5%	144
Support facilities	2.3	43%	43%	15%	107
Enforcing rules and regulations	2.3	44%	38%	18%	105
Acquire land for new trails	2.2	39%	41%	21%	104
Acquire access land	2.2	37%	47%	16%	94
Providing education, safety, and trail etiquette information	2.2	35%	48%	17%	83
Developing new trails	2.1	32%	50%	18%	77
Interpretive information	1.9	19%	55%	26%	45
Landscaping along trails	1.4	6%	29%	65%	14
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 5\%$.					

Ten percent of non-motorized trail users provide priorities for funding not mentioned including preservation of trail-less wilderness and a variety of innovative ideas:

I'd like the parks service to purchase land simply to prevent development, but I don't feel like building trails on land is important. Human access isn't as important as preservation.

Ecological integrity is my top priority for natural sites in Oregon.

Tape recorded trails signs that can be activated by buttons for those who can't read or see.

⁵⁰ Number of respondents selecting this answer. Asked only if respondent answered "very important."

Should have an international “go out and experience trails” day. An appreciation day⁵¹.

Use of Non-Motorized Trails

When asked what they use non-motorized trails for, most choose “recreation.” Ninety-seven percent of non-motorized trail users answer recreation and fitness alone or in combination. Only two percent report they use non-motorized trails primarily for commuting or other transportation purposes:

TABLE 25: Primary Use of Non-Motorized Trails N = 325	
Recreation	77%
Fitness	13%
Combination (if volunteered)	8%
Commuting, transportation	2%
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 4\%$	

Preferred Non-Motorized Trail Surface Type

The survey asked non-motorized trail users, “For [your] favorite activity, what is your preferred trail surface type? Would it be a native or natural surface, such as packed soil, sand, grass, rock or snow; woodchip; gravel or rock, such as pea gravel or crushed rock; a hardened surface like asphalt or concrete; or boardwalk, wood or engineered plastic?” The responses:

TABLE 26: Preferred Surface Type for Non-Motorized Trail Users N = 325	
Natural surface	75%
Hardened surface like asphalt or concrete	14%
Woodchip	4%
Gravel or rock	3%
Boardwalk, wood, plastic	2%
No preference (if volunteered)	1%
Sampling error for this question is $\pm 4\%$	

Natural surface is the overwhelming favorite, with asphalt/concrete a distant second and no other surface garnering more than 4% of response.

Importance of Non-Motorized Trails

The survey asked respondents, “In your opinion, how important is it to you to have non-motorized trails for the following recreation trail activities?” Responses are presented in the following table:

⁵¹ There actually is such a day, in June. However, this and other such suggestions indicate the low level of public awareness of initiatives that are being taken.

Respondents provide overwhelming support for hiking and walking trails. Although backpacking is not a highly popular trail use, there is disproportionate support for trails for backpackers. Jogging, bicycling, and cross-country skiing trails also have support.

TABLE 27: Importance of Non-Motorized Trail Types (1 = Not as Important, 3 = Very Important)				
N = 315-317	Mean	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not As Important
Trail hiking or day hiking	2.9	85%	14%	1%
Walking for pleasure	2.7	77%	20%	3%
Overnight backpacking	2.2	47%	27%	26%
Jogging or running	2.1	40%	28%	32%
Cross-country skiing	2.0	37%	24%	39%
Bicycling (other than mountain biking)	2.1	35%	35%	29%
Mountain biking (on natural terrain trails)	1.8	25%	26%	49%
Horseback riding	1.7	26%	20%	54%
Hiking with horses, mules, llama	1.6	20%	24%	56%
Competitive trail events	1.6	17%	22%	61%
Geocaching	1.5	13%	24%	63%
Roller blading (in-line skating)	1.4	11%	19%	70%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 5%				

Mean answers present one number that summarizes all responses. The full distribution of answers illuminates the intensity of respondent views. Hiking and walking remain far in front of the other choices. Although only 16% of non-motorized trail users report having backpacked in the past year, almost half feel that trails for such users are very important. More than half of non-motorized trail users feel it is not as important to have trails for horseback riding, hiking with stock, competitive trail events, geocaching, and roller blading.

Signage for Non-Motorized Trails

Non-motorized trail users were asked to rate the importance of signs at different trail locations:

TABLE 28: Importance of Signage - Non-Motorized (1 = Not That Important, 3 = Very Important)				
N = 313-326	Mean	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not That Important
Trail junctions	2.8	78%	20%	3%
At trailhead	2.7	74%	19%	7%
Along trail	2.5	59%	30%	11%
Stream crossings	2.1	41%	28%	31%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 5%				

Trail junctions and at the trailhead are ranked highest, with along the trail and at stream crossings trailing behind.

Club Membership – Non-Motorized

Non-motorized trail users were asked if they belong to a trail club or group.

TABLE 29: Membership in a Club or Group – Non-Motorized	
N = 326	
Yes	7%
No	93%
Sampling error for this question is \pm 4%	

Only seven percent of non-motorized trail users report membership in a group or club related to their activity. Although this represents a sizable 30,700 households in Oregon, as many as another 408,000 households with non-motorized trail users contain no club or group member, reflecting a large potential membership for such organizations.

STATEWIDE NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES



Goals, Objectives and Strategies for Top Statewide Trail Issues and Concerns

The chapter focuses on a set of long-range goals, objectives and strategies for the top two Statewide Non-motorized Trails Issues and five Statewide Trail Concerns as identified through the non-motorized trails planning effort. A brainstorming session during the September 23, 2003 Non-motorized Trails Steering Committee Meeting produced an initial set of goals, objectives and strategies for resolving these top statewide issues and concerns.

For the purposes of this plan:

- Goals are general, broadly stated, desirable conditions toward which all non-motorized trail providers in the state should direct their efforts.
- Objectives are the proposed long-range solutions to the issues and the discrete problem areas involved. Objectives do not represent the complete solution to the identified issue, but are aspects of the solution identified during the planning process.
- Strategies are what need to be done to accomplish each objective and identify which specific non-motorized trail providers would be responsible for the strategies within the state's ten-year planning cycle.

Trail managers and planners in the state of Oregon must address the needs of a wide variety of non-motorized trail users such as (but not limited to) hikers, backpackers, mountain bike riders, equestrians, runners, walkers, bicycle riders, inline skaters and individuals with functional impairments.

During this statewide trails planning process, all trail users had an opportunity to voice their specific needs and concerns through the issues workshops held across the state and the statewide non-motorized trail user survey. This plan recognizes that in Oregon there are finite resources to satisfy the demands of a growing number and diversity of trail users. The increased sharing of resources sometimes creates friction between the diverse user groups competing for limited trail space. Rather than focusing on individual user groups, the following statewide goals, objectives and strategies are designed to optimize the use of limited trail resources in ways that benefit all users and their appropriate trail uses. Decisions about how to best allocate resources for specific user groups are more appropriately addressed in local and regional trails planning efforts.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Issue A:

Need for Trail Connectivity

As in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), recreation providers and other workshop attendees consistently reported in issues workshops the need for non-motorized trail connectivity within their regions. According to recreation providers, trail connectivity involves linking urban trails to outlying Federal trail systems; linking neighborhood, community and regional trails; connecting community parks and other recreational and public facilities; and connecting neighboring communities (e.g.

Ashland to Medford). Recreation providers strongly felt that increasing non-motorized trail connectivity will result in better use of the state's existing non-motorized trail infrastructure and provide more trail opportunities.

Recreation providers stated that in order to properly plan for trail connectivity, there is a need for regional multi-jurisdictional trail planning entities (e.g. Deschutes Bike and Pedestrian Committee) to facilitate regional and urban trail system planning. Such groups would work with private landowners, irrigation districts and public agencies (federal, state and local) to coordinate the trails planning process and facilitate idea sharing and the communication process. In addition, there is a need for a shared vision between local, state and federal recreation providers on a regional scale that can be used to identify trail development priorities. Such an overall vision is essential in order to see trails projects through to completion and to ensure that individual trail projects make sense as part of the larger trail system.

According to recreation providers, the prioritization of trail development projects should be done at a regional level using gap analysis and a peer review process. At the local level, projects should be developed using grass roots organizations such as community solution teams to get a broader perspective on what other governmental agencies are doing which might affect trail development.

Finally, recreation providers stated that there is a need for a central database or statewide GIS system including all Local Transportation System Plans and current inventories of existing and proposed trails so that trails planners and local public officials are better aware of the current

status of trails planning within their jurisdiction. The trails planning information should be easily accessible such as on a website.



Goal #1:

Identify and encourage key trail linkages between and among local, regional and statewide trails to better use the state's existing non-motorized trail system.

Objective 1: Collect and disseminate statewide multi-jurisdictional non-motorized trails information.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- OPRD will develop a GIS-compatible statewide trails inventory database that will allow agencies and other users to identify and map trail resources and characteristics for non-motorized trails of Statewide, Regional and Local Significance.
- OPRD and ORTAC will develop a vision map of trails of Statewide Significance (including those trails or existing trail maps in GIS format) showing the backbone or spine of a statewide trails system that could be linked to regional or local trail

systems, and can be used for identifying statewide priorities.

- OPRD will collect vision maps from those regions in the state that have existing regional trail system maps in GIS format, and can be used to identify regional priorities and encourage other regions to develop trail system maps.
- Develop a list of potential funding sources for non-motorized trail development, maintenance and planning to be made available to providers.

Objective 2: Develop a regional approach to non-motorized trail planning.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 2:

- Establish regional working groups (e.g. Coos Regional Trails Partnership, Metro Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee) including representatives from trail organizations, federal, state, and local agencies, tribal governments and other stakeholders, to work in cooperation with managing agencies in trail planning, funding, and design to facilitate the identification of multi-jurisdictional priorities.
- Develop regional non-motorized trails plans (multi-jurisdictional) to identify regional priorities.
- Involve trail organizations, non-motorized trail users and other interested stakeholders, private conservancies, foundations, and land trust organizations in the

development of regional non-motorized trails plans.

- Identify potential funding sources for regional trails planning.

Objective 3: Provide technical assistance and outreach for regional non-motorized trails planning.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 3:

- The Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory Council (ORTAC) will develop and implement a regional trails planning forum process to promote interagency coordination.
- OPRD will develop a trails planning how-to manual to encourage connectivity.
- Develop case studies that showcase the planning and development of well designed and managed regional trail systems (e.g. Rivers to Ridges Planning process spearheaded by the Lane Council of Governments).

Objective 4: Focus resources towards the most significant components of local and regional trail systems.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 4:

- Develop a statewide GIS system to collect maps of all trails of local and regional significance identified in the statewide trails inventory as they become available.
- OPRD and ORTAC will perform a "gap analysis" of the statewide GIS system to identify local and regional trail connection priorities.

- Provide additional scoring points in trail-related OPRD administered grant programs for projects identified in this forum process as top local and regional trail system priorities.
- ORTAC will establish a process for regularly reporting the development of, and connections to, the "State Significant" trail system (e.g. Desert Trail, Corvallis to Sea, Bear Creek Greenway).
- OPRD will work with the National Park Service (NPS) Rivers and Trails Program to identify and provide planning assistance for the most significant trail development projects in the state.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Issue B:

Need for Trail Maintenance

Recreation providers strongly stated that they are struggling to maintain existing trails due to increasing use levels and declining maintenance budgets. At the same time, providers are being asked by user groups to develop more and more new trails. A common argument made across the state was that additional priority should be given to maintaining what we currently have before adding additional facilities. According to providers, there always seems to be funding available for trail development—but not for routine day-to-day trail maintenance.

Recreation providers argue that compliance with health and safety regulations must continue to be addressed by trail providers throughout the state. Deterioration of our trail system jeopardizes the safety and health of trail users, discourages continued

visitation, and threatens the investments already made in trail resources. Delaying maintenance will result in increased long-term costs; deterioration is less expensive to fix if diagnosed and dealt with early. Poor maintenance can also foster lack of respect and encourage depreciative behavior. Providers reported that we are already beginning to lose the use of some trails due to lack of maintenance and associated resource damage.

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees felt a need for a dedicated long-term funding source for non-motorized trail maintenance in the state. Funding suggestions mentioned during issues workshops included:

- A trail use pass;
- Direct trail use fees;
- Out-of-state user fees;
- Taxes on the purchase of recreational equipment; and
- Recreation Trail Program priority for maintenance projects.

According to recreation providers and other workshop attendees, there is a need to make better use of trail clubs and other volunteers for conducting trail maintenance. In addition, there are opportunities to engage private conservancies, foundations and land trust organizations as partners and providers in trail planning, development, management and maintenance.

Finally, providers argued that there is a need for consistent trail design and maintenance standards and procedures to proactively address resource damage occurring on trails. They reported a need for high-quality trail construction and maintenance information in the state. Such

resources are currently available, but simply need to be housed in a central statewide location.

Goal #2:

Preserve and maintain the public's substantial investment in the existing infrastructure of trails and related facilities

Objective 1: Inform the public, and state and local leaders, about the importance of maintenance in protecting the long-term viability of Oregon's trail system.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- Develop promotional materials for the general public stressing the importance of trail maintenance in getting the longest life out of the public's investment in trails.
- Develop case studies that showcase successful trail maintenance programs and methods.
- Encourage the use of standardized trail assessment methods (e.g. Universal Trail Assessment Process, USFS inventory and assessment process, OPRD inventory and assessment process) by all public recreation providers to conduct a trail condition assessment to determine short-term and long-term maintenance needs.
- Each public recreation provider in the state should conduct a facility condition report for trails and prepare a maintenance plan.

Objective 2: Increase the amount of resources available for trail maintenance.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 2:

- ORTAC and the state trails coordinator should work with other trail management organizations to identify and push for innovative and improved maintenance funding sources at the federal, state and local levels.
- ORTAC and the state trails coordinator should investigate the potential for initiating a trails foundation with a mission of funding trail maintenance.
- Recreation providers should better prioritize trail maintenance needs among other budget items.
- Establish public and private partnerships to augment trail maintenance budgets.
- Provide additional scoring points in trail-related OPRD administered grant programs for trail maintenance identified in a trail condition assessment process and included in a maintenance plan.

Objective 3: More effectively engage volunteers as stewards of Oregon's trail system to help preserve the legacy for future generations.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 3:

- Create an interagency volunteer information clearinghouse to match volunteers with local trail

maintenance projects (e.g. Washington Trails Association).

- Encourage agencies to fund volunteer coordinator positions.
- Provide volunteer coordination training for trail managers and appropriate maintenance training for volunteers.
- Encourage organized trail groups and trail users to become more active in Adopt-A-Trail and other volunteer programs.
- Organize maintenance and clean-up events or other special projects on heavily used and high-visibility trails.
- Create an annual award for the best maintained trail/trail system in the state using volunteer assistance (such as the Doug Newman Award).
- Encourage agencies to award outstanding trail volunteer efforts at the local level.
- Better use National and State Trails Day as an opportunity to recognize volunteers and the importance of trail maintenance.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 1:

Need For More Trails In Close Proximity To Where People Live

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees in issues workshops across the state voiced a need for more trails in close proximity to where people live. This need is clearly in line with the findings of the 2002 Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey that identified running and walking for exercise and walking for pleasure as the most

popular everyday outdoor recreation activities of Oregonians. According to the OSU report, these activities are generally engaged in near home, and on a regular basis and state residents demand these opportunities in the communities in which they live.

Trail users also stressed the need to recognize the benefits that trails provide to communities such as attracting businesses, increasing overall quality-of-life, and drawing additional residents to the community. In addition, urban trails need to be considered as an important component of the urban transportation system. Additional trails also encourage the disbursement of recreational use in urban areas.

Finally, the U.S. Center for Disease Control (CDC), the Oregon Department of Human Services, Health Services, and the Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity (OCPPA) are currently promoting physical activity and the health benefits associated with participation in recreational trail activities. The OCPPA has recently completed a plan entitled the Oregon Plan for Physical Activity⁵², which states that, "Physical inactivity together with poor eating habits contributes significantly to the development of obesity, high blood pressure, heart disease, cancer, and diabetes, which are the leading causes of disease and death among Oregonians. The current epidemic of obesity in the United States has hit Oregon particularly hard. At 22%, our state has the highest percentage of adult obesity of any state west of the Rockies. Our youth follow closely behind,

⁵² Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity (2003). A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan.

with 28% of eight graders and 21% of eleventh graders currently overweight."

According to the plan, "Communities need to make daily physical activity the easy choice, where parks and recreation facilities are available to children and adults in neighborhoods and are easily accessible by walking, bicycling, and public transit." The plan has identified providing pathways and trails in parks, along rivers, and in other natural settings to encourage walking and bicycling for exercise and transportation as a key strategy. The Oregon Department of Human Services, Health Services is also working with the CDC to develop federal funding for trail projects that would enhance other funding programs such as the Recreation Trails Program, TEA-21 grants, the Land & Water Conservation Fund and the Local Government Grant Program.



Goal #3:

Promote daily physical activity by improving local access to trails.

Objective 1: Inform the public about existing community trails close to where they live.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- Explore public/public and public/private partnerships to develop and disseminate trail maps and information to residents and communities of all sizes.
- Include trail users in the development of maps and information.
- OPRD will develop a GIS-compatible statewide trails inventory database that will allow trail users to access trail resources and characteristics for non-motorized trails of Statewide, Regional and Local Significance.
- OPRD will develop a search engine for public web access to the trails inventory database to assist individuals to find nearby trails.
- Encourage recreation providers to develop trail maps.
- Target trail information distribution to the disabled and the elderly populations through appropriate clubs and organizations such as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and school children as part of the "Safe Routes to School" program.
- Seek recognition of trails as part of local transportation systems and that trails provide an alternative to the automobile for local trips.

Objective 2: Encourage local governments to conduct community trails planning efforts to identify and prioritize local trail needs that will provide close-to-home trail opportunities.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 2:

- Provide additional scoring points in trail-related OPRD administered grant programs for grant requests satisfying priority needs identified through a local trails planning process—especially trails of regional and local significance.
- Involve trail organizations, non-motorized trail users, local business leaders and other interested stakeholders in the development of local trails plans.
- Identify potential funding sources/assistance for community trails planning (including funding for GIS mapping).
- Develop case studies that showcase the planning and development of well-designed and managed community trail systems (e.g. Jacksonville, Sisters and Bend).
- Work with transportation and school officials to provide children with safe pedestrian and bicycle routes to and from schools.
- Develop conveniently accessible trail networks which interconnect communities with shopping and employment districts, community activity centers, public transportation stops, parklands, and trails of local, regional and statewide significance.

Objective 3: Encourage local recreation providers to seek innovative funding mechanisms for urban trail development.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 3:

- Encourage local recreation providers to work with their City Council to develop Park Systems Development Charges (SDC) that can be used to provide funding for trail acquisition and development to keep pace with population growth and new development.
- Ensure that trails plans are incorporated into local land development ordinances to make sure that the development of the local trail system is considered with all land development proposals.
- Establish private foundations dedicated to urban trail systems (e.g. Portland 40-Mile Loop Land Trust and Ashland Woodlands & Trails Foundation).
- Recreation providers should consider other local revenue sources for addressing trail deficiencies (e.g. general obligation bonds, grants and gifts, local option taxes, regional funding or niche taxes).
- Develop case studies that showcase innovative and successful funding strategies for urban trail development (e.g. Bend Urban Trails Plan).

Objective 4: Develop and disseminate information on the personal and societal benefits of trails to a wide variety of local consumers such as policymakers, public works departments, school administrators, planners, business owners and leaders, chambers of commerce and developers.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 4:

- Compile, summarize and distribute information describing the physiological, economic, environmental, social, psychological and educational benefits associated with community trails.

Objective 5: Increase cooperation and communication with community-based health organizations related to trail development.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 5:

- Partner with health care systems and providers to support and promote trail development in communities throughout the state.
- Revise applicable health-related funding programs to include trail projects.
- Work with the Active Community Environments (ACE) Working Group to advocate for trail development as a means of building healthy communities.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 2:

Need For Additional Non-Motorized Trails

Recreation providers and trail users stated that there is a strong need for additional non-motorized trail opportunities in areas experiencing high growth rates and in trail planning regions with current shortages of non-motorized trails of all types. There also was a reported need for more non-commercial groomed cross-country ski trails, more snow parks and related facilities and additional equestrian camps and day-use trailheads.

Recreation providers stated that trails are not always seen as top priorities in relation to other community needs or even other recreational needs. As a result, recreation providers must work together to make a stronger case that trails are important to communities and provide a broad range of social and economic benefits to communities and are deserving of a higher position on the city, county, state and federal political agendas.

Finally, recreation providers and other workshop attendees stated a strong need for a state administered funding source for non-motorized trail development that is similar to the ATV grant fund program that taps user contributions and is not dependent on federal funding.



Goal #4:

Support the development of new trails.

Objective 1: Increase funding devoted to expanding trail opportunities for Oregonians.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- ORTAC will develop a statewide interagency marketing plan for educating local, state and federal politicians on the outstanding value of investing in non-motorized trails in the state of Oregon (RTP, Enhancements, LWCF, Local Government Grant Program— Measure 66, RTCA).
- ORTAC will advocate at local, state, and national levels for increased funding for trail planning, development, maintenance and operation (Partnerships with Public Health, Transportation and Urban Planning Organizations).
- ORTAC and the state trails coordinator should investigate an "Oregon Trails Foundation" concept with a mission of providing funding for trail planning, construction and maintenance.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 3:

Need To Consider Public Ways (Roads, Railroads, Utility Corridors) Proposed For Closure Or Abandonment For Non-Motorized Trail Use

Oregon is crossed by thousands of miles of linear facilities such as railroad beds, pipelines, canals, utility rights-of-way and roads. Public utility and irrigation easements include oil and natural gas pipelines, sewer lines, irrigation ditches, electrical transmission, telephone, and television lines, and fiber optic cable. Recreation providers and other workshop attendees argued that there are opportunities to make greater use of such transportation rights-of-way and public utility and irrigation easements for recreational trail development.

Goal #5:

Ensure trail use is evaluated when roads, railroads & utility corridors are considered for abandonment, change of use, or shared use.

Objective 1: Develop additional trails along canal and utility easements and transportation rights-of-way.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- Work with federal, state and local agencies to create more

opportunity for public input in the road closure/vacation process.

- Use the State Transportation Planning Goal and Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12) requiring cities and counties to develop utility/pipeline plans as a part of local transportation system plans to identify potential trail opportunities.
- OPRD should create a notification process to alert park and recreation agencies of all railroad notices of intention to file for Exempt Abandonment.
- Contact railroad managers to explore Rail-With-Trail possibilities on railroad lines that are still in use, but receive little train traffic in areas where need has been determined.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 4:

Need For Trail Accessibility Information

Recreation providers in several regions reported a need for improved trail access for people with disabilities. At the same time, these providers argued that not all trails can or should be accessible to all users. There was general agreement that providing key trail type and condition information to users has the potential to increase the usability of existing trails and enable everyone, of all ages and abilities, to enjoy the benefits of recreational trails. To make better use of the existing trail infrastructure, all trail providers need to do a better job informing trail users of the conditions they will encounter on trails to allow each individual to decide if a particular trail is accessible to them.

To date, there have been only limited efforts by recreation providers to provide consistent trail access information for trails in the state of Oregon. There is no centralized trails information source in the state. In addition, there is no standardized methodology used for gathering and disseminating accessibility information.



Goal #6:

Provide the public with better trail accessibility information.

Objective 1: Develop and distribute key trail type and condition information to allow users to evaluate if a trail is accessible to them.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- ORTAC will host a statewide trail accessibility meeting involving a wide range of stakeholders to evaluate standard trail access assessment approaches and disseminate trail accessibility information.
- Develop a statewide sign program for conveying trail access information at trailheads.
- Work closely with different groups of elderly and disabled trail users to identify the types of information most important to allow each individual to decide if a particular trail is accessible to them.

Statewide Non-Motorized Trail Concern 5:

Need For Regional Interagency Coordination/Cooperation In Trail Management

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees consistently reported that successful non-motorized trail development, management and planning relies on good coordination and communication between trail

organizations, federal, state, and local agencies, tribal governments and other stakeholders. In many regions, providers and user groups stressed the need for regional coordination and information sharing between agencies for non-motorized trail planning, operations and management.

Regional coordination and communication should also encourage:

- adopting consistent design, construction and maintenance standards,
- developing and implementing directional and regulatory signing consistency,
- developing regulatory and law enforcement consistency,
- sharing limited trail maintenance resources and equipment,
- taking a regional approach, rather than having each agency working independently, to more effectively address trail capacity issues,
- taking a regional approach, rather than having each agency working independently, to more effectively address user conflict (e.g. mountain bikers and equestrians),
- taking a regional approach, rather than having each agency working independently, to more effectively develop and distribute trail information and other promotional materials,
- taking a regional approach, rather than having each agency working independently, to more effectively identify trail grant funding priorities, and
- connecting existing trails where opportunities exist.

According to recreation providers and other workshop attendees, managing agencies should strive to provide users with seamless and coherent trail experiences that are not disrupted by administrative boundaries.

Goal #7:

Promote coordination and cooperation between public agencies, private organizations and non-motorized trail users.

Objective 1: Standardize statewide trail management practices.

Strategies/Actions for Addressing Objective 1:

- Coordinate the standardization of rules and regulations across management boundaries.
- Review and revise any state laws or agency regulations or rules to create consistency in the regulation of non-motorized trail use.
- Develop statewide design and construction standards.
- Develop statewide directional and regulatory signing standards and standard messages.
- ORTAC will provide coordination between the OPRD, other agencies and non-agency stakeholders in the implementation of the Oregon Trails 2005-2014: Non-Motorized Trails Plan.
- Promote communication and information sharing through websites, trail workshops or other public forums.

Next Steps

This chapter includes an extensive list of strategies recommended by a wide range of stakeholders who are dedicated to providing high-quality trail opportunities across the state. In total, these strategies are intended to enable many to work together in resolving the top two Statewide Non-motorized Trails Issues and five Statewide Trail Concerns identified through the non-motorized trails planning effort. The OPRD would like to thank all those who participated in this important part of the overall planning process.

This plan is ambitious and intended to be so, however, it is not necessarily an expectation or measure of success that every strategy be implemented within the plan's 10-year timeframe. As we proceed towards implementation, we must keep in mind that the ultimate success of the plan rests on the continued support of stakeholders across the state to actively participate in implementing these strategies. There are two entities that must take a lead role in engaging stakeholders across the state in the implementation of these strategies—the OPRD and its commission appointed advisory body, the Oregon Recreation Trails Advisory Council.

ORTAC Priority Strategies

ORTAC advises the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department on statewide trail matters that come before the department. They also make recommendations to other trail managing agencies and non-government groups and assist OPRD on a variety of funding committees. As a result, ORTAC will play a vital role in implementing a number of important strategies included in this chapter. The following is a list of **high-priority strategies**

that ORTAC will focus on early in the 10-year planning cycle.

- Provide coordination between agency and non-agency stakeholders in the implementation of the non-motorized trails plan.
- Develop and implement a regional trails planning forum process to promote interagency coordination (Participate in those that exist and try to encourage them whenever they do not).
- Develop a vision map of trails of "Statewide Significance" showing the backbone or spine of a statewide trail system that could be linked to regional or local trail systems and can be used for identifying statewide priorities.
- Perform a "gap analysis" of the statewide trails system to identify local and regional trail connection priorities.
- Establish a process for regularly reporting on the development of and connections to, the "Statewide Significant" trail system (e.g. newsletters, website, quarterly meetings).
- Work with other trail management organizations to identify and advocate for innovative and improved maintenance funding sources at the federal, state and local levels.
- Develop a statewide interagency marketing plan for educating local, state and federal politicians on the outstanding value of investing in non-motorized trails in the state of Oregon (sell the benefits, stories of current funding programs—

Enhancements, LWCF, RTP, Local Grant Program).

- Advocate at the local, state and national levels for increased funding for trail planning, development, maintenance and operation.
- Investigate an "Oregon Trails Foundation" concept with a mission of providing funding for trail planning, construction and maintenance.
- Host a statewide trail accessibility forum involving a wide range of stakeholders to evaluate standard trail assessment approaches and disseminate trail accessibility information.

As with any long-term plan, the implementation strategies included in this chapter may change over the course of the planning cycle. The Council's public meeting process will provide opportunities for agency and citizen participation when implementation strategies need to be revised over time as circumstances change and opportunities arise.

OPRD Priority Strategies

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department was given responsibility for recreation trails planning in 1971 under the "State Trails Act" (ORS 390.950 to 390.990). In addition, the agency administers Recreational Trails Program, a federal-aid assistance program to help states provide recreational trails among other funding sources. As such, OPRD will also play a vital role in implementing a number of important strategies included in this chapter.

The following is a list of high-priority strategies that OPRD will focus on during the 10-year planning cycle.

- Develop a GIS-compatible statewide trails inventory database that will allow agencies and other users to identify and map trail resources and characteristics for non-motorized trails of Statewide and Regional Significance.
- Develop a search engine for public web access to the trails inventory database to assist individuals to find nearby trails.
- Collect vision maps from those regions in the state that have existing regional trail system maps in GIS format that can be used to identify regional priorities and encourage other regions to develop trail system maps.
- Work with advisory committees to provide additional scoring points in trail-related OPRD administered grant programs for projects identified in ORTAC's regional trails planning forum process as top local and regional trail system priorities.
- Work with the NPS Rivers and Trails Program to identify and provide planning assistance for the most significant trail development projects in the state.
- Work to create a non-profit organization responsible for developing an interagency volunteer information clearinghouse to match volunteers with local trail maintenance projects (e.g. Washington Trails Association); providing volunteer coordination training for trail managers and appropriate maintenance training for volunteers; and organizing maintenance and clean-up events or other special projects on heavily used and high-visibility trails.
- Create an annual award for the best maintained trail/trail system in the state using volunteer assistance (such as the Doug Newman Award).
- Better use National and State Trails Day as an opportunity to recognize volunteers and the importance of trail maintenance.
- Provide additional scoring points in trail-related OPRD administered grant programs for grant requests satisfying priority needs identified through a local trails planning process—especially trails of regional and local significance.
- Develop case studies that showcase the planning and development of well-designed and managed community trail systems (e.g. Jacksonville, Sisters and Bend).
- Work with the Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity and the statewide Active Community Environments Working Group to foster communities where people of all ages and abilities can easily and safely enjoy walking, bicycling and other forms of recreation.



Recreational Trail Program Evaluation Criteria

Technical Review - Application Completeness

As part of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) grant evaluation process, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) first conducts a technical review of all grant applications. Submitted grant application packets need to include all materials requested in Section 2 (Application Process - How to Apply) of the Recreational Trails Program Grant Manual & Application Packet. Ineligible or incomplete applications will be returned to the project sponsor with an explanation of why their application was returned. Project applicants are encouraged to contact OPRD grant staff regarding eligibility and for information on other suitable funding sources.

Project Priority Scoring System

Following staff technical review, qualified applications are scored by Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (RTAC) members according to the application criteria, rating factors, and points shown in the following "Project Priority Scoring System." The criteria reflect the RTP program guidelines and are based on the findings of the current state trails plan and reflect priorities identified by workshop participants, trails plan steering committee members, and trail user survey respondents. These criteria have been designed to evaluate and prioritize motorized and non-motorized terrestrial trail and water trail projects.

The project score will be calculated as an average of the sum of all individual RTAC member scores. The highest possible score for a project will be 100 points. (See Potential RTP Evaluation Criteria Point Summary on the next page for criteria point breakdowns.) The priority rank of a project will depend on its score relative to other projects and in relation to the amount of RTP grant funds available each year.



Recreational Trail Program Evaluation Criteria Point Summary

TABLE 30. RTP Grant Program Evaluation Criteria Point Summary			
CRITERIA TYPE	MOTORIZED	NON-MOTORIZED	WATER
	Potential Points	Potential Points	Potential Points
TECHNICAL REVIEW			
1. Compliance Criteria	0	0	0
RTAC MEMBER EVALUATION CRITERIA			
2. First Time Awards	3	3	3
3. Matching Shares	7	7	7
4. Close-To-Home Opportunities	10	10	10
5. Long-Term Commitment to Trail Maintenance	5	5	5
6. Top Statewide Trail Issues	21	15	21
7. Local Needs and Benefits	15	15	15
8. Motorized Trail Opportunities	6	0	0
9. Public Access to Waterways	0	0	6
10. Trail Design & Management	5	5	5
11. Non-Motorized Trail Connectivity	0	7	0
12. Multi-Use Trails	5	5	5
13. Economic Development Opportunities	3	3	3
14. NST, NRT or NHT	0	5	0
15. Project Urgency	5	5	5
16. Discretionary Committee Member Criteria	15	15	15
TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS	100	100	100

Note: The variation in the allocation of points reflects the differences in priorities for the three trail types as reported in the current state trails plan.

OPRD Technical Review

1. Compliance Criteria (0 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Due to the large number of requests for RTP funds, the following set of compliance criteria were developed to ensure that:

- Project sponsors with active and previously awarded grants through OPRD are in full compliance with federal and state programs (for past RTP funded projects see progress

and completion responsibilities included in the current Oregon Recreational Trail Program Fund Grants Manual and project agreements),

- Funds are expended and projects completed within the agreement period, and
- Each new project proposal satisfies the requirements of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and are consistent with the Federal RTP guidelines.

Note: No scoring points will be awarded for compliance criteria. Failure to comply with or lack of sufficiently demonstrated progress with the following compliance criteria (a and b) may result in the **disqualification of consideration for new grant assistance** during the current grant review period.

A. Grant Performance and Compliance

The successful completion of projects in a timely and efficient manner is an important goal of the RTP grant program. A project sponsor's past performance in effectively meeting the administrative guidelines of the program is also an important factor in evaluating performance and compliance.

a. The project sponsor is on schedule with all active OPRD administered grant projects.

___ Yes ___ No

b. The project sponsor is in compliance with applicable guidelines for current and past projects.

___ Yes ___ No

Recreational Trails Advisory Committee Member Evaluation Criteria

2. First Time Awards (3 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Priority points are given to projects from project sponsors that have not received an RTP grant to date.

- The project sponsor has never received Recreational Trail Program funding.
_____ points awarded (0 or 3 points)

(3 points for project sponsors who have not received an RTP grant to date, 0 points for all other project sponsors.)

3. Matching Shares (7 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Priority points will be provided to the extent that the applicant match the RTP grant with contributions from their own cash and/or in-kind services.

- The applicant provides:

0 to 19.9% of the project's value.....	(0 points)
20 to 25% of the project's value.....	(1 point)
25.1 to 30% of the project's value.....	(2 points)
30.1 to 35% of the project's value.....	(3 points)
35.1 to 40% of the project's value.....	(4 points)
40.1 to 45% of the project's value.....	(5 points)
45.1 to 50% of the project's value.....	(6 points)
Over 50% of the project's value.....	(7 points)

_____ points awarded (0-7 points)

4. Close-To-Home Trail Opportunities (10 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

A. Close-To-Home Motorized Trail Projects (For motorized trail projects)

The 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey identified that over half of motorized trail users travel more than 40 miles to enjoy their favorite trail activity, and one-fifth travel more than 100 miles. The survey also reports that lack of time and lack of close by riding opportunities are the top two reasons why motorized trail users do not use trails as much as they wanted. A project sponsor that develops a close-to-home motorized trail project will receive up to 10 priority points.

- The applicant should describe how their project is intending to provide close-to-home motorized trail opportunities including information such as driving distances from nearby communities and populations served.

_____ points awarded (0-10 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-10 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

B. Close-To-Home Non-Motorized and Water Trail Projects (For non-motorized and water trail projects)

According to the Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey⁵³, the most popular everyday activities in Oregon are running and walking for exercise and walking for pleasure. According to the OSU report, these activities are generally engaged in near home, and on a regular basis. The implication for outdoor recreation planners and managers is that people demand such opportunities in the communities in which they live, and nearby. In addition, exercise derived from non-motorized trail activities lessens health-related problems and subsequent health care costs. Regular, moderate exercise has been proven to reduce the risk of developing coronary heart disease, stroke, colon

⁵³Rebecca Johnson (2002). Oregon's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP): Demand and Needs Analysis. Department of Forest Resources, Oregon State University.

cancer, hypertension, diabetes, osteoporosis, obesity, and depression⁵⁴. Project sponsors are strongly encouraged to submit projects that develop "close-to-home" trail facilities.

- To qualify as a "close-to-home" trail, the trail must be located in or connect to a trail or trailhead located within an urban growth boundary (UGB), unincorporated community boundary, or a Tribal community. A **map clearly identifying the trail location and UGB or unincorporated community boundary or Tribal community boundary drawn on it must be submitted in order to receive points.**

The non-motorized or water trail project will develop close-to-home non-motorized or water trail facilities.

_____ points awarded (0-10 points)

(10 points for project sponsors qualifying as a "close to home" trail, 0 points for all other project sponsors.)

5. Long-Term Commitment To Trail Maintenance (5 Points)

(For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

A. Commitment to Long-Term Maintenance

Trail maintenance was identified as the top funding priority for all trail user groups in the 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey.

- The applicant should carefully explain how they plan to continue trail operation and maintenance after the project is complete. List maintenance requirements (including the level of annual maintenance required for the trail) and strategies to be used. Also describe the degree of commitment by reporting on such items as on-going funding, partnerships with other agencies, or volunteer maintenance (e.g. youth conservation or service corps). Include appropriate documentation such as volunteer hour tracking reports, cooperative agreements, donations, private sponsorships support letters, or signed memoranda of understanding—as may be useful in demonstrating commitment to maintenance.

_____ points awarded (0-3 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-3 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

B. Identification of Trail Maintenance Need

During the issues workshops, recreation providers stated a need to use a systematic process in determining the need for trail maintenance.

⁵⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1996). Surgeon General's Report on Physical Activity and Health, Department of Health and Human Services. July.

- Priority points are awarded for trail maintenance (see note below) identified in a trail condition assessment process and included in a maintenance plan. _____ points (0-2 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-2 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

Note: The RTP grant program **does not fund routine trail maintenance** work but **does fund trail rehabilitation/restoration projects**. See specific routine trail maintenance and trail rehabilitation/restoration definitions below.

Routine trail maintenance includes work that is conducted on a frequent basis in order to keep a trail in its originally constructed serviceable standard (e.g. mowing, tree and brush pruning, leaf and debris removal, cleaning and repair of drainage structures culverts, water bars, drain dips) maintenance of water crossings, and repairs to signs and other amenities. Routine maintenance work is usually limited to minor repair or improvements that do not significantly change the trail location, width, surface, or trail structure.

Trail rehabilitation/restoration involves extensive trail repair (e.g. resurfacing of asphalt trails or complete replacement, regrading, and resurfacing of all trails) needed to bring a facility up to standards suitable for public use (not routine maintenance). In some cases, trail rehabilitation/restoration may include necessary relocation of minor portions of the trail.

6. Top Statewide Trail Issues (21 Points Motorized, 15 Points Non-Motorized And 21 Points Water) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

The statewide trails plan involved representatives from 56 public-sector provider organizations (including representatives from federal, state, county, and municipal agencies, Park and Recreation Districts, Ports, and Native American Tribes) and many citizen and interest groups in the process of identifying top statewide and regional trail issues. The following trails plan criteria are based on this public input process.

Statewide trail issues were identified during the current trails planning process. Project proposals addressing statewide motorized, non-motorized and water trail issues and non-motorized trail concerns will receive additional priority points. To receive points, project sponsors should describe how the project addresses appropriate statewide trail issues and concerns. Statewide non-motorized, motorized and water trail issues and non-motorized trail concerns are included below.

(FOR MOTORIZED TRAIL PROJECTS)

Statewide Motorized Trail Issues

Issue A: Need for new trails/managed riding areas.

Issue B: Need for regional interagency coordination/cooperation in trail planning and management.

Issue C: Need for user education/training (regulatory and safety information).

If the motorized trail project addresses:

- 0 statewide motorized trail issues..... 0 points
- 1 statewide motorized trail issue 7 points
- 2 statewide motorized trail issues..... 14 points
- 3 statewide motorized trail issues..... 21 points

Points awarded: _____ (0-21 points)

Note: No points are awarded for Statewide Motorized Trail Issue D: Concern About Trail Closures/Loss of Riding Opportunities.

(FOR NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL PROJECTS)

STATEWIDE NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUES

Issue A: Need for trail connectivity (see trail network definitions on page 83).

Issue B: Need for trail maintenance (see trail maintenance definitions on the preceding page).

If the non-motorized project addresses:

- 0 statewide non-motorized trail issues 0 points
- 1 statewide issue (either A or B) 5 points
- 2 statewide issues (both A and B)..... 10 points

Points awarded: _____ (0-10 points)

(FOR NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL PROJECTS)

STATEWIDE NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL CONCERNS

Trail Concern 1: Need for more trails in close proximity to where people live. According to the statewide trail user survey, lack of time is the greatest barrier to participation in non-motorized activities. Close to home trails allow people to use trails in a more time-efficient manner.

- Trail Concern 2: Need for additional non-motorized trails.
- Trail Concern 3: Need to consider public ways (roads, railroads, and utility corridors) proposed for closure or abandonment for non-motorized trail use.
- Trail Concern 4: Need for trail accessibility information (such as key trail type and condition information allowing individuals to decide whether a particular trail is accessible to them or not).
- Trail Concern 5: Need for regional interagency coordination/cooperation in trail management.

If the non-motorized project addresses:

- 0 statewide non-motorized trail concerns 0 points
- 1 statewide non-motorized trail concern..... 1 points
- 2 statewide non-motorized trail concerns 2 points
- 3 statewide non-motorized trail concerns 3 points
- 4 statewide non-motorized trail concerns 4 points
- 5 statewide non-motorized trail concerns 5 points

Points awarded: _____ (0-5 points)

(FOR WATER TRAIL PROJECTS)

STATEWIDE WATER TRAIL ISSUES

- Issue A: Need to address conflicts between non-motorized boaters and waterfront property owners.
- Issue B: Need for more public access to waterways.
- Issue C: Need for adequate and consistent user and safety information resources (e.g. signs, maps, level of difficulty and water level information and available paddling opportunities) user education and outreach. (Recognize that a maximum of 5% of total RTP funding allocation will be awarded to “education” projects.)

If the project addresses:

- 0 statewide water trail issues 0 points
- 1 statewide water trail issue 7 points
- 2 statewide water trail issues 14 points
- 3 statewide water trail issues 21 points

Points awarded: _____ (0-21 points)

7. Local Needs And Benefits Criteria (15 Points)

(For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

A. Comprehensive Planning

Project sponsors are strongly encouraged to develop project applications that meet high priority needs of the intended clientele. The assessment of these needs should be based upon coordinated, long-range planning.

The extent to which the project will satisfy priority needs, as identified in a current comprehensive local plan or recreation/park master plan, county or regional master plan, trail system plan, land use/ management plan or a regional trails planning forum process. The comprehensive plan must clearly identify and describe the specific proposed trail project.

_____ points awarded (0 or 10 points)

Note: The local planning document should be adopted/approved by the applicable governing body.

(10 points for projects identified in a current plan, 0 points for all other projects.)

B. Public Involvement

Involving the public throughout a trail development project can be the cornerstone for future success. Public involvement is a means of building support and developing a constituency and a partnership for the development effort.

The extent to which public involvement through public meetings/ workshops, open houses, interviews, questionnaires, and so forth were used in the long-range comprehensive planning process to identify public support for this trail project.

_____ points awarded (0-5 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-5 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

8. Motorized Trail Opportunities (6 Points) (For motorized trail projects)

A. Need for riding opportunities outside of federal lands

According to recreation providers and members of the general public, there is a need for more riding opportunities on lands outside of federal ownership. They

stated a need to explore motorized recreation opportunities on private timberlands, state or local government land, and work with private landowners for access.

The motorized trail project will develop riding opportunities on private, state, county or local recreation provider land.

_____ points awarded (0 or 3 points)

Note: If funded, riding opportunities on private land must be open to the general public.

(3 points for projects located outside of federal lands, 0 points for projects on federal lands.)

B. Need to maximize the sustainable carrying capacity at existing managed riding areas

In recent years, the trend in motorized recreation in Oregon has been that more motorized areas and trails are being closed to use rather than opened. The result has been increased pressure on other trails and riding areas and increased violation of posted closure. As a result, there is a need to develop additional riding opportunities at existing OHV recreation areas identified in The Official Guide to Oregon Off Highway Vehicle Recreation⁵⁵.

The motorized trail project intends to maximize the sustainable carrying capacity at one of the 40 OHV riding areas where such a need exists.

_____ points awarded (0-3 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-3 points based on information provided by the applicant.)

9. PUBLIC ACCESS TO WATERWAYS (6 POINTS) (For Water Trail Projects)

Recreation providers and other workshop attendees across the state consistently reported a need for more public access to waterways to accommodate the needs of a growing number of non-motorized boaters. Priority points will be awarded to water trail projects providing new or improving existing points of legal entry to the water (at the starting point, at reasonable intervals along, and at the final take out point of paddling routes), developed facilities at public access points (e.g. adequate parking, restroom facilities, boat launches), and information describing how people can access the paddling opportunity (e.g. water trail guides, brochures, signage).

⁵⁵ A listing of managed OHV riding areas in the state is available at the following website: <http://atv.prd.state.or.us/places.php>

- The water trail development increases public access to Oregon’s waterways.

_____ points awarded (0-6 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-6 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

10. TRAIL DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT (5 POINTS) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Increasing use levels often results in resource impact on recreational trails and damage to trail facilities. Such impacts and damage can be proactively prevented or minimized through innovative and sustainable trail and facility design and management practices.

The National Park Service describes a sustainable trail as follows⁵⁶.

A Sustainable Trail:

- Supports current and future use with minimal impact to the area’s natural systems.
- Produces negligible soil loss or movement while allowing vegetation to inhabit the area.
- Recognizes that pruning or removal of certain plants may be necessary for proper maintenance.
- Does not adversely affect the area’s animal life.
- Accommodates existing use while allowing only appropriate future use.
- Requires little rerouting and minimal long-term maintenance.

In addition, specific examples of sustainable efforts are included on the OPRD grant website at: <http://egov.oregon.gov/OPRD/GRANTS/docs/2005.sustainability.pdf> under the heading Sustainability in OPRD Grant Programs.

- The trail project will result in a well-designed, managed and sustainable trail or trail system.

_____ points awarded (0-5 points)

Note: RTP funds are not intended for trail planning and management projects. To gain points, applicants will need to show proof that proper trail design and management strategies and sustainability efforts are included in the development project.

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-5 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

⁵⁶ National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Region, January 1991.

11. Non-Motorized Trail Connectivity (7 Points) (For non-motorized trail projects)

According to recreation providers in the state, trail connectivity involves linking urban trails to outlying Federal trail systems; linking neighborhood, community and regional trails; connecting community parks and other recreational and public facilities; and connecting neighboring communities (e.g. Ashland to Medford). During the trail issues workshops, recreation providers strongly felt that increasing non-motorized trail connectivity will result in better use of the state's existing non-motorized trail infrastructure and provide more trail opportunities. As a result, priority points will be awarded for non-motorized trail projects that connect to another trail system to form trail networks.

If the project*:

- is not part of a local, regional or statewide trail network0 points
- is a part of a local, regional or statewide trail network7 points

_____ points awarded (0-7 points)

*The applicant must clearly describe why the trail is a part of a local, regional or statewide trail network in relation to the following specific trail system definitions.

Trail Network Definitions

A non-motorized trail of local significance as identified in a local trail system gap analysis.

Trails of local significance are those trails making important community connections to local destinations (within the community boundary) such as public lands, parks, town centers, cultural or historic sites, neighborhoods and schools or transportation systems (e.g. light rail).

A non-motorized trail of regional significance as identified in a regional (multi-jurisdictional) trails planning effort. Trails of regional significance are trails that connect to regionally significant sites, are multi-jurisdictional, multi-use and that connect to statewide or other regionally significant trails.

A non-motorized trail of statewide significance. Trails of statewide significance are trails forming a network making connections beyond local and regional boundaries, connecting major destinations such as large public natural lands, communities, cultural or historic sites of statewide or national significance and providing long-distance recreational opportunities. Trails of statewide significance will form the spine of the statewide trail network to which trails of regional and local significance can connect.

12. Multi-Use Trails (5 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

The 2004 Oregon Statewide Trail User and Non-Motorized Boater Survey reported that a wide variety of user groups participate on Oregon's motorized and non-motorized trails and waterways in the state. Multi-use trails are trails that permit more than one user group to use the trail. Multi-use trails can include a mix of motorized and non-motorized uses or can be limited to either motorized or non-motorized uses.

A project that includes the development of multi-use trails will receive up to 5 priority points. The applicant must identify which of the trail user groups included in the table below will be allowed to use to use the trail.

If the project will was designed to accommodate:

1 user group	0 points
2 user groups.....	1 point
3 user groups.....	2 points
4 user groups.....	3 points
5 user groups.....	4 points
6 or more user groups	5 points

_____ points awarded (0-5 points)

Note: Points will not be awarded for user groups not included in the table below.

TRAIL USER GROUPS

MOTORIZED TRAIL	NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL	WATER TRAIL
ATV riders	Hikers (including walkers, runners, backpackers)	White water rafters
Off-road motorcyclists	Bikers (road & mountain)	Canoeists
4-wheel drivers	Equestrian (including all stock user)	Drift boaters/ Row boaters
Snowmobilers	Cross-country skiing/Nordic	White water kayakers
Sand rail/Dune buggy drivers	Other wheeled uses (rollerbladers/ inline skaters, roller skaters)	Sea kayakers
ADA accommodations	ADA accommodations	Sail boaters
		Inner tubers
		ADA accommodations

13. Economic Development Opportunities (3 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Across Oregon, motorized, non-motorized and water trails are stimulating tourism and recreation-related spending. Local trail users, vacationers and conference attendees provide direct economic benefits to hotels, restaurants, gas stations, and other business from increases in tourist activity and spending on durable goods such as bikes or skates, motorized recreation equipment, and non-motorized watercraft, and soft goods such as gasoline, food, and drinks. This, in turn, attracts and revitalizes businesses, creates jobs, and increases public revenue.

OPRD would like to encourage the development of motorized, non-motorized and water trails in areas of the state designated as economically distressed by the Oregon Economic & Community Development Department. Such areas could greatly benefit from economic benefits associated with recreational trail use.

- Priority points are awarded for developing trail opportunities in economically distressed counties or nearby economically distressed cities (see listing of counties and cities on the following page).

_____ points awarded (0-3 points)

(3 points for project sponsors with a project in an economically distressed county or nearby an economically distressed city, 0 points for all other project sponsors.)

Economically Distressed Counties in Oregon

Baker	Klamath
Columbia	Lake
Coos	Linn
Crook	Malheur
Douglas	Morrow
Gilliam	Sherman
Grant	Umatilla
Harney	Wallowa
Hood River	Wasco
Jefferson	Wheeler
Josephine	

Economically Distressed Cities in Oregon

City	County	City	County
Albany	Benton	Jefferson	Marion
Monroe	Benton	Mill City	Marion
Estacada	Clackamas	Mount Angel	Marion
Johnson City	Clackamas	Scotts Mills	Marion
Seaside	Clatsop	Stayton	Marion
Warrenton	Clatsop	Woodburn	Marion
Port Orford	Curry	Falls City	Polk
Butte Falls	Jackson	Independence	Polk
Eagle Point	Jackson	Monument	Polk
Gold Hill	Jackson	Monmouth	Polk
Phoenix	Jackson	Willamina	Polk
Rogue River	Jackson	Garibaldi	Tillamook
Talent	Jackson	Tillamook	Tillamook
Cottage Grove	Lane	Elgin	Union
Creswell	Lane	La Grande	Union
Florence	Lane	North Powder	Union
Lowell	Lane	Summerville Town	Union
Oakridge	Lane	Union	Union
Springfield	Lane	Unity	Union
Veneta	Lane	Cornelius	Washington
Westfir	Lane	Forest Grove	Washington
Aumsville	Marion	Gaston	Washington
Detroit	Marion	Amity	Yamhill
Gates	Marion	Dayton	Yamhill
Gervais	Marion	Layfayette	Yamhill
Hubbard	Marion	McMinnville	Yamhill
Idanha	Marion	Sheridan	Yamhill

14. National Scenic Trail, National Recreation Trail Or National Historic Trail (5 Points) (For non-motorized trail projects)

Non-motorized trail projects located on a National Scenic Trail, National Recreation Trail or National Historic Trail in Oregon will receive 5 priority points.

_____ points awarded (0 or 5 points)

Note: Please provide a map and documentation indicating that the project is located on a designated National Scenic Trail, National Recreation Trail or National Historic Trail.

(5 points for project sponsors with a project on National Scenic, National Recreation, or National Historic Trails, 0 points for all other sponsors.)

15. Project Urgency (5 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

The Recreational Trails Advisory Committee (RTAC) is aware that timing can often be a critical factor in the acquisition and operation of valuable recreation properties. The intent of the following criteria is to provide priority for project proposals showing an urgent need for time-sensitive land acquisitions, immediate threat of closure because of non-compliance with state and federal law, threat of lost opportunity, meeting project completion deadlines, public health and safety concerns or impacts on cultural and natural resources.

For trail projects, land acquired with RTP grant funding must be directly related to the provision of trail recreation. As such, park and open space acquisitions are not eligible for RTP grant funding.

Note: Opportunities that may be lost as a result of sponsors budget cycles or other activities within the control of the project sponsor will not be considered as "urgent."

_____ points awarded (0-5 points)

(The rating team will determine a value from 0-5 points based on the information provided by the applicant.)

16. Discretionary Committee Member Criteria (15 Points) (For motorized, non-motorized and water trail projects)

Consistent with RTP guidance, RTAC membership represents a broad range of motorized and non-motorized trail users that take place in the state. This assessment allows committee members to bring their knowledge of statewide and local recreation patterns, resources, and needs into consideration. The determination of points awarded is an individual decision, based on informed judgment.

Reviewers may award the project additional points based upon their subjective evaluation of the following⁵⁷:

- Site Suitability: The extent to which the site is suitable for the proposed development (e.g. minimizes negative impacts on the environment, surrounding neighborhood).
- Fiscal Consideration: Under this review, project sponsors will be asked to justify their request for financial assistance including the extent to which the project provides sufficient value (through a cost/benefit analysis), is cost comparable to other trail facilities of its type in their geographic area, is justifiable in terms of the quantity and quality of recreation opportunities the facilities will provide, and that the sponsor has budgeted enough money to successfully complete the project.
- Commitment to Long-Term Operation and Maintenance: Sponsors should show evidence of a commitment to long-term operation and maintenance that their organization has demonstrated at existing trail and park resources. In those cases where the applicant does not presently have an operation/maintenance responsibility for an existing trail or park, information about other public facilities or resources within the sponsor's jurisdiction may be presented.
- Basic Intent of TEA-21: A development project is considered to be questionable, elaborate, or borderline with respect to the basic intent of The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century if serious questions arise concerning the following:
 - Project cost: Consideration will be given to the degree to which a significant portion of the State's annual apportionment is requested for one project.
 - Mixed use: Project sponsors should provide evidence that the specific trail design demonstrates that the project will support mixed-use recreational trail opportunities serving a wide range of abilities including the elderly and disabled as well as the more active and highly skilled trail user.
- Regional Issues: Regional trail issues were also identified in the current trails planning process. Project sponsors should describe how the project addresses appropriate regional trail issues. Regional motorized, non-motorized and water trail issues are included on the following pages.

Note: Locate the project sponsor's region and identify each regional motorized, non-motorized or water trail issue addressed in the project proposal.

_____ points awarded (0-15 points)

⁵⁷ This list is not intended to be a complete list of all discretionary criteria to be considered by RTAC members. Other considerations could include superior design, ADA compliance, special needs, project presentation, superior leverage of funding and partnership including the use of volunteers, heritage context and/or potential for legacy.

REGIONAL MOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUES

Northwest Region: Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Lincoln, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lane and Benton Counties.

Issue A: Need for adequate and consistent information resources.

Issue B: Need for new trails including loop trails.

Issue C: Need to better manage for trail-related environmental impacts and resource protection through careful selection of riding area locations, planning, design, public education and understanding the capacity limits of motorized areas.

Southwest Region: Includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson, and Douglas Counties.

Issue A: Need to increase motorized trail and trailhead capacity within the region by developing motorized recreation opportunities on private timberlands and designating trails/areas for motorized use including trails currently used in that manner.

Issue B: Need for increased user education (rules, regulations, restrictions, environmental) and safety training in the region.

Issue C: Need to provide managed motorized areas.

North Central Region: Includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson, Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties.

Issue A: Need to use snow park areas for OHV use during summer months.

Issue B: Need to repair or reroute OHV trails to minimize resource damage.

Issue C: Need for a wide variety of Class II (4-wheel drive, jeep, SUV) riding opportunities—particularly technical riding areas.

South Central Region: Includes Klamath and Lake Counties.

Issue A: Need for more designated motorized areas.

Issue B: Need for interagency cooperation for developing a seamless long-range trail system across jurisdictional boundaries.

Issue C: Need for increased management (safety, environmental and regulatory) of OHV riding areas.

Northeast Region: Includes Wallowa, Union, Grant and Baker Counties.

Issue A: Need for standardized trail signage to provide consistency and continuity between riding areas.

Issue B: Need for additional motorized camping areas and related facilities (staging areas, restrooms and amenities) to minimize damage to existing riding areas.

Issue C: Need for more motorized trails throughout the region—especially in Baker, Pine and Wallowa Valley Ranger Districts.

Southeast Region: Includes Harney and Malheur Counties.

Issue A: Need to consider OHV use of roads proposed for closure or abandonment and to review recreational use on roads previously closed or abandoned.

Issue B: Need for designated and managed OHV areas for ATVs and motorcycles.

Issue C: Need for safety information and training for young adults (over 15 years of age) who are beginning to ride snowmobiles.

REGIONAL NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUES

Northwest Region: Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Lincoln, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lane and Benton Counties.

Issue A: Need for trail connectivity.

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

Issue C: Need for additional funding for non-motorized trail acquisition and development.

Southwest Region: Includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson, and Douglas Counties.

Issue A: Need for trail connectivity.

Issue B: Need for funding and technical assistance for easements, permitting fee title, and acquisitions for trail projects.

Issue C: Need for additional funding for trail maintenance.

North Central Region: Includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson, Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties.

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

Issue B: Need to develop and extend a regional trails system.

Issue C: Need for trail access opportunities that do not require user fees or permits.

South Central Region: Includes Klamath and Lake Counties.

Issue A: Need for trail connectivity.

Issue B: Need dedicated funding for trail operation and maintenance.

Issue C: Need for better education/information on the sharing of multiple-use trails.

Northeast Region: Includes Willamette, Union, Grant and Baker Counties.

Issue A: Need to secure long-term funding for non-motorized trail maintenance.

Issue B: Need for trail connectivity.

Issue C: Need for greater cooperation between state and federal agencies in providing trail opportunities.

Southeast Region: Includes Harney and Malheur Counties.

Issue A: Need for additional non-motorized trails.

Issue B: Need for information on existing non-motorized trails.

Issue 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.

REGIONAL WATER TRAIL ISSUES

Northwest Region: Includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Lincoln, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lane and Benton Counties.

Issue A: Need for more public access to waterways.

Issue B: Need for a designated funding source for non-motorized watercraft facility development.

Issue C: Need to properly address the navigability issue and clearly define to users where they legally can launch or access the water and shore.

Southwest Region: Includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson, and Douglas Counties.

Issue A: Need for additional access to waterways and launch/landing facilities.

Issue B: Need to provide adequate and consistent information resources for designated water trail routes for trip preparation and navigation.

Issue C: Need for a dedicated funding source for non-motorized water trail development.

North Central Region: Includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson, Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties.

Issue A: Need to identify water trail resource impacts associated with rapid growth of water-based recreation.

Issue B: Need for additional water trail facilities—particularly those providing close-to-home paddling opportunities.

Issue C: Need for leave-no-trace practices, respect for private property rights of waterfront property owners and need to reduce resource impacts.

South Central Region: Includes Klamath and Lake Counties.

Issue A: Need for public access on some waterways and information on points of water access.

Issue B: Need for adequate public properties along water trails to reduce conflicts with waterfront property owners.

Issue C: Need for a dedicated funding source for water trail development.

Northeast Region: Includes Wallowa, Union, Grant and Baker Counties.

Issue A: Need for a non-motorized boater education program.

Issue B: Need for a central information source for interested non-motorized boaters to access information regarding flat and whitewater paddling opportunities.

Issue C: Need to consider the potential for user conflict between an increasing number of non-motorized and motorized boaters using facilities developed primarily for motorized watercraft.

Southeast Region: Includes Harney and Malheur Counties.

Issue A: Need to educate communities about the economic benefits associated with water trail development to address local opposition to trail development.

Issue B: Need for additional water access facilities, marketing and interpretive information related to water trail development.

Issue C: There are a number of flat water-paddling opportunities (including Lake Owyhee, the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, connections to irrigation canals and other remote settings) that could be developed as water trails.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TRAIL DESIGN, MAINTENANCE AND ACCESSIBILITY PUBLICATION LIST

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
An Axe to Grind: A Practical Ax Manual	1999	Bernie Weisgerber and Brian Valchowski. USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	A practical and detailed handbook about axes and their historic and continuing usage. Describes types and patterns of axes and adzes, with many photos and illustrations. Shows how to hang (rehandle) and sharpen axes. Describes proper ax usage for tree felling, limbing, bucking, splitting and hewing. Lists procurement sources and selected references.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/99232823/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3900
Appalachian Trail Design, Construction and Maintenance - 2nd Edition	2000	William Birchard, Jr., Robert Proudman and the Appalachian Trail Conference	The second edition of the definitive handbook on trail work including standards and technical details of trail design, construction and maintenance.	No	http://www.atctrailstore.org/catalog/iteminfo.cfm?itemid=111&compid=1
ATV Utility and Gravel Trailer	1997	Brian Vachowski: Project Leader - USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program	The Missoula Technology and Development Center (MTDC) has construction drawings available for a rugged, steel trailer designed to be pulled behind an all-terrain vehicle. The trailer has been used on the Palouse Ranger District, Clearwater National Forest, over the past several years. It has proven invaluable for hauling gravel and supplies for trail work on their ATV trail system. It should be equally well suited for other project work like hauling supplies on fires, for fencing projects, or wherever an ATV is a safe and appropriate tool to help get the job done.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/97232310/index.htm	No

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Backcountry Sanitation Manual	2001	The Appalachian Trail Conference	This 220-page manual addresses the management of human waste in the backcountry. Proper management of human waste protects hikers, the environment and trail maintainers. The manual was created in the belief that all remote recreation areas will benefit from an expanded discussion of backcountry sanitation. It also introduces a new, simpler and often safer method of composting human waste in the backcountry- the moldering privy.	http://www.appalachiantrail.org/protect/pdfs/Sanitation_Manual_rev.pdf	http://www.atctrailstore.org/
Boulder Buster - Breaking Rocks Without Explosives	1998	Bill Killroy and Jim Tour. USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program	Describes using the Boulder Buster rather than explosives to break rocks larger than 2 meters in diameter or rock walls in 2-meter lifts. The Boulder Buster uses a cartridge resembling a shotgun shell and a column of liquid to generate a high-pressure wave. The wave fractures the surrounding structure. The Boulder Buster does not produce flyrock, so operators can be 25 meters away when they pull a lanyard to fire the device. Because the Boulder Buster is not an explosive device, operators do not require explosives certification. No special transportation or storage regulations apply. The Boulder Buster is a commercial product made in South Africa. During Forest Service field tests, the Boulder Buster was used to break a large rock that had fallen alongside a roadway, break rocks to lower spillways on two dams, and break a rock beneath a bridge where explosives could not have been used without damaging the	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/98672840/index.htm	No

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Building Better Trails: Designing, Constructing and Maintaining Outstanding Trails	2002	International Biking Association	bridge. Building Better Trails is an essential resource for mountain bikers, land managers and other trail enthusiasts. The 72-page book teaches readers how to build sustainable trails by offering step-by-step instructions for trail design, construction and maintenance. The book also provides trail building resources, and includes a section on a new trend: building challenging, technical trails that are environmentally sustainable.	http://www.imba.com/resources/trail_building/trailbuilding_basics_index.html	Phone: 303.545.9011 Email: webmaster@imba.com
Building Crusher Fines Trails	2002	Lois Bachensky, USDA Forest Service on American Trails Website	How to use Crusher Fines (finely crushed compacted rock) as a trail surface material.	http://www.americantrails.org/resources/railbuilding/BuildCrushFinesOne.html	No
Camping Impact Management on the Appalachian National Scenic Trail	2003	Jeffrey Marion-The Appalachian Trail Conference	The report addresses the management of overnight use and associated impacts along the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (A.T.) This effort was initiated in response to agency and Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC) management concerns regarding the resource and social impacts of increasing overnight visitation, particularly in high use areas. Report findings are primarily based on a series of on-site investigations at 17 problem areas selected by A.T. clubs and ATC staff.	http://www.appalachiantrail.org/protect/pdfs/AT_Camping_Impacts.pdf	http://www.atctrailstore.org/catalog/iteminfo.cfm?itemid=111&compid=1

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Cattle Guards for Off-Highway Vehicle Trails	1998	USDA Forest Service - Brian Vachowski: Project Leader	Designs for trail cattle guards suitable for trails used by ATV's, motorcycles, mountain bikes and hikers that are successfully used on U.S. Forest Service lands.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/98232826/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Crosscut Saw Guards	1997	George Jackson: Project Leader - USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program	Crosscut saws are an efficient tool for cutting timber, but they can represent a safety hazard if they are carried improperly. The Washington Office staffs in Recreation, Fire and Aviation, and Engineering asked the Missoula Technology and Development Center (MTDC) to recommend ways to safely transport crosscut saws. The primary objective is to protect personnel and pack stock from accidentally contacting the saw's cutting teeth.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/97232341/index.htm	No
Floating Trail Bridges and Docks	2002	Jansen Neese, Merv Erickson and Brian Vachowski - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	The Missoula Technology Development Center evaluates the use of floating bridges for trail crossings in very wet areas. The report includes information about floating docks, floating bridge designs, anchorage systems, and devices that allow the dock to adjust itself to varying water levels.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/02232812/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Florida Greenways and Trails System Design Guidelines for Unpaved and Paddling Trails.	1998	Florida Recreational Trails Council	Guidelines for the design and development of unpaved trails in the Florida Greenways and Trails System.	http://www.dep.state.fl.us/gwt/community/refguide/pdf/appende.pdf	Phone: 850.245.2052

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Geosynthetics for Trails in Wet Areas	2000	Steve Monlux and Brian Vachowski - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	Geosynthetics are synthetic materials that are used with soil or rock in many types of construction. They perform three major functions: separation, reinforcement, and drainage. This report describes several types of geosynthetics; explains basic geosynthetic design and utilization concepts for trail construction in wet areas; and provides geosynthetic product information. Detailed product specifications and procurement sources are listed.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/00232838/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Gravel Bags for Packstock	1995	Brian Valchowski. USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program.	The Missoula Technology and Development Center was asked to develop plans, and fabricate and test fabric bags that could be mounted on packsaddles. MTDC worked from a design developed in the 1970's by retired Wallowa-Whitman National Forest employee Ivan Carper. Missoula smokejumper Tony Petrilli fabricated the bags for MTDC in 1994 and they were tested on a partnership turnpike construction project on the Rocky Mountain Ranger District of the Lewis and Clark National Forest that same year. MTDC also tested and evaluated some bags that closely followed the original Carper design built by the Professional Wilderness Outfitters Association (PWOA), and some off-the-shelf fruit picking bags. Included in this report are test results, recommendations, a design pattern, and some alternatives.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/95232840/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3900

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Green Trails: Best Practices for Environmentally Friendly Trails	2004	Metro Parks and Greenspaces	This publication is intended to provide guidelines for environmentally friendly or green trails that support the goals of Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan. Those goals seek to promote an interconnected system of parks, natural areas, trails and greenways for fish, wildlife and people throughout the Portland metropolitan region and still maintain biodiversity and protect water quality. The guidelines are not standards; they are recommendations to complement existing standards and guidelines adopted by local parks and watershed groups in the region.	http://www.metro-region.org/library_ps.cfm?id=5	Phone: 503.797.1850
Greenways: A Guide to Planning, Design, and Development	1993	Charles Flink, Kristine Olka and Robert Searns	A "soup-to-nuts" guide to the practical issues involved in planning and designing greenways and trails. It offers guidance on the overall process of greenway creation while detailing each step along the way. Explains topics such as land acquisition and trail design, development and maintenance, safety and liability, public relations and mapping, organizing volunteers and managing multi-user conflicts.	No	http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/1559631368/002-4882275-7580031?v=glance
Hand Drilling and Breaking Rock for Wilderness Trail Maintenance	1984	Dale Mrkich and Jerry Oltman - USFS Technology and Development Program	Percussive or hammer drilling is most often used to drill rock. In Forest Service trail work, gasoline-powered hammer drilling is common. Hand drilling is sometimes necessary however, because machines cannot be used. This manual describes elementary tools and techniques for hand drilling rock.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/84232602/index.htm	No

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Handtools for Trail Work	Revised, 1997	William Hutcheson, Dale Mrkich and Jerry Oltman - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	Describes the handtools commonly used by Forest Service trail crews for sawing, chopping, grubbing, digging and tamping, brushing, pounding and hammering, lifting and hauling, peeling and shaping, sharpening, and rehandling. Includes many illustrations of the tools.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/88232601/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Lightly on the Land	1996	Robert Birkby, Student Conservation Association, Inc.	A 267-page comprehensive trail construction guide compiled by the Student Conservation Association (SCA) designed for trail crew leaders and crew members of SCA crews. Chapter titles include Trails, Crew Leadership, Camping with Work Crews, Safety, Tools, Crosscuts and Chain Saws; Measuring Distances, Grades, and Heights; Trail Survey and Design, Trail Construction, Trail Drainage, Trail Maintenance, Building with Rock, Felling and Bucking, Building with Timber, Bridge Construction, Revegetation and Restoration, Rigging, Knots, and History of the SCA Work Skills Program.	No	http://www.thesca.org/res_trail.cfm
Logical Lasting Launches: Design Guidance for Canoe and Kayak Launches	2004	Caroline Wolf, Student Conservation Association. National Park Service Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance Program.	This guide provides design guidance for developing canoe and kayak launches for a variety of access sites. Case examples, designs, and photos of launch sites are included.	http://www.nps.gov/rctca/helpfultools/ht_launch_guide.html	No

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Managing Degraded Off-Highway Vehicle Trails in Wet, Unstable, and Sensitive Environments	2002	Kevin Meyer - National Park Service Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	A 48-page report describing techniques that have been used to manage off-highway vehicle trails in Alaska. The report explains why off-highway vehicle trails become degraded and suggests management options to prevent degradation. It also reports the results of test comparing different options for hardening off-highway-vehicle trails. Appendixes provide installation instructions for porous pavement panels and a list of locations where trail-hardening systems are being tested in cooperation with the National Park Service Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance program.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/02232821/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Mechanized Trail Equipment	1996	Ralph Gonzales - USDA Forest Service. San Dimas Technology and Development Center	This 94-page report documents an effort to catalog mechanized trail maintenance and construction equipment. The publication provides information on mechanized trail equipment, specifically earthmoving and hauling machinery. Earthmoving equipment includes excavators, dozer, and trail machines with a width not exceeding 72 inches. Hauling equipment includes motorized wheelbarrows, totters, and ATVs. Specifications and line drawings or pictures are provided to give the user information about the equipment.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/download/hep/fspubs/pdf96231207.pdf	No
Mountain Bike Accessories For Trail Work	1998	Brian Vachowski: Project Leader - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of	It should come as no surprise that mountain bike enthusiasts who also maintain trails have seen the benefits of using mountain bikes for trail work. This case study shows how the Seward Ranger District on the Chugach National	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/98232812/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
		Transportation.	Forest uses mountain bikes. In addition, it describes how the Missoula Technology Center worked with the District trail crews to develop a bicycle-mounted chain saw carrier and evaluate several single-wheeled bicycle cargo trailers.		
North American Water Trails. A Guide to Establishing and Maintaining Recreational Waterways on Fresh and Salt Water. Second Edition	2000	David R. Getchell, Sr. A Publication of North American Water Trails. Inc.	The publication includes 3 sections. The first is a how-to guide covering the five steps in setting up a water trail: planning, promoting, funding, organizing, and operating. The second section has a listing and description of many of the existing North American water Trails. The third section lists resources that may prove useful to project managers.	No	NAWT RR1, Box 3358 Appleton, ME 04862
Off-Highway Motorcycle & ATV Trails Guidelines for Design, Construction, Maintenance and User Satisfaction. 2nd. Edition	1994	Joe Wernex. Published by the American Motorcyclist Association.	This book was written to aid planners in the development of trail bike trails in a mountainous forest environment. However, others have indicated that the techniques described have broad application and are useful in developing trails in many environments and for ATV recreation as well. The author's goal was to provide a tool that would help public lands managers meet their responsibility to provide high quality outdoor recreation opportunities for trail bike enthusiasts - on an equitable basis with other trail users.	http://www.nttp.net/resources/motors/WernexReport.pdf	Phone: 641.856.1900

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan: An Element of the Oregon Transportation Plan	1995	Oregon Department of Transportation	The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan offers the general principals and policies that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) follows to provide bikeways and walkways along state highways. It also provides the framework for cooperation between ODOT and local jurisdictions, and offers guidance to cities and counties for developing local bicycle and pedestrian plans.	http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/planimag/toc-imag.htm	http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/obpplanold.htm
Pedestrian Facilities Guidebook: Incorporating Pedestrians into Washington's Transportation System	1997	Otak, Inc. Sponsored by the Washington State DOT, County Road Administration Board, & the Assoc. of Washington Cities	As part of the planning process that culminated in the development of the 1994 Transportation Policy Plan for Washington State, the subcommittee responsible for creating the Pedestrian Policy Plan recommended that the Washington DOT coordinate with other state and local jurisdictions to develop a pedestrian design manual that recommends appropriate design practices for pedestrian facilities and provides common sense approaches to improving the pedestrian environment.	http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/12000/12200/12220/12220.pdf	Phone: 360.705.7258 Email: Reeves@wsdot.wa.gov
Personal Backpacks for Carrying a Chain Saw	2001	Bob Beckley: USDA Forest Service, Technology & Development Program, Missoula, Montana	Describes field tests of backpacks designed to carry chain saws. Two models were found to be satisfactory for field use: the MacKenzie "Mack" chain saw backpack manufactured by Frontline Safety Gear of Cook, MN, and the Epperson chain saw backpack manufactured by Epperson Mountaineering in Libby, MT. The main concern identified by the Missoula Technology and Development Center was the possibility that either pack	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/01232334/lc01232334.htm	Phone: 406.329.3978

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
			would be contaminated by fuel and oil from the saw or the fuel and oil containers.		
Natural Surface Trails by Design: Physical and Human Essentials of Sustainable, Enjoyable Trails	2004	Troy Scott Parker	Explains the real keys to all types of natural surface (soil, rock, crushed stone) trails. For any trail use or location, it builds the critical foundation of a system of thought that can generate a sustainable, enjoyable trail.	No	http://www.natureshape.com/pubs/nstbd.html
Off-Highway Vehicle Trail and Road Grading Equipment	1998	Brian Vachowski and Neal Maier - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	Describes light-duty grading equipment that can be pulled by an all-terrain vehicle to maintain wide trails and roads. Three pieces of equipment were tested on a sandy motorcycle trail and a trailhead access road in the Francis Marion National Forest in South Carolina: a modified trail rock rake, a trail drag, and a commercial product, the Ultra Light Terrain Grader. All three pieces of equipment removed the wash boarded "whoop-de-doo" in the sandy soil. Narrower equipment would have worked better on trails. The equipment worked very well on roads and offers an affordable alternative to heavier graders for light-duty use. Other trail-grading accessories and drags for small tractors are also described.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/98232837/index.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Park Guidelines For Off Highway Vehicles (OHVs): A Resource Guide to Assist in the Planning, Development, Enhancement, and Operation of OHV Recreation Facilities	2002	George Fogg in association with the National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council.	The 196-page document summarizes a practical approach to a multifaceted effort required to bring about a new or revised off-highway vehicle park project and keep it in good condition throughout its lifespan.	No	Phone: 800.348.6487 Email: trailhead@nohvcc.org
Planning Trails With Wildlife in Mind: A Handbook for Trail Planners	1998	Trails and Wildlife Task Force, Colorado State Parks, Hellmund Associates	A 56-page handbook for trail planners and builders to better balance the benefits of creating trails and being stewards of nature, especially wildlife.	http://www.rmc.ca.gov/projects/guidance_recipients/trailshandbook.pdf	Phone: 303.866.3437
Portland Pedestrian Design Guide	1998	City of Portland, Oregon. Office of Transportation, Engineering and Development. Pedestrian Transportation Program	The public right-of-way houses many transportation activities, including walking, bicycling, transit, freight movement, and automobile travel. Each of these functions has specific design needs and constraints. In the past, conflicts between the design needs of competing functions occasionally have produced conditions that discourage pedestrian travel. The purpose of Portland's Pedestrian Design Guide is to integrate the wide range of design criteria and practices into a coherent set of new standards and guidelines that, over time, will promote an environment conducive to walking.	http://www.trans.ci.portland.or.us/DesignReferences/Pedestrian/DesignGuide.PDF	If you would prefer to purchase a hard copy from the Office of Transportation, please send US \$15 drafted on a United States bank to: Pedestrian Coordinator, Office of Transportation. City of Portland. 1120 SW Fifth Ave. Suite 800 Portland, OR. 97204
Rail-Trail Maintenance: Preparing for the Future of Your Trail	1996	Susan Thagard, USDA Americorps. Pennsylvania Rails-to-Trails Conservancy	A 49-page study report providing trail builders with the tools to plan maintenance and management budgets and to enable them to build more cost-effective and durable trails.	http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/manage/PA_maintenance.pdf	Phone: 877.476.9297

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Recreational Trail Design and Construction	1997	David M. Rathke and Melvin J. Baughman	A concise and easy-to-read 28-page booklet on natural surface trails. This publication is a guide for private woodland owners, organizations, and businesses (including nature centers, youth groups, schools, conservation clubs, and resorts) that are interested in designing and constructing trails. It describes step-by-step construction methods, ways to handle trail obstacles, and recommended standards for the most common types of trails.	http://www.extensio.n.umn.edu/distribution/naturalresources/DD6371.html	Phone: 800.876.8636
Ripper Retrofit for the Sweco 480 Trail Dozer	2000	Bob Beckley: USDA Forest Service, Technology & Development Program, Missoula, Montana	Describes modifications to the ripper system for the Sweco 480 Trail Dozer. When the operator backs the dozer without lifting the ripper system, slots that individual rippers fit into become elongated, allowing the rippers to fall out. Modifications to repair this problem and prevent future problems require welding and take about 2 hours. Newer versions of the Sweco 480 Trail Dozer ripper system include this modification.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/00232310/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3900
Signposts For Snow Trails	1998	Brian Vachowski: Project Leader - USDA Forest Service and Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.	Describes signpost systems that work in shallow, moderate, and deep snowpacks. Traditional signposts anchored firmly in the ground work best for trails with low and moderate amounts of snow. Free-floating signposts supported only the snow around them work best in moderate to deep snowpacks. Telescoping signposts and signposts with temporary bases work for shallow, moderate, and deep snowpacks, but these systems are rarely used because they are more expensive	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/98232806/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3900

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
			and harder to install and maintain than traditional of free-floating signposts.		
Standard Specifications for Construction and Maintenance of Trails (Part 1: Text)	1996	USDA Forest Service - Engineering Staff	A 97-page text-only book presenting the standard specifications for construction and maintenance of trails developed for guidance of U.S. Forest Service employees, its contractors, and cooperating federal and state government agencies.	http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/helena/contracting/96_Trail_Specs_English.pdf	http://bookstore.gpo.gov/sb/sb-231.html
Standard Specifications for Construction and Maintenance of Trails (Part 2: Trail Drawings & Specifications)	1996	USDA Forest Service - Engineering Staff	Trail construction related drawings and specifications described in Part 1 (above).	http://www.fs.fed.us/ftpoot/pub/acad/dev/trails/trails.htm	http://bookstore.gpo.gov/sb/sb-231.html
Stock-Drawn Equipment for Trail Work	1996	Steve Didier and Dianne Herzberg - USDA Forest Service, Technology & Development Program, Missoula, Montana	Includes photos of stock-drawn plows and grading equipment that can be used to build and maintain trails in the backcountry. Describes the advantages and disadvantages of different types of equipment. Includes sources where the equipment can be purchased.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/download/hep/fspubs/962802hi.pdf	Phone: 406.329.3978
The Complete Guide to Trail Building and Maintenance, 3rd Edition	1998	Carl Demrow & David Salisbury	A 256-page classic manual for trail building. The book was developed by the Appalachian Mountain Club for workers on the Appalachian Trail, but has been widely used for natural surface trails by trailbuilders everywhere. You'll learn new techniques and be introduced to new tools, environmentally sound erosion control, and naturalizing trails with minimum impact on the backcountry.	No	http://www.engineering-shop.com/Complete_Guide_to_Trail_Building_and_Maintenance_3rd_1878239546.html

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
The Trail Assessment Handbook	1993	The Appalachian Trail Conference	The 26-page handbook describes a trail assessment process designed to analyze trail maintenance and land management needs for the Appalachian Trail to identify the most significant trail maintenance and land-management priorities and problems.	http://www.appalachiantrail.org/protect/pdfs/TA_Handbook_screen.pdf	http://www.atctrailstore.org/catalog/iteminfo.cfm?itemid=111&compid=1
Trail Bridge Catalog	2003	Merv Eriksson: Project Manager - USDA Forest Service, Technology & Development Program, Missoula, Montana	The web site is intended to help land managers and engineers select trail bridge types, decks, rail systems, abutment systems, and materials. The site is divided into five sections: Trail Bridge Types, Trail Bridge Decks, Trail Bridge Rail Systems, Trail Bridge Abutments, and Trail Bridge Materials. The Trail Bridge Types, Decks, Rail Systems, and Abutments sections contain sketches, pictures, example and/or standard drawings, and guidelines for appropriate use with the USDA Forest Service Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classifications. Standard drawings, or example drawings, are intended for informational purposes only.	http://www.fs.fed.us/na/wit/WITPages/bridgecatalog/	No
Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook	2000 Edition	USDA Forest Service - Technology Development Program	This notebook describes techniques used to construct and maintain trails. It is written for trail crew workers and is intended to be taken along on work projects. Numerous illustrations help explain the main points. The notebook was printed in 1996 and has been revised slightly during two reprinting. Revisions in this edition update references and reflect minor editorial changes.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/download/hep/fspubs/pdf00232839.pdf	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreations/trails/trailpub.htm

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Trail Manual for the Florida Trail System	2001	Florida Trail Association, Inc.	The manual is to guide trail development, construction and maintenance techniques for the Florida National Scenic Trail and the Florida Trail System.	http://www.florida-trail.org/traildocs/trailmanual.pdf	Phone: 800.343.1882
Trail Shorts: A cursory Look at Trail Maintenance	1996	California State Department of Parks and Recreation	A 9-page document focusing on general design and maintenance guidelines to prevent most trail deterioration and minimize maintenance costs. The document focuses on wilderness trails and is intended to be used as a reference by trail maintenance crews.	http://www.foothill.net/fta/work/trailmaint.html	No
Trail Solutions: IMBA's Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack	2004	International Biking Association. Project was supported by a grant from the Federal Highway Administration's Recreation Trails Program	The 272-page book combines cutting-edge trail building techniques with proven fundamentals in a colorful, easy-to-read format. "Trail Solutions" is an essential tool for land managers and volunteer trail builders aspiring to raise their trail systems to the next level. The book is divided into eight sections that follow the trailbuilding process from beginning to end including trail planning, tool selection, construction and maintenance. It also describes how to secure funding and support volunteers to get the job done.	No	Phone: 888.442.4622 http://www.imba.com/resources/trail_building/trail_solutions.html
Trail Traffic Counters: Update	1999	Dave Gasvoda: Project Leader. USDA Forest Service, Technology & Development Program, Missoula, Montana	This report updates a 1994 report entitled Trail Traffic Counters for Forest Service Trail Monitoring. Three types of trail counters were evaluated: active infrared, passive infrared, and seismic. The report recommends an active infrared system for most trail monitoring situations because these systems provide the most accurate counts. One	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/99232835/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3978

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
			disadvantage of infrared systems is that they are harder to hide from vandals than seismic systems, particularly the active infrared systems that require bright reflectors to return the beam to the sending unit. Passive infrared systems should be reserved for situations that require a small, lightweight unit that must be set up quickly. Seismic systems may be used when problems with vandalism outweigh the need for accuracy.		
Trails Design and Management Handbook	1993	Troy Parker: Pitkin County Open Space and Trails Program	The 230-page handbook was commissioned by the Pitkin County Colorado (Aspen area) Open Space and Trails Program for development of a county trail system. The handbook is designed to help produce unique trails that are uniquely suited to their sites and users. It is intended to provide recognizable design consistency between trails and to eliminate the need to start from scratch with every trail. Major sections include Trail Design Process and Guidelines, Multiple Use Hard Surface Trail Specifications, Crusher Fines Trail Specifications, and the Trail Proposal and Evaluation Process.	(Table of Contents Only) http://www.trailbuilders.org/resources/link_resources/Pitkin_Trail_Design_Intro.pdf	Pitkin County Open Space and Trails Program 530 E. Main Street, Aspen, CO 81611 Phone: 970.920.5232 or Email: tsparker@natureshape.com
Trails For the Twenty-First Century: Planning, Design, and Management Manual for Multi-Use Trails, 2nd Edition	2001	Charles Flink, Kristine Olka and Robert Searns: Rails-To Trails Conservancy	A 212-page comprehensive guidebook for planners, landscape architects, local officials, and community activities interested in creating a multi-use trail. It provides a guide through the process of creating a trail from start to finish and managing the trail for the future.	No	http://railtrails.tranguard.com/square.asp?tgs=133662:9506043&cart_id=&item_id=87

Trail Design & Maintenance Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Trails, Bridges and Boardwalks	1994	Alan Long and Anne Todd-Bockarie - University of Florida School of Forest Resources and Conservation	This 19-page paper provides practical information for planning and developing recreational trails on forest land. It describes general designs and construction methods as well as some of the structures that may be important components of your trails, such as bridges, boardwalks, and benches. Costs are mentioned with the cautionary disclaimer that they may be highly variable depending on how you implement your recreation plans.	http://www.sfrc.ufl.edu/Extension/pubtxt/Framefor5.htm	No
Using Roundup to Treat Trail Surface Vegetation	1997	Ellen Eubanks- USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program.	Technical paper on using Roundup as a safe and economical way to eradicate vegetation and weeds that grow through the surfaces of trails.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/97231305/index.htm	Phone: 406.329.3978
Wetland Trail Design and Construction	2001	Robert Steinholtz and Brian Vachowski: USDA Forest Service in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, United States Department of Transportation	This 82-page manual describes materials and techniques used to construct trails in wetlands. This manual is written primarily for workers who are inexperienced in wetland trail construction, but it may also be helpful for experienced workers. Techniques suitable for wilderness settings and more developed settings are included. Drawings by the author illustrate all important points. A glossary is included, as are appendixes with material specifications.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/01232833/	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/publications.htm

Trail Accessibility Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Part 1, Review of Existing Guidelines and Practices	1999	U.S. Dept. of Transportation	In an effort to determine when Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) provisions apply to sidewalks and trails, the Federal Highway Administration sponsored a project to research existing conditions on sidewalks and trails for people with disabilities. Phase I of this project reports the history of accessibility legislation; travel characteristics of people with disabilities, children, and older adults are analyzed in relation to their use of sidewalks and trails; the effects of current legislation pertaining to sidewalk and trail project planning and funding are analyzed; and current design practices used in the design of sidewalks and trails are described and analyzed in terms of accessibility, engineering, and construction.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sidewalks/	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Part 2, Best Practices Design Guide	2001	U.S. Dept. of Transportation	Phase II of the project focused on designing sidewalks and trails for access. It was created to provide planners, designers, and transportation engineers with a better understanding of how sidewalks and trails should be developed to promote pedestrian access for all users, including people with disabilities.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sidewalk2/	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm

Trail Accessibility Publication	Year Published	Author	Description	Available On Web	To Order A Hardcopy
Soil Stabilizers On Universally Accessible Trails	2000	The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board)	The Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines state that ground and floor surfaces should be firm, stable, and slip-resistant. This publication provides field personnel with the results of soil stabilizers on universally accessible trails. The study areas were the Wood River Accessible Fishing Site and Day Use Area on the Winema National Forest and the Bell Rock Pathway on the Coconino National Forest. Seven types of trail surfacing products are discussed.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/fspubs/00231202/lc00231202.htm	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rec/trails/trailpub.htm
The Final Report on the Regulatory Negotiations Committee on Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas	1999	National Center on Accessibility	Proposes accessibility guidelines under the Americans with Disabilities Act for Trails, outdoor recreation access routes, beach access routes, and picnic and camping facilities.	http://www.access-board.gov/outdoor/outdoor-rec-rpt.htm	Phone: (800) 872-2253 Email: info@access-board.gov
Universal Access to Outdoor Recreation: A Design Guide	1993	Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S.D.A. Forest Service	This award-winning book provides universal design concepts and guidelines for outdoor environment, establishing a framework for determining the appropriate level of access in outdoor sites. It presents detailed design guidelines for the systems and elements necessary for ensuring accessibility to recreational trails, campsites, picnic areas, group meeting areas, and more. Examples demonstrate how the guidelines can be applied in typical outdoor settings to achieve a range of recreational opportunities for individuals of varying abilities.	No	http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0944661254/104-8615295-4367951?v=glance
What is an Accessible Trail?	2002	Project Play and Learning in Adaptable Environments (PLAE) Inc.	A technical assistance paper for developing accessible trails.	http://www.ncaonline.org/monographs/8-accessible-trails.shtml	Phone: (812) 856-4422

APPENDIX B: POTENTIAL TRAIL FUNDING SOURCES IN OREGON

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
American Canoe Assoc.	Club Fostered Stewardship	http://www.acanet.org/conservation/cfs.htm			X	X									Clubs
American Hiking Society	National Trails Endowment	www.americanhiking.org			X	X									
Americorps		http://www.americorps.org/joining/direct/direct_or.html			X			X		X	X	X	X		
Avista Foundation	Avista Foundation Grants	http://www.avistafoundation.org/application.asp			X				X						
Barnes & Nobles	Affiliates Program	www.barnesandnoble.com		X					X						
Bikes Belong Coalition	Bikes Belong Grants Program	http://bikesbelong.org/site/page.cfm?PageID=21			X				X		X	X	X		
Boeing Charitable Foundation	Civic and Environmental Contributions	http://www.boeing.com/companyoffices/aboutus/community/charitable.htm	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					
Center for Disease Control (CDC)	Preventive Health & Health Services Block Grant Program	http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/aag/aag_blockgrant.htm		X	X						X	X	X		
Coors Brewing Company	Coors Pure Water 2000 Grants	http://www.coors.com/community/philanthropy.asp			X	X									
Eastman Kodak Company	Kodak American Greenways Program	www.conservationsfund.org	X						X		X	X	X		
Federal Dept. of Health &	Healthy People 2010	www.health.gov/healthypeople	X	X					X		X	X			

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
Human Services	Implementation Grants														
Federal Highway Admin.	Recreational Trails Program National Program	www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rectrail.htm			X	X				X		X	X	X	X
Ford Family Foundation	Rural Civic and Community Enhancement Program	http://www.tfff.org/main/guidelines.html#a			X					X					
Honda Motor Company	American Honda Foundation	http://www.hondacorporate.com/community/index.html?subsection=foundation		X						X					
Kongsgaard Goldman Foundation	Environmental Protection and Conservation Program	http://www.kongsgaard-goldman.org/program.html	X		X					X					
M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust	Programs to Strengthen the Contemporary American Family	http://www.murdock-trust.org/		X						X					Universities
Metro	Parks & Greenspaces Grants Program	www.metro-region.org								X	X	X	X		
Meyer Memorial Trust	General Purpose Grants	http://www.mmt.org/		X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X
National Endowment for the Arts	Challenge America Fast Track Grants	www.arts.gov		X						X					

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation		www.nfwf.org								X	X	X	X	X	X
National Park Service	Challenge Cost-Share Program (CCSP)	http://www.nps.gov/chal/sp/jchalapp.htm		X	X			X							
National Park Service	River Trails & Conservation Assistance Program	http://www.nps.gov/ccso/rtca/application.html	X	X						X		X	X	X	X
National Park Service	Disposal of Federal Surplus Real Property for Parks and Recreation and Historic Monuments	http://www.cfda.gov/public/viewprog.asp?progid=471					X		X			X	X	X	
National Tree Trust	Multiple Programs	www.nationaltreetrust.org		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X
New England Foundation for the Arts	Art and Community Landscapes Program	http://www.nefa.org/grantprog/acl/	Trail side Art						X		X	X	X	X	
Nike - Community Investment	Community Investment Program	http://www.nike.com/nikebiz/nikebiz.html?page=26&item=giving		X						X					
Oregon Dept. of Trans.	Transportation Enhancement Program	http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/engineer/pdu													

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
Oregon Dept. of Trans. / Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development	Transportation and Growth Management Program	http://www.lcd.state.or.us/tgm/grants.htm	X								X	X			CO Gs, METRO
Oregon Economic and Community Development Dept.	Needs and Issues Inventory	http://www.econ.state.or.us/needs_issue.htm			X				X		X	X			
Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.	ATV Fund	http://atv.prd.state.or.us/grant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.	Recreation Trails Program	www.prd.state.or.us/grants-rectrails.php			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.	Land & Water Conservation Fund	www.prd.state.or.us/grants_lwcf.php			X	X					X	X	X		X
Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.	Local Government Grant Programs	www.prd.state.or.us/grants-localgov.php			X	X					X	X	X		X
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board	Small Grant Program	http://www.oweb.state.or.us/SmallGrant/smallgrant.shtml			X				X		X	X	X	X	
Patagonia	Environmental Grants Program	www.patagonia.com	X	X					X		X	X			
Polaris Industries	Trail Safety and Grants	http://www.polarisindustries.com		X					X				X	X	
Power Bar	Direct impact on Rivers and Trails (DIRT)	www.powerbar.com		X											

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
	Program														
Recreation Equipment Inc. (REI)	Recreation and Conservation Grants	www.rei.com		X						X					
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation		www.rwjf.org													
Rockefeller Family Fund		www.rfund.org	X	X	X										
SOLV	Project Oregon	http://www.solve.org/programs/project_oregon.asp	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	
Surdna Foundation		www.surdna.org		X	X					X		X	X	X	
The Collins Foundation		http://www.collinsfoundation.org/			X			X		X					
The Conservation Alliance		http://www.conservationalliance.com/grants.m			X	X				X					
The Hugh & Jane Ferguson Foundation	Foundation Grant Fund	http://fdncenter.org/grantmaker/ferguson/guide.html	X		X					X					
The Kresge Foundation	Bricks & Mortar Program	http://www.kresge.org/programs/index.htm		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X
The Mountaineers Foundation		www.mountaineersfoundation.org						X	X	X	X				X
The Oregon Community Foundation	Oregon Historic Trails Fund	http://www.ocf1.org/grant_programs/grant_programs_fr.htm		X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X
The Oregon Community Foundation	Community Grants Fund	http://www.ocf1.org/grant_programs/community_grant		X	X			X		X					

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES						APPLICANTS						
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
		fr.htm													
The Trust for Public Land		http://www.tpl.org/tier2_sa.cfm?folder_id=1825								X	X	X	x	x	
Tom's of Maine/National Park Foundation	River Conservation Grants	http://www.tomsomaine.com/toms/community/rivers2004/frameset_overview.asp			X	X	X		X						
Tread Lightly!	Restoration For Recreation	http://www.treadlightly.org/restore.mv		X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture	The Conservation Reserve Program	www.fsa.usda.gov													
U.S. Dept. of Commerce Economic Development Administration	Various Grant Programs	http://www.eda.gov/InvestmentsGrants/Pgmguide.xml	X		X						X	X			
U.S. Dept. of Health & Human Services	Steps to a Healthier U.S. Initiative (STEPS)	http://www.healthierus.gov/steps/	X	X				X		X	X				Tribes
U.S. Dept. of Transportation	Transportation & Community & System Preservation Pilot Program	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tcsp/	X		X						X	X	X		
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Partnership for Wildlife	http://federalaid.fws.gov/pw/partwld.html			X								X		
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Jobs in the Woods Program	http://pacific.fws.gov							X		X	X	X		

FUNDING SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	WEB ADDRESS	USES					APPLICANTS							
			Plan	Program	Develop	Acquire	Education	Equipment	Non Profit	School	City	County	State	Federal	Other
U.S. Forest Service	Cooperative Programs - Rural Community Assistance: Economic Recovery Program	http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/coop/Oregon%20State%20Coordinators			X					X		X	X	X	
U.S. Forest Service	Cooperative Programs - Rural Development Program	http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/coop/Oregon%20State%20Coordinators			X					X		X	X	X	
U.S. Forest Service	Urban & Community Forestry Program	http://www.fs.fed.us/ucf/			X					X		X	X	X	
Wal-Mart Foundation		www.walmartfoundation.org								X	X	X	X	X	X
Wild Bird Unlimited	Pathway to Nature Conservation Fund	www.pathwaystonature.com/index.htm			X										X

APPENDIX C: NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL BENEFITS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benefits of Non-motorized Trails Bibliography

Publications

Bichis-Lupas, M. and Moisey, R. (2001). A Benefit Segmentation of Rail-Trail Users: Implications for Marketing by Local Communities. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19(3), pp. 78-92.

Brownson, R., Housemann, R., Brown, D., Jackson-Thompson, A., King, B. and Salas, J. (2000). Promoting Physical Activity in Rural Communities: Walking Trail Access, Use and Effects. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* (18) 3, pp. 235-241.

Gitelson, R., Guadagnolo, F. and Moore, R. (1988). Economic Impact Analysis of a Community-Sponsored Ten-Kilometer Road Race. *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 6(4).

Crompton, J. (2000). The Impact of Parks and Open Space on Property Values and the Property Tax Base. Ashburn, VA. National Recreation and Parks Association.

Crompton, J. (2001). Perceptions of How the Presence of Greenway Trails Affects the Value of Proximate Properties. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19(3), pp. 114-132.

Crompton, J. (2001). The impact of parks on property values: A review of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 33(1), pp. 1-31.

Crompton, J., Love, L., and More, T. (1997). An Empirical Study of the Role of Recreation, Parks, and Open Space in Companies' (Re) Location Decisions. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 15(1), pp. 37-58.

Equestrian Land Conservation Resource. Equestrian Economic Impact Analysis: How Your Community Benefits. Order online at: <http://www.elcr.org/publist.html>

Federal Highway Administration (1992). Transportation Potential and Other Benefits of Off-Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 7. Publication No. FHWA-PD-92-040. Order at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/nbws-ord.htm>

Federal Highway Administration (1992). Benefits of Bicycling and Walking to Health. U.S. Department of Transportation. Case Study No. 14. Publication No. FHWA-PD-93-025. Order at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/nbws-ord.htm>

Feeney, S.(1997). The Mohawk-Hudson Hike-Bike Trail and Its Impact on Adjoining Residential property. Schenectady, NY: Schenectady County Department of Planning.

Frauman, E. and Cunningham, P. (2001). Using a Means-End Approach to Understand the Factors that Influence Greenway Use. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19(3), Pp. 93-113.

Haigood, T., and Crompton, J. (1998). The Role of Recreation Amenities in Retiree Location Decisions. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 16(1).

Kent, M., Gilbertson, D. and Hunt, C. (1997). The Educational Value of the Rural Trail: A Short Walk in Lancashire. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(3), pp. 349-362.

Lee, B., and Shafer, S. (2002). The Dynamic Nature of Leisure Experience: An Application of Affect Control Theory. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(3), pp. 290-310.

Little, C.E. (1991). *Greenways for America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Moore, R., Gitelson, R, and Graefe, A. (1994). The Economic Impacts of Rail-Trails. *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 12(2).

Moore, R. and Barthlow, K. (1998). The Economic Impacts and Uses of Long-Distance Trails: Featuring a Case Study of the Overmountain Victory National Historic Trail, Washington, D.C. National Park Service.

Moore, R. and Ross, D. (1998). Trails and Recreational Greenways: Corridors of Benefits. *Parks and Recreation*, 33(1), pp. 68-79.

Murphy, M. (1992). The Impact of Brush Creek Trail on Property Values and Crime. Sonoma State University: Environmental Studies and Planning Department.

National Park Service Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program (1992). The Impacts of Rail-Trails, A Study of Users and Nearby Property Owners From Three Trails. For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328, ISBN 0-16-041677-9.

National Park Service (1990). Trails For All Americans: The Report of the National Trails Agenda Project. Prepared through a Cooperative Agreement between American Trails and the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

Renner, J. (1994). Making a Case for the Economic Benefits of Historic and Heritage Tourism. Paper presented at the 12th. National trails Symposium, Anchorage, AS, September 28 - October 1, 1994.

Shafer, C., Lee, B., and Turner, S. (2000). A Tale of Three Greenway Trails: User Perceptions Related to Quality of Life. *Landscape and Urban Planning: An International Journal*, 49, pp. 163-178.

Shafer, C., Scott, D., and Mixon, J. (2000). A Greenway Classification system: Defining the Function and Character of Greenways in Urban Areas. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 18(2), pp. 88-106.

Siderelis, C. and Moore, R. (1995). Outdoor Recreation Benefits of Rails-Trails. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, pp. 344-359.

Swan, L. (1991). Preliminary Economic Impact Analysis: Three Alternative Uses of the Oregon, California, and Eastern Railway Company Right-of-Way Between Klamath Falls and Bly, Oregon. Klamath Falls, OR: USDA Forest Service, Winema National Forest, Pacific Northwest Region.

Teddler, L. (1995). Do Greenways Make Good Neighbors? Evidence From a Survey of Adjacent Residents in Cary, North Carolina. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina.

Turco, D. and Kelsey, C. (1993). Measuring the Economics of Special Events. *Parks and Recreation*, (28)12, pp. 33-37.

Publications Available on the Internet

A Guide To Transportation Enhancements: Enhancing America's Communities. Nov. 2002. National Transportation Clearinghouse.

<http://www.enhancements.org/misc/TEGuide2002.pdf>

A Healthy Active Oregon: The Statewide Physical Activity Plan. Oregon Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity. February 2003.

<http://www.dhs.state.or.us/publichealth/hpcdp/physicalactivityandnutrition/paplan.pdf>

A Step in the Right Direction. The Health Benefits of Hiking and Trails. American Hiking Society. http://www.americanhiking.org/news/pdfs/health_ben.pdf

ACES: Active Community Environments Initiative. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/aces.htm>

Active Communities. How Trails Benefit Your Neighborhood. American Hiking Society.

http://www.americanhiking.org/news/pdfs/active_com.pdf

Benefits of Greenways: A Pennsylvania Study. (2002). Pennsylvania Greenways Partnership Commission. <http://www.pagreenways.org/toolbox/Benefits.pdf>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Pathways to Nature and Kinship. James Swan. Presented at the National Trails Symposium. September 21 - 24, 2000.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/NatureKinBene.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Ten Reasons to Consider a Trail or Greenway in Your Next Project. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/10reasons.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/BenefitsGrnwy.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Unplugged and Reconnected: Working Toward A New Mentality For Trails. By Robert Searns. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/unpluggedSearns.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways: Anchorage Trail System Adds To Quality of Life. Julie Madden. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/GrnwyAnchorage.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways: Artful Ways: Enhancing Trails and Greenways With Art and Artists. Charles Tracy. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/ArtfulWays.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways Fact Sheet. Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse.

http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_benefits.pdf

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Health Programs and Trails. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/HealthTwoArtic.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Health-Based Benefits of Parks, Trails and Open Space. American Trails. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/HealthGrnwy.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways. More News and Research on Trails and Health. American Trails. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/HealthNews3.html>

Benefits of Trails and Greenways: Outdoor Recreation As A Motivational Tool For Youth. Mary Midkiff. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/HorsesGiveBene.html>

Benefits of Trails. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.

<http://www.railtrails.org/benefits/recreation/default.asp>

Benefits of Walking. Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center.

<http://www.walkinginfo.org/pp/benefits/printerversion.htm>

Bicycle Tourism In Maine: Economic Impacts and Marketing Recommendations. Executive Summary. April 2001. Maine Department of Transportation.

<http://www.maine.gov/mdot/opt/pdf/biketourismexecsumm.pdf>

Case Studies: Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse.

Virginia Civil War Trails:

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/VACivilWarTrails.pdf>

Silver Comet Trail (GA):

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/SilverComet.pdf>

Misphillion River Greenway (DE):

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/misphillionRiverGreenway.pdf>

Great Allegheny Passage (PA, MD):

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/GreatAlleghenyPassage.pdf>

Mineral Belt Trail (CO):

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/MineralBeltTrail.pdf>

Greenway Trail (TN):

<http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/development/casestud/GreenwayTrail.pdf>

Community Benefits. The Social and Economic Benefits of Transportation Enhancements. National Transportation Clearinghouse. <http://www.enhancements.org/misc/benefits.pdf>

Community Benefits of Open Space. John Crompton.

http://www.tpl.org/content_documents/tx_H-GBenefits.pdf

Communities by Design: Influencing Your Communities Quality of Life. The American Institute of Architects. <http://www.aia.org/gov/CommByDesign.pdf> - <http://www.aia.org>

Connectivity: Reconnecting People and Places. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.

<http://www.railtrails.org/benefits/connectivity/default.asp>

Creating Walkable Communities: A Guide for Local Governments - Mid-America Regional Council. http://www.bikewalk.org/assets/pdf/Creating_Walkable_Communities.pdf

Economic Benefits, Making Open Space. Leger, M. GORP.

http://gorp.away.com/gorp/features/trusts/econ_ben.htm

Economic Benefits of Trails and Greenways. Rails To Trails Conservancy.

http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_economic.pdf

Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenway Corridors. Rivers Trails and Conservation Assistance, National Park Service. 1995, Fourth Edition (Revised).

http://www.nps.gov/pwro/rtca/econ_all.pdf

Chapter 7: Corporate Relocation and Retention: <http://www.nps.gov/pwro/rtca/crppte.htm>

Economic Impacts of Trails: Forest Recreation's Growing Impact. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/economics/EconForestRec.html>

Enhancing The Environment With Trails and Greenways. Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse.

http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_conenv.pdf

Estimating the Economic Benefits of Bicycling and Bicycling Facilities: An Interpretive Review and Proposed Methods (2004). Krizek, K. University of Minnesota.
<http://www.enhancements.org/trb/trb2004/TRB2004-000070.pdf>

Evaluation of the Burke-Gilman Trail's Effect on Property Values and Crime. Seattle Engineering Department. May 1987. <http://www.massbike.org/bikeways/wayside/westapp4.htm>

Green Infrastructure: Smart Conservation For The 21st Century. Benedict, M., and McMahon, E. (2001). The Conservation Fund. Sprawl Watch Clearinghouse Monograph Series.
<http://www.sprawlwatch.org/greeninfrastructure.pdf>

Growing Demand for Safe Walking and Bicycling. The Perspective of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center. A Four-Year Report. Jan. 2003.
<http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/pdf/fouryearreport.pdf>

Health and Wellness Benefits. Rails To Trails Conservancy.
http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_health.pdf

Healthy Communities/Healthy Economies. The Trust for Public Lands.
http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=1339&folder_id=829

Historic Preservation and Community Identity. Rails To Trails Conservancy.
http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_historic.pdf

How Land Use and Transportation Systems Impact Public Health. A Literature Review of the Relationship Between Physical Activity and Built Form. Frank, L., Engelke, P., Schmid, T., and Killingsworth, R. (Working Document). ACES: Active Community Environments Initiative Working Paper #1. pp. 147. <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/pdf/aces-workingpaper1.pdf>

How Land Use and Transportation Systems Impact Public Health: An Annotated Bibliography. Frank, L., Engelke, P., and Hourigan (Working Document). ACES: Active Community Environments Initiative Working Paper #2. pp. 63.
<http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/pdf/aces-workingpaper2.pdf>

Link Between Health and Sprawl Makes "Smart" Growth Look Even Smarter. Active Living By Design 3/1/04.
http://www.activelivingbydesign.org/news/?fuseaction=press_detail&subject=general&category=Land%20Use&press_id=15905

Measuring the Health Effects of Sprawl. A National Analysis of Physical Activity, Obesity and Chronic Disease. McCann, B. and Ewing, R. (2003). Smart Growth America. Surface Transportation Policy Project. pp. 48.
<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/report/HealthSprawl8.03.pdf>

Mountain Biking at Ski Resorts - An overview.
http://www.imba.com/resources/bike_management/ski_resorts_overview.html

Mountain Biking Tourism Success Stories. International Mountain Bicycling Association.
http://www.imba.com/resources/organizing/tourism_success.html

More News and Research on Trails and Health. American Trails.
<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/HealthNews3.html>

National Partnership Promotes Health and Recreation. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.
<http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/physical/partnership.htm>

Obesity and The Environment. Initiatives of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. <http://www.niehs.nih.gov/drcpt/beoconf/factsht.pdf>

Omaha Recreational Trails: Their Effect on Property Values and Public Safety. Greer, D. (2000). Partial Funding Provided by Challenge Cost Share Grant Program Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance, National Park Service.
<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/adjacent/OmahaStudy.html>

Oregon State University Bicycle Tourism Evaluation Proposal.
http://www.odot.state.or.us/tddresearch/05_Multimodal/BicycleTourismOSUProposal.pdf

Physical Activity and Health. A Report of The Surgeon General. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center For Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. 1996. pp. 300.
<http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/sgr/pdf/sgrfull.pdf> - <http://www>

Planning Healthier Suburbs, Where Cars Sit Idle and People Get Moving. American Trails.
<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/health/SuburbBrody.html>

Policy Prescriptions for Healthier Communities. Pollard, T. (2003). American Journal of Health Promotion, September/October 18(1), pp. 109-113.
http://www.activelivingbydesign.org/resources/ajhppolicyprescriptions_pollard.pdf

Preserving Historic and Cultural Resources. Trails and Greenway Clearinghouse.
<http://digilander.libero.it/greenways/pdf/5%5B1%5D.pdf>

Promoting Physical Activity Through Trails. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/physical/trails.htm>

Property Values and Landowner Concerns. The B&O Netliner.
http://www.rcdi.org/trailissues/concerns_prop_values.html

Rail Trails and Safe Communities: The Experience On 372 Trails. Tracy, T. and Morris, H. (1998). Rails to Trails Conservancy. <http://www.enhancements.org/rtcdocs/safecomm.pdf>

Rail Trails And Special Events: Community and Economic Benefits. (2001). Nelson, C., Vogt, C., Lynch, J., and Stynes, D. Paper presented at the 2001 Northeast Recreation Research Symposium, April 1-3, 2001, Bolton Landing, NY. <http://www.prr.msu.edu/trails/nerrfinal.htm>

Relationship Between Urban Sprawl and Physical Activity, Obesity, and Morbidity. American Ewing, R., Smid, T., Killingsworth, R., Zlot, A., and Raudenbush, S. (2003). Journal of Health Promotion. September/October 18(1). Pp. 47-57. <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/report/JournalArticle.pdf>

Safe Routes To School: A National Movement in Need of Federal Support. American Bikes. [http://www.americabikes.org/images/resource/saferouts/SRTS Fact Sheet.pdf](http://www.americabikes.org/images/resource/saferouts/SRTS_Fact_Sheet.pdf)

Spiritual Pilgrimages and Sacred Places: Applying Feng Sui To Trails and Greenways. Presented at the National Trails Symposium. November 16, 1998. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/planning/SpiritualPilgrimPlan.html>

Study Links Health to Neighborhood Design. National Public Radio. All Things Considered Audio File. <http://www.npr.org/features/feature.php?wfld=1415707>

Ten Reasons to Consider a Trail or Greenway in Your Next Project. American Trails. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/10reasons.html>

The Benefits That Trails Provide to Communities. San Diego County Strategic Plan. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/SDCountyPlan.pdf>

The Challenges in Health: Getting America Moving Again. National Center for Bicycling and Walking. http://www.bikewalk.org/challenge/challenge_health.htm

The Economic and Social Benefits of Off-Road Bicycling and Pedestrian Facilities. (1995). NBPC Technical Brief. National Bicycle and Pedestrian Clearinghouse. Technical Assistance Series, Number 2, September 1995. http://www.imba.com/resources/science/econsoc_benefits.html

The Economic Benefits of Parks and Open Space: How Land Conservation Helps Communities Grow Smart and Protect the Bottom Line. The Trust for Public Lands. http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=1195&folder_id=727

The Economic Benefits of Trails Fact Sheet. Feb. 2004. American Hiking Society. http://www.americanhiking.org/news/pdfs/econ_ben.pdf

The Economic Benefits of Trails: Trail Monitor 1. Go for Green, The Active Living and Environment Program. <http://www.lin.ca/lin/resource/html/sp0039.pdf>

The Economic Benefits of Bicycle and Pedestrian-Based Tourism. National Center for Bicycling and Walking. http://www.bikewalk.org/assets/Reports/economic_impact.htm

The Economic Benefits of Mountain Biking at One of its Meccas: An Application of the Travel Cost Method to Mountain Biking in Moab, Utah. Fix, P. and Loomis, J., Colorado State University. http://www.imba.com/resources/science/economic_moab.html

The Economic Benefits of Parks and Open Space. (1999). How Land Conservation Helps Communities Grow Smart and Protect the Bottom Line. Lerner, S. and Poole, W. Trust For Public Land. <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/fourthlevel/pdf/econbenz.pdf>

The Economic Cost of Physical Inactivity in Michigan: Executive Summary. Michigan Fitness Foundation. <http://www.michiganfitness.org/indexpagedownloads/CostofInactivity.pdf>

The Economic Impacts and Uses of Long-Distance Trails: A Case Study of the Overmountain Victory National Historic Trail (1998) Moore, R. and Barthlow, K. Prepared for United States Department of the Interior National Park Service. <http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/12000/12200/12275/12275.pdf>

The Importance of Physical Activity. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/physical/importance/index.htm>

The Environmental Benefits of Bicycling and Walking. National Bicycling and Walking Study (1993). U.S. Dept. of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration. Case Study No. 15. Publication No. FHWA-DD-93-015. <http://www.americantrails.org/pdf/BikePedBen.pdf>

The Property Value Effects of the South Ridgeline Trail in Eugene, OR. Jensen, D., and Durham, J. (2003). http://economics.uoregon.edu/honors/2003/Ridgeline_paper.pdf

The Social, Health and Heritage Benefits of Trails. Trail Monitor 2. Go For Green, The Active Living and Environment Program. <http://www.americantrails.org/pdf/BikePedBen.pdf>

Thinking Green: A Guide to the Benefits and Costs of Greenways and Trails. (1998). Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Greenways and Trails. <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/gwt/publications/thinkgreen.pdf>

Tips From IMBA on Developing Mountain Biking Tourism. International Mountain Bicycling Association. http://www.imba.com/resources/bike_management/tourism.html

Traffic Calming, Auto-Restricted Zones and Other Traffic Management Techniques - Their Effects on Bicycling and Pedestrians. Case Study No. 19. National Bicycling and Walking Study. U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration. <http://www.bikewalk.org/assets/pdf/CASE19.PDF>

Trail Effects on Neighborhoods: Home Value, Safety, Quality of Life. Webel, S. American Trails. <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/adjacent/sumadjacent.html>

Trails Across Time... Trails Across Adversity: Re-Thinking The Benefits of Trails and Greenways: Opinions by Robert Searns. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/RethinkingSearns.html>

Trails and Greenways: Advancing the Smart Growth Agenda. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. 2002. <http://www.enhancements.org/rctdocs/tgandsg.pdf>

Trails and Greenways For Livable Communities. Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse. http://www.trailsandgreenways.org/resources/benefits/topics/tgc_fs_livable.pdf

Trails For Health: Promoting Healthy Lifestyles and Environments (Brochure). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/TrailsHealth.pdf>

Twenty-Five Communities Begin Projects to Promote Active Living. American Trails.

<http://www.americantrails.org/resources/health/ActiveLivGrant03.html>

Walk Which Way? How Health and Fitness Professionals Can Use Pedometers to Achieve Current Physical Activity Recommendations. LeMasurier, G. American College of Sports Medicine. Health and Fitness Journal. January/February 2004. <http://www.acsm-healthfitness.org/pt/re/acsm/pdfhandler.00135124-200401000-00006.pdf;jsessionid=AoEB45bRsey8FelMOOG9F54LjHxnSYLe9pSgl71z1lwGM25uzUsVI-1534462964>

What Can "Birding Economics" Bring To Oregon Communities? Oregon Cascades Birding Trail.

<http://www.oregonbirdingtrails.org/economics.htm>

APPENDIX D: LIST OF REGIONAL NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUE COMMENTS

REGIONAL NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL ISSUE COMMENTS

NORTHWEST REGION (Portland) 5/21/03

(Northwest Region includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lincoln, Benton and Lane Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Portland)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 21 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department	City of Aurora
Bureau of Land Management	City of Gresham
U.S. Forest Service	City of Hubbard
Oregon Department of Forestry	City of Oregon City
METRO	City of Portland
Tualatin Hills P&R Dist.	City of Salem
Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Council	City of Tigard
Clackamas County	City of Woodburn
Tillamook County	
Oregon Recreational Trails Advisory Council	

Non-motorized Trail Issues

1. There is a need for funding for local trails planning within the region (8 dots).
2. There is a need for connectivity of trail systems in the region (8 dots).
3. There is a need for more urban trails in close proximity to where people live (7 dots).
4. There is a need for an inventory of available trail development opportunities such as railroad right-of-ways, utility corridors, unused right-of-ways, and feasibility studies to determine corridor usability (4 dots).
5. There is a need for better coordination between agencies/organizations such as ODOT, railroads, ports, utility companies, land trusts/conservancies and the health community to develop trail opportunities in the region (4 dots).
6. There is a need to examine the carrying capacity of non-motorized trails including urban, rural, and wilderness use standards and level of service standards for urban trail systems (3 dots).
7. There is a need for information regarding the economic and health-related benefits of recreation. The information should be packaged in an easy to use manner including summary bullet points, literature review summaries and bibliography listings for those wanting more information on a given topic. The materials should be designed to assist trail in overcoming resistance to trail development projects (3 dots).

8. There is a need for a toolbox designed to assist trail planners in building partnerships with developers, take better advantage of trail development opportunities, bring together urban and park planners and address recreational liability statutes (2 dots).
9. There is a need for trail maintenance and rehabilitation in the region (1 dot).
10. There is a need to use condemnation to acquire trail right-of-ways for essential trail systems (1 dot).
11. There is a need for trail development funding (1 dot).
12. There is a need to develop "Best Management Practices" for trails including environmental and code compliance and trail designs that are compatible with the natural environment (1 dot).
13. There is a need for balance between habitat and wildlife, water quality and human demand in trail design and planning. Endangered species protection/requirements are currently placing a great burden on trail planners—particularly on federal lands in the region (1 dot).
14. Trail development creates a trespass issue with adjacent landowners (1 dot).
15. There is a need for training in trail design, maintenance and planning (1 dot).
16. There is a need to ensure that trails are safe and secure from theft, vandalism and other crimes. To accomplish this, there is a need for coordination between federal, state, county and local law enforcement efforts. Safety concerns should also be included in trail planning, management, site selection and design (1 dot).
17. There is a need for Leave-No-Trace Guidelines for front country trail use and an accompanying educational program (1 dot).
18. There is a need to better manage for trail-related environmental impacts and resource protection through selection of proper trail area locations, planning, design and public education (0 dots).
19. There is a need for trail acquisition funding (0 dots).
20. There is a need to consider rail with trail opportunities in the region. There are a lot of rail lines that are still in use, but receive little train traffic (0 dots).
21. There is a need for adequate trailheads and associated facilities such as parking and restrooms (0 dots).
22. There is a need to better manage the process of providing accessible trails in the region. The management effort should an inventory of existing trails, what trails are currently accessible and what improvements are needed, how to properly address new technologies and the need to provide challenging trails for people with disabilities (0 dots).
23. There is a need to address new trail uses and technologies (such as geocaching) through management, information and education (0 dots).
24. There is a need to address user conflicts associated with new uses and special events (0 dots).

25. There is a need for better management of dogs and other pets on trails to address security, threats and impacts. SCORP survey results have shown that approximately 40% of people running and walking for exercise and walking for pleasure bring a dog with them while using recreational trails (0 dots).

26. There is a need to protect Historic Trail Corridors within the region and the historic character of these corridors. Protection of these corridors may at times conflict with ADA requirements and other uses (e.g. motorized uses) (0 dots).

27. There is a need to simplify the current complexity of the user fee and permit requirements for recreational use within the region (0 dots).

28. There is a need to proactively address the effects of technology changes on trail management (e.g. Segway) (0 dots).

29. There is a need for additional birding trails within the region (0 dots).

30. There is a need to develop linkage/partnerships with the Tourism Council to promote our trail resources, interpret our natural and cultural history, and promote trails as an Oregon tourism attraction. Because of its scenic beauty and weather, Oregon should own summer tourism. There is a need to develop a central clearinghouse for trail opportunities including ordinance maps (0 dots).

31. The advantage of a statewide trails plan and system is that smaller communities have any opportunity for recognition and participation (0 dots).

General Public Session (Portland) (Evening Session)

Attendance: 15 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

1. There is a need for maintenance of existing trails in the region. We are currently losing some trail resources through lack of maintenance (e.g. Wygant Trail and Chetwok Loop). There are also safety issues associated with the lack of trail maintenance (3 dots).

2. There is a need for more trails for all user types. These additional trails would help to solve many conflicts and damage cause by overuse and help to disburse use (2 dots).

3. There is a need for education associated with multi-use conflicts, regulations, Leave-No-Trace, Tread Lightly and the presence of animals and bikes (2 dots).

4. There is a need for trail connection within the region including connecting population areas, parks and open space and public facilities. There is also a need for an interconnected statewide trail system with direct OPRD administrative involvement. Key components would include the Lower Columbia River Water Trail, Corvallis to the Sea, Portland to Coast Greenway, Rogue River Trail connection to the coast and a new Oregon Trail (2 dots).

5. There is a need for more long-distance and day-use Llama trails within the region—particularly in the Willamette Valley. Such trails provide low-impact backcountry opportunity for an aging population. These trails would help to satisfy a rapid growth in Llama ownership and use on trails (1 dot).
6. There are multi-use trail development opportunities in the Columbia River Gorge (1 dot).
7. There is a need for increased funding for trail acquisition, maintenance, development, planning, environmental assessment and volunteer coordination within the region (1 dot).
8. There is a need to develop new mountain biking opportunities in the region. Part of this process could involve reevaluating mountain biking access on existing trails (1 dot).
9. There may be a need for separation of certain trail uses to provide more challenging trail opportunities (1 dot).
10. There are trail development opportunities in the Coast Range (1 dot).
11. There is a need to look for opportunities on private lands (primarily timber company lands) and to work with and help private landowners accommodate public recreation use. Part of the solution could involve the use of user assistance as stewards for monitoring use (1 dot).
12. There is a need to make completion of the Oregon Coast Trail a higher priority based on the number of visitors drawn to the trail. Additional work would include adding public access, landscape protection, maintenance, connections with existing and future trails, interpretation, and developing/implementing a pilot long-distance hiker program including user permits, facilities and services (1 dot).
13. There is a need to reevaluate trails closed to equestrian use such as the 600 Trail on Mt. Hood, the Gorge Loop and the Coast (1 dot).
13. There is a need for new long-distance trail facilities such as trail shelters and stock facilities (0 dots).
14. There is a need for well-designed multi-use trails and user conflict education (0 dots).
15. There is a need for low elevation trails constructed for all season use (0 dots).
16. Rock is not a preferred trail surface for mountain bikers and may be a problem for Llamas (safety concerns) (0 dots).
17. There is a need for good information resources such as maps, signage/kiosks, and user education (0 dots).
18. There are opportunities on trails for interpretation of nature, culture and history (0 dots).
19. Llamas and equestrians may have different needs, impacts, etc. (0 dots).

NORTHWEST REGION (Lincoln City) 5/20/03

(Northwest Region includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lincoln, Benton and Lane Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Lincoln City)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 7 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
Bureau of Land Management
Oregon Department of Forestry
City of Newport
Tillamook County

Non-motorized Trail Issues

S. There is a need for a state administered funding source for non-motorized trail development that is similar to the ATV grant fund program that taps user contributions and is not dependent on federal funding. A suggestion included allocating a certain portion of the state lottery funds for trail construction projects. The funding source should include a reduced applicant match and a simplified application process to assist small communities access grant funding dollars (5 dots).

T. There is 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. Finally, connections should be made from long-distance state and regional trails to community facilities such as overnight lodging and dining establishments (4 dots).

U. There is a need for increased security at trailhead parking areas within the region (3 dots).

V. There is a need for educational programs addressing the issue of user conflicts on multiple-use trails and how to successfully use the shared trail resources without creating conflicts with other trail users (2 dots).

W. There is a need for more maintenance funding for existing trails within the region due to increasing use levels and declining maintenance budgets (2 dots).

X. There is a need to better utilize volunteer/user groups for conducting trail maintenance within the region (e.g. using programs such as adopt-at-trail). Providers pointed out that it takes a high amount of front-end staff time to adequately prepare volunteers for successful maintenance work (1 dot).

Y. There is a need for a trail connection between the Willamette Valley and the coast (e.g. cooperation from Oregon Department of Transportation, railroad right-of-ways, etc.) (1 dot).

Z. There is a need to address the construction of unauthorized trails within the region (1 dot).

AA. There is a need for a centralized source of recreational trail information at the statewide level (1 dot).

BB. There is a need for increased promotion of safety-related information and training (e.g. Leave-No-Trace) and more safety training facilities, instructors, and more user-friendly training schedules (times and locations) (0 dots).

CC. There is a need for better trail development and management coordination between agencies and private landowners due to the region's checkerboard land ownership. Trail connections will help to better utilize existing trail systems (0 dots).

DD. In high rain areas, there is a need to harden trails to properly accommodate equestrian use. The other option would be to limit equestrian trail use to seasonal use (0 dots).

EE. There is a tendency to promote use of trails such as the Oregon Coast Trail before providing all the necessary trail information and trail amenities such as adequate camping facilities (0 dots).

FF. There is a need for trail informational guides, brochures and maps—particularly for large groups using trails within the region (0 dots).

GG. There is a need to provide an adequate variety of challenge opportunities to meet the needs of experienced trail users and to accommodate new technological advances in trail-related equipment. Managers should take great care to strike a proper balance between what types of trail uses to accommodate and what uses are inappropriate to accommodate. Managers should not attempt to satisfy the needs for all extreme sports currently popular. To address this issue in a proactive manner, managing agencies should have a management plan in place to properly address long-term trail sustainability and emerging technologies (0 dots).

HH. There is a need for a funding source for community trail planning within the region—particularly for small communities. Such communities are currently struggling with setting trail project priorities and the formal public input process. Currently, there are extremely limited resources for conducting community trail planning efforts (0 dots).

II. People are now looking for a more diverse offering of outdoor recreational opportunities during their overnight camping trips including activities on both terrestrial and water trails. If a destination area doesn't have something for them to do, they will go elsewhere (0 dots).

JJ. There is considerable confusion among trail users in the region regarding trail access pass requirements (e.g. USFS, BLM, NPS, OPRD, ODF) (0 dots).

KK. There is a need for emergency response training to ensure that the necessary skills and knowledge are in place to properly respond to trail-related emergency situations (0 dots).

LL. There is a need to make the trail inventory a living document/resource. As new trails are designated they should be added to the inventory. The long-term objective should be to keep the inventory as up-to-date as possible (0 dots).

General Public Session (Lincoln City)
(Evening Session)

Attendance: 9 people attended the meeting.

SSS. There is a need to maintain access to beaches for all users. There is concern that equestrian and ATV use of the beaches is threatened (7 dots).

TTT. There is a need for quality/consistent standards on trail planning, design, maintenance, and construction (4 dots).

UUU. As non-motorized trail use continues to grow in the region, there is a need to identify ways to allow users to pay for their trail-related facilities and services in a similar way as motorized users are paying the costs associated with new areas and maintaining riding areas. Such a funding system needs to ensure that it is equitable and affordable for people for all people (4 dots).

VVV. There is a need for quality information regarding regulation (impact of non-compliance), level of difficulty (guidelines, definitions and standards), route maps, and consistent signing across agencies (3 dots).

WWW. Mountain bike use can be incompatible with other trail uses and separate riding areas are needed within the region (2 dots).

XXX. There is a need to explore recreation opportunities on private timberlands and work with private landowners for access. Some keys to success for securing use on private lands are user education (respect for property) and the purchase of recreational easements (2 dots).

YYY. It is important to note that user conflicts and use conflicts are not the same thing (2 dots).

ZZZ. There is a need to consider the capacity of trail systems and incentives to disperse use (1 dot).

AAAA. Trail difficulty level ratings should be coordinated/designated at the state level to create more consistency across riding areas (1 dot).

BBBB. Trail construction is extremely labor intensive (1 dot).

CCCC. There is a need to make trails safe from crime and, in some cases, wildlife (e.g. mountain lions) (0 dots).

DDDD. There is a need to design trails that are more compatible with nature (0 dots).

EEEE. There is a need for regional motorized trail planning including the need for camping, overnight accommodations, as well as riding areas (0 dots).

FFFF. There is a need to consider reuse of roads on federal lands for recreation purposes (0 dots).

GGGG. I recently completed serving as chairman of the Bay Ocean Task Force. The task force was a well-chosen panel of citizens tasked with making recommendations to the commissioners of Tillamook County, endeavoring to resolve user conflicts on the Bay Ocean spit at Tillamook Bay. We were also tasked with re-zoning considerations. The task force had been formed by the Tillamook County

Commissioners in response to a small but very vocal group of people that wanted to restrict or remove various recreational user groups from the spit. Bay Ocean property is composed of a combination of owners, state (beaches), federal, county, and private lands. The task force completed its one-year term, sent its recommendations on to the commissioners and has been dissolved. As a task force we took input from government, citizens and specialists. We also looked at what worked and what didn't work at Oregon State Parks, Oregon Department of Forestry, U.S. Forest service and other such entities. We used input from the Oregon State Parks surveys too. We presented the commissioners with some specific recommendations that we based on our general discovery of how to handle the conflicts. Our recommendations were to not remove or restrict any of the traditional users of the spit (this included hunting, equestrian use, U.S. Military survival school). Conflicts and protection of habitat were to be handled through education and not more regulations. We actually recommended to relax part of one ordinance and to not further restrict zoning. Education as the key would be accomplished through utilization of user groups such as is successfully now used in the state parks and forestry. One ODF manager I spoke with said they could not possibly handle the habitat or user conflict in the Tillamook Forest without cooperation and educational work from the various user groups. My recommendation to you on trails is to not look to removals, restrictions, or new regulations but to the opposite philosophy of making more trails and opportunities available for all the user groups through education and increased use of organized user groups and their volunteers (on-line comment).

NORTHWEST REGION (Eugene) 5/22/03

(Northwest Region includes Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Hood River, Tillamook, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Polk, Marion, Linn, Lincoln, Benton and Lane Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Eugene)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 14 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.

Willamalane Park & Recreation Dist.

Bureau of Land Management

City of Corvallis

Lane Council of Governments

City of Eugene

Port of Siuslaw

Siuslaw Watershed Council

Non-motorized Trail Issues

BB. There is a need for funds for acquisition of fee title, easements and land exchanges (5 dots).

CC. There are opportunities to engage private conservancies, foundations and land trust organizations as partners and providers in trail planning, development, management and maintenance. Such groups should also be involved in regional and statewide trails planning efforts (4 dots).

DD. There is a need for additional funding for trail and trail corridor maintenance (3 dots).

EE. There is a need for interpretation/education opportunities on trails including historical, cultural and natural themes. There are also opportunities to engage school-age children and others in trail-related interpretation/ education through service learning and other learning opportunities (2 dots).

FF. Recreational trails are a key economic development opportunity within the region. Policy makers and planners should consider this in state planning and resource allocation (2 dots).

GG. There is a demand for more accessible nature-based trails and a uniform rating system for describing trail accessibility information to the public (2 dots).

HH. There is a need for more trails near population centers/urban areas in the region. Adding additional trails could help to solve many local issues such as transportation, need for exercise and user conflicts (2 dots).

II. There are opportunities for increasing public recreation on private lands (e.g. timber company lands) in the region (2 dots).

JJ. There is a need to address conflicts on multiple use trails through design, site selection, planning and education (2 dots).

KK. There is a need for connectivity in trail systems (completing gaps in the trails systems) and connecting local/regional parks and open space (1 dot).

LL. There is a need for regional coordination and information sharing between agencies for trail planning and coordinating for funding. There is a need for a regional planning process and design and construction standards for use in the region (1 dot).

MM. There is a need for additional trail development/construction funds (1 dot).

NN. There is a need to manage not only the trail, but the landscape around trails to minimize erosion and movement of invasive species (0 dots).

OO. There is a need for more equestrian trails near population centers/urban areas in the region (0 dots).

PP. Regarding comment OO, I am handicapped. I broke my leg very badly in a "non-horse" accident. I can no longer walk or hike for any long distance or over rough terrain. My horses, on the other hand, can. They can take me where I cannot go on my own. One of my favorite local rides is Elijah Bristow State Park. Recently, a sign was posted there saying the park would close to us from October through May. This is the only "handicap accessible" place I have found locally where I am able to ride on my own. There have been "erosion issues" and "downstream fish" issues raised by the park ranger to try and justify these closures. I have ridden there in October and November...and even after a long summer of use, I have not seen evidence that the park, river, or trails have suffered at all from the use of the equestrian trails. As for the "downstream fish" issue, that is ridiculous!! We are not causing any uproarious event in the river!! The state officials should be looking to their own for that type of damage...like the after effects of the work done at Cougar Reservoir. the McKenzie River was BROWN for over a year downstream from there. That probably impacted the rivers fish population...I know it ruined the fishing for a good long time. Elijah Bristow was endowed to the state of Oregon as an EQUESTRIAN park. Year round...and should remain that way. Much of the maintenance of the trails and other areas of the park are taken care of by local equestrian groups. We riders need MORE parks, MORE trails, and MORE consideration for those of us who are not physically capable of enjoying them without our 4-legged companions. Please try to consider the REAL impact the closure of the park for 6 months of the year on my life, and the lives of others like me. I am inclined to believe that the decision

was made by "one" when it should have been considered by "many." One or two officials do not voice the view of the public...and true "owners" of State Lands (on-line comment).

QQ. Regarding comment OO, as trail riding opportunities shrink, our organization is trying mightily to make horse traffic as responsible as possible and contribute man-hours, tools and when possible, materials to maintain and improve trails and campsites so that we are not squeezed out of the recreation picture altogether. Horse owners spend a good deal of money in Lane County on supplies and equipment and should be welcome on established horse friendly trails and camps (on-line comment).

RR. Regarding comment OO, we are very concerned about the recent closure sign placed at Elijah Bristow State Park, stating horses will be prohibited from the park during the winter. This park is an EQUESTRIAN Park and one of the few places where we can regularly ride all year. Our OET chapter has work parties there to help maintain the trails. Why has this arbitrary decision been made without prior public input and notification (on-line comment)?

SS. There are opportunities for seasonal closures and other management techniques to protect resources (0 dots).

TT. There is a need for public land managers to develop clear objectives related to trail management intentions and to articulate those objectives simply and clearly. These objectives must be carried through planning and implementation. Finally, there is also a need to take a regional view on how to best provide trail opportunities (0 dots).

UU. There is a need for management of unauthorized trails, new technologies (e.g. geocaching) and new activities not on designated trails and recreation areas (0 dot).

VV. There is a need to use recreational trails as vehicles of education and interpretation related to issues such as resource protection and appreciation, understanding of natural systems and sustainability (0 dots).

WW. There is a need for more safety/security at trailheads—particularly trailhead parking lots (0 dots).

XX. There is a need to be creative in terms of partnerships and funding (0 dots).

YY. There is a need to address impacts associated with competitive/organized trail events. Such events must be matched with those trail resources designed for such a use. Many trails are not designed to handle such intensive use (0 dots).

ZZ. There is a need to explore options to generate revenues associated with trail use (0 dots).

AAA. Liability is a deterrent to private-sector provision of trail opportunities in Oregon. If you charge a fee for recreational use you can be held liable for injuries/damages occurring on private lands (0 dots).

BBB. The prioritization of trail development projects should be done at a regional level using a peer review process. At the local level, projects should be developed using groups such as community solutions teams to get a broader perspective on what other governmental agencies are doing which might affect trail development (0 dots).

CCC. There is a need for consistent/uniform signage and a way to develop multi-agency information coordination (0 dots).

DDD. There is a need for more safety/security at trailheads—particularly trailhead parking lots (0 dots).

EEE. There is a need for information resource coordination including maps, regulations, signage and providing trail users with information to make informed decisions (0 dots).

FFF. As the fees for outdoor recreation use grow, there is a growing need/opportunity for the private sector to get involved in providing trail facilities and opportunities in the region (0 dots).

GGG. There is a need for an informational clearinghouse for trail design, maintenance, interpretation and accessibility (0 dots).

HHH. There is a need for additional trail enforcement (0 dots).

III. There is a need to address conflicts on multiple-use trails through design, site selection, planning and education (0 dots).

JJJ. There is a need for additional law enforcement in the region (0 dots).

KKK. There is a need for a universal recreation pass system within the region. The current fee and pass system, where each agency requires their own payment, is extremely confusing to the public (0 dots).

LLL. There is a need for public land managers to develop clear objectives related to trail management intentions and to articulate those objectives simply and clearly. These objectives must be carried through planning and implementation. Finally, there is also a need to take a regional view on how to best provide trail opportunities (0 dots).

MMM. There is a need to understand and capitalize on transportation and recreation projects through better coordination in planning, project development and funding (0 dots).

NNN. There is a need for coordination at the state level that matches funds with projects. OPRD administers a variety of grant funding programs (LWCF, local, ATV, and RTP). Applicants often have a difficult time deciding which pot of money to go after for their project. OPRD should provide guidance at the statewide level to match projects with dollars so that everyone has the best chance to succeed in getting funding. OPRD should also provide information about the timing, content and requirements of the grant programs and to allow applicants to better understand grant funding priorities (0 dots).

OOO. There is a need for historical, cultural and natural interpretation/education opportunities on trails. There are also opportunities to engage school-age children in trail-related interpretation (service learning and other types of learning opportunities) (0 dots).

PPP. There is a need to understand and capitalize on transportation and recreation projects through better coordination in planning, project development and funding (0 dots).

QQQ. There is a demand for challenge trail opportunities such as "trial" trail areas and mountain bike areas (0 dots).

General Public Session (Eugene)
(Evening Session)

Attendance: 19 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

WWWWW. There is a need to make greater use/coordination of volunteers for trail maintenance because agencies do not have sufficient resources (8 dots).

YYYYY. There is a need to make sure that trails not regularly maintained are not lost and grandfather in older/existing trails (6 dots).

ZZZZZ. There is need for more trails close to urban areas (5 dots).

AAAAAA. There is a need to address environmental impacts including wildlife, need for good planning and design, capacity issues, soil issues and the value in study of impacts (5 dots).

BBBBBB. There is an opportunity to work with private landowners (timber companies) to allow recreational use (5 dots).

CCCCCC. There is an opportunity for recreation use of roads scheduled for abandonment (4 dots).

DDDDDD. There is a need for additional user education (including noise, and trail etiquette) that targets new users (3 dots).

EEEEEE. There is a need for a central website location where users can go for information on trip planning including information such as current trail condition, GIS and mapping (3 dots).

FFFFFF. There is a need for loop trail systems on a variety of terrain (2 dots).

GGGGGG. There is a need to focus on connecting existing trail systems in the region. This should be done through gap analysis and cooperative multi-agency planning efforts (2 dots).

HHHHHH. Multi-use trails are a great resource if users respect each other (1 dot).

IIIIII. There is a need to address the noise issue on trails within the region. Trails planners should carefully consider compatibility (associated with noise) during the development of multi-use trails. There is also a need for greater tolerance between user groups on multi-use trails (1 dot).

JJJJJJ. There is a need for good information resources including where to ride, regulations, good signage, mapping, and clear designation (e.g., type, class, etc.) (1 dot).

KKKKKK. There is a need to promote Leave No Trace and Tread Lightly programs in the region (1 dot).

LLLLLL. There is a need for trailheads with adequate facilities such as proper accommodations for trailers (1 dot).

MMMMMM. There is a need for more active trail management by the federal agencies (1 dot).

NNNNNN. There is a need for more multiple-use trailheads in the region (1 dot).

OOOOOO. There is a need to investigate the future of trail use fees in the region. Potential strategies include direct trail use fees, out of state fees, and direct use of fees for trail maintenance (1 dot).

PPPPPP. There is a need for adequate sanitary facilities at resting/stopping areas (1 dot).

QQQQQQ. There is a need for education for dog owners so that dogs are not banned from trails in the region (1 dot).

RRRRRR. There is a need for more accessible trail opportunities in the region (0 dots).

SSSSSS. I would like to add my feelings about the newly posted sign at Elijah Bristow Park restricting horses from October to May. I was under the impression this park was donated for equestrian use. It is also one of the handicap accessible parks. I have just moved my horses 25 miles to be able to ride the park more often. It is so disheartening that we equestrians are being further and further restricted. We spent a lot of money to care and enjoy our horses. What is it about them that is so awful? I have never been a political person, but my voting will certainly be influenced by such decisions. It used to be if you were plain, hard-working folks you could at least go camping for entertainment. Now with fees and restrictions, it is becoming increasingly difficult to share good, clean family fun with our kids (on-line comment)!

SOUTHWEST REGION (Bandon) 4/17/03

(Southwest Region includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson and Douglas Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Bandon)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 12 people participated in the workshop including representation from:

- Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
- U.S. Forest Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Coos County
- City of Powers

Non-motorized Trail Issues

T. There is a need for additional funding for trail maintenance within the region. There always seems to be money available for trail development—but not for routine day-to-day trail maintenance (7 dots).

U. Resources are limited for trail maintenance, but providers are constantly being asked to develop additional trails. As a result, trail maintenance should be a high grant funding priority. There should also be a grant evaluation criteria stating that if an agency does not have a history of properly maintaining existing trails, they should not receive funding for new trail development projects. More priority should be given to maintaining what we currently have before adding additional trail facilities. In addition, we should share information on successful trail projects, maintenance examples, and officially recognizing agencies with exemplary trail maintenance programs (7 dots).

V. There is a need for readily accessible funding for both trail planning and environmental assessment work on trails on state and federal lands. For example, if a federal agency is asked to develop an equestrian trail on land which they manage which requires an environmental assessment, they will have to put in a year or two of time up front before even beginning to put a trail on the ground. If adequate staff-time is not available for such work, the trail will not be developed (4 dots).

W. There is a need for good trail design and maintenance to proactively address resource damage occurring on trails within the region. As a result, there is a need for good maintenance resources and access to construction and maintenance information. Such resources are currently available, but simply need to be housed in a central statewide location. But at the core of the maintenance problem—it all comes down to funding. We end up shortcutting some of the process to stay within limited construction and maintenance budgets (3 dots).

X. There is a need for trails adjacent to major travel corridors and near population centers in the region. People are stressed for time and not willing to drive 2 hours to get to backcountry trail opportunities. For example, if a trail is adjacent to Highway 101 the trail is going to get more use (3 dots).

Y. There is a need for more coordination between agencies in regional trail planning and marketing to provide the correct mix of facilities and more cost-effectively market trail information to the public. There is a need for a good one-stop location for marketing trail opportunities in the region (2 dots).

Z. There is a need to address user conflicts through trail design and making sure there are adequate opportunities for all users (e.g. if a trail is closed for mountain biking use, the another place should be provided) (1 dot).

AA. There is a need for increased/adequate trailhead parking, staging areas for trails (including good spacing for equestrians) and signage for allowed use, level of difficulty, distance, and adequate directional signage (1 dot).

BB. There is a need for connectivity in trail systems connecting local resources with county, state, and federal trails and communities within the region (1 dot).

CC. There is a need for more universally accessible trail options to better serve an aging population base which is still very active. Accessible trail opportunities should be available at the community level and in the wild land interface. In addition, there is a need for technical assistance and funding for complying with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements (1 dot).

DD. Many existing trail-related facilities are old (both in location and use) and have not been modified to represent current needs. Times have changed but the facilities haven't changed with them—such as tent camping facilities including room for one car and one tent and RV campsites not large enough for modern vehicles (0 dots).

EE. There is a need for consistency in sign standards such as level of difficulty symbols to allow users with enough information to avoid getting in over their level of experience. All agencies should use the same types of trail markers and standardized regulation signs and jurisdictional boundary signs (0 dots).

FF. There is a need for training in the design, management, and maintenance of trails. Training should be done in an interagency fashion as a collaborative effort (e.g. the National Trails Training Partnership) to improve networking and partnership opportunities (0 dots).

GG. There is a need for additional long-distance hiking opportunities in the region. Currently, most trails are only a mile or two in length and many users are looking for longer hiking experiences (0 dots).

HH. There is a need for additional trails along waterways in the region (0 dots).

II. There is a need for adequate trip planning resources such as maps and regional trail information on a central web location with links to other sites (0 dots).

JJ. There is a need for good information on where hikers can and cannot camp on long-distance trails within the region such as the Coastal Trail (0 dots).

KK. There is a need for creating partnerships within the region to assist with getting trails information out to tourists and selling trails as an economic development strategy. Recreation providers should partner with the tourism industry, trade associations, and user groups/clubs to multiply their efforts (0 dots).

General Public Session (Bandon) (Evening Session)

Attendance: 6 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

NNN. More trails will disperse use and reduce user conflict (5 dots).

OOO. There is a need to consider strategies such as state initiatives and technical assistance programs to develop trail opportunities on rail corridors within the region (3 dots).

PPP. There is a need to increase trail and trailhead capacity within the region (2 dots).

QQQ. There is a need for more multiple use trails (motorized and non-motorized) within the region (1 dots).

RRR. There is a need for greater tolerance, shared use, and good practices (education, information, and signage) on trails within the region (1 dots).

SSS. There is a need for trail connectivity within the region. Connecting trails is an effective way to increase capacity and provide more long-range riding opportunities (1 dots).

TTT. There is a need to work with clubs and volunteers for the provision of trail maintenance and user education within the region (1 dots).

UUU. Trails are needed close to where people live (1 dot).

VVV. There is a need to recognize the economic benefits of trails such as the importance of trails in business location, quality of life, and where people want to live (1 dot).

WWW. Smaller Oregon communities need outside technical assistance to develop trail opportunities (1 dot).

XXX. There is a need for consistent and effective directional signage (0 dots).

SOUTHWEST REGION (Grants Pass) 4/16/03

(Southwest Region includes Coos, Curry, Josephine, Jackson and Douglas Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Grants Pass) (Daytime Session)

Attendance: 6 people participated in the workshop including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
U.S. Forest Service
City of Rogue River
City of Ashland

Non-motorized Trail Issues

L. There is a strong need for trail connectivity within the region. In Ashland, connectivity includes making trail connections within the urban area and to trails in adjacent public lands. There are also opportunities in the region to connect communities with nearby parks and open spaces (Gold Hill, Bear Creek Greenway, Rogue River, Valley of the Rogue) and to connect land-based trails with water trails. Connecting communities to outlying trails also creates opportunities for both local community recreation (no need to drive to outlying trails) and park connections to communities as recreation destinations. A trail connection is nearly complete between the Bear Creek Greenway and the Pacific Crest Trail that will serve as a major conduit between urban and forest settings. But, this in itself does not address the growing number of unmanaged trails in the interface on privately owned and public lands. Management needs to occur that develops sustainable trails in appropriate locations that are desirable while at the same time decommissioning trails in inappropriate locations that are not sustainable. The issue of unmanaged trails is directly affecting rare plants, introduction of evasive species, and to a lesser degree, water quality from soil erosion (5 dots).

M. Regarding comment L, OPRD staff members have proposed research of the Rails with Trails program for the Rogue Valley. Ashland already has used this method for part of their bike trail. By working out an agreement with the railroad we could connect the north and south sections of the valley via this conduit. Spur trails could be developed off this trail to connect to the other hiking/biking trails throughout the area. The City of Rogue River is currently researching this possibility. This could provide a firebreak alongside the rail bed, which is currently bladed off by small dozers in some stretches for just this purpose. OPRD proposes a spur trail to its current River's Edge Hiking Trail. We would entertain the idea of a hiker/biker camp area within the campground. The rail trail would be able to provide a safe corridor that could be signed and maintained by local county, state and federal agencies. This could be a win/win for all concerned with the usual property owner concerns needing active consideration. Ideally, there would be a countywide bicycle/hiker rule enforcement patrol (on-line comment).

N. There is a need for funding and technical assistance for easements, permitting fee title, and acquisition for trail projects. Population growth in the Ashland area has resulted in increased demand

for trails. Population growth has also increased the cost of land acquisition and easements and reduced the supply of available land acquisition opportunities. A trail counter set up on a National Forest System Trail north of Ashland in 1999 had 12,033 hits. In 2002, that same counter registered 18,466 hits. Trail easements have been difficult to obtain throughout the urban interface. Property owners are not agreeing to easements because of perceived property devaluation, liability and risk of fire (5 dots).

O. There is a need for a variety of trail types (hardened to natural surfaces) within the region. If we are going to have an extensive regional trail system, we realistically cannot afford to pave it all (3 dots).

P. There is a need to look at trail design as a means of managing use to reduce user conflict and trail erosion. Proper trail design can be a more cost-effective trail management strategy than regulation. There is a need for separate designated areas for use by downhill mountain bikers (mountain bike parks). The more extreme mountain bikers are often incompatible with other trail uses. Downhill mountain biking is also resulting in extreme erosion problems on watersheds within the region. But, we should keep in mind that "extreme riders" look for the "knarliest" route possible, which then attracts them to trails (managed or unmanaged) not suited for their use. Even off road (bushwackers) use by downhill mountain bikers is growing rapidly. Braided trails are becoming an issue as riders develop side trails along the main routes. Separating uses is a difficult option to reduce user conflict. Dogs are even an issue within the hiker community (2 dots).

Q. Regarding comment P, we need a statewide trail etiquette and ethics brochure and sign program. This would be able to proactively state the reasons why domestic pets are allowed while leashed or are not allowed at all on specific trails. There is a need for a statewide hiking/biking trail map similar to the statewide ATV map currently available (on-line comment).

R. There is a need for coordination and communication between public agencies (federal, state, and local agencies) regarding trail planning, funding and design and to facilitate the identification of multi-jurisdictional priorities. We should also consider establishing a shared interagency statewide goal to develop trail connectivity throughout the state. Communication is more important now than ever between agencies and the public. It is critical that the public be involved in trail development, design, and maintenance to preserve the long-term viability of a trail. Lesser-used trails are being abandoned to divert energy and resources to higher use areas, resulting in the loss of some recreation experiences. As agencies reorganize to be in line with reduced budgets, they should look at opportunities to combine services. Agency stability needs to happen as quickly as possible because the public is not being served with good information, nor can agencies be responsive with mounting workloads and uncertain futures (1 dot).

S. There are considerable economic benefits associated with developing trail connectivity within the region. There are many active people in Ashland who own or work in bike shops who are keenly aware of the importance of trails in the area. Their bike shops are dependent on good trail systems. The Ashland Chamber of Commerce is also very interested in the trail systems and are quite interested in information that can be prepared and cleanly displayed (0 dots).

T. Trails provide a safe alternative route for bicycle and pedestrian commuting within the region (0 dots).

U. There are several local trail development opportunities on land and water at and around Rogue River (0 dots).

V. There is a need to provide good information on trail opportunities to potential visitors during trip planning so they are not disappointed by a lack of opportunities after arrival. It is more effective to tell people where to go rather than later telling them where not to go for trail opportunities (0 dots).

W. There is a need for trail ethics information, especially on multi-use trails (0 dots).

X. There is an increasing amount of vandalism occurring at trailheads (0 dots).

Y. There appears to be an increasing need for regional and "local" tourist information. Several area long-time residents are unaware of opportunities existing in the present parks/trails system (on-line comment).

General Public Session (Grants Pass) (Evening Session)

Attendance: 7 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

JJJ. Need for trailheads and related facilities (4 dots).

KKK. Need for trailside camping areas in remote locations only accessible by non-motorized means (foot, horse and mountain bike) (4 dots).

LLL. Need for better coordination between agencies on trail planning and development (2 dots).

MMM. Need for connectivity within urban and rural areas of the region (2 dots).

NNN. Need for appropriate signing when crossing into areas with different regulations (2 dots).

OOO. Need for contact information at riding areas on who to contact to address a maintenance issue (2 dots).

PPP. There is a need for signing consistency between different areas within the region (1 dot).

QQQ. Need for multiple-use trail tolerance and user-conflict education (1 dot).

RRR. Regarding comment QQQ, I have often felt that conflict is created by management when they say that there may be conflict. I was riding a multiple-use trail in Montana and asked the ranger about conflicts on his system. He told me that he made it very clear that if someone complained about multiple use too hard he would ban the complaining group. He told me that he had not had a complaint in several years and that everyone seemed to get on just fine (on-line comment).

SSS. Need for more trail signage within the region (0 dots).

TTT. Need for more snow parks (0 dots).

UUU. Need for maps not divided by jurisdictional boundaries (0 dots).

WV. Need to separate non-compatible motorized and non-motorized uses where appropriate (0 dots).

NORTHCENTRAL REGION (Bend) 4/3/03

(North central Region includes Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Jefferson, Wheeler, Deschutes and Crook Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Bend)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 11 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
Bureau of Land Management
Bend Metro Parks & Recreation District
City of Sisters

Non-motorized Trail Issues

N. There is a need to develop and extend a regional trails system within the region. To properly plan such a system, there is a need for a region-wide, multi-jurisdictional trail planning entity (like the Deschutes Bike and Pedestrian Committee) to facilitate regional and urban trail system planning. Such a group would work with private landowners, irrigation districts and public agencies (federal, state and local) to coordinate the trails planning process and facilitate idea sharing and the communication process. Finally, there is a need for a shared vision between local, state and federal recreation providers for trails planning within the region to identify trail development priorities. Such an overall vision is essential in order to see trails projects through to completion (6 dots).

O. The region contains a number of historic travel corridors (Native American and early Anglo-settlement) that could potentially provide great recreation trail development opportunities (including potential rail-to-trail projects). The unique history associated with these travel corridors would provide an incredible interpretive theme for drawing users (5 dots).

P. There is a need to develop urban trail systems to connect urban parks and open space including connections to recreational opportunities on outlying public lands (4 dots).

Q. Trails are not always seen as top priorities in relation to other community needs. As a result, recreation providers must work together to make a stronger case that trails are important to communities and provide a broad range of social and economic benefits to communities and are deserving of a higher position on the city/county political agenda. (3 dots).

R. There is a need for flexible funding to accommodate trail projects crossing multiple jurisdictional (city, county, state, federal) boundaries. The statewide trails plan should include an up-to-date inventory of trail funding resources available for trail development projects in the state. The list should also include the specific types of projects funded by the grant program (1 dot).

S. There is a need for a central OPRD contact to provide trail planners across the state with technical assistance (1 dot).

T. There is a need for a consistent set of trail design standards for use within the region (1 dot).

U. There is a need for additional funding for building trails and trail-related facilities such as parking areas, trailheads and signage. In order to provide the necessary incentive for new trail development projects, there must also be funding provided for trail maintenance and enforcement assistance. Finally, there is a need for funding for maps and brochures to market these trails after completion (0 dots).

V. There is a need to educate trail users (especially those riding mountain bikes and ATVs) to control resource damage associated with increasing use in urban interface areas within the region (0 dots).

W. There is a need for a central database or statewide GIS system including all Local Transportation System Plans and current inventories of existing and proposed trails so that trail planners and local public officials are better aware of the current status of trails planning within their jurisdiction. The trails planning information should be easily accessible such as on an internet site (0 dots).

General Public Session (Bend) (Evening Session)

Attendance: 48 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

ZZ. There is a need for trail access opportunities that do not require user fees or permits. Such trail opportunities should include minimal levels of improvement (8 dots).

AAA. There is a need for more non-commercial groomed cross-country ski trails within the region (8 dots).

BBB. There is a need for more equestrian camps and day-use trailheads within the region (7 dots).

CCC. There is a need for more snow parks and related facilities within the region (6 dots).

DDD. There is a need for additional funding for maintenance and trail development within the region (6 dots).

EEE. Regarding comment DDD, I agree with the above comment. For example we would like to see a looped trail developed within our community that would be about 2 miles long through our greenbelt area. It would provide opportunities for joggers, walkers, bike riders, and those interested in scenic vistas, history and nature as it goes through an area abundant in bird and wildlife. There doesn't seem to be much funding for such trails for small communities like ours (on-line comment).

FFF. There is a need for increased multi-use non-motorized trail connectivity (local, regional and state trail networks) within the region (5 dots).

GGG. There is a need for more urban trails within the region. Such trails contribute to the disbursement of recreational use in urban areas (5 dots).

HHH. There is a need for public education and planning for people of different age and cultural groups to reduce user conflicts on multi-use trails within the region (4 dots).

III. There is a need for more designated target shooting areas and firearm education so that target shooting does not occur in public-use trail areas (3 dots).

JJJ. There is a need for more off-leash dog trail opportunities within the region (3 dots).

KKK. There is a need for incentives/programs to encourage volunteer trail maintenance and construction projects within the region. Recreation providers should make better use of the special skills of trail volunteers and to provide more training/certification opportunities for volunteers (3 dots).

LLL. There is a need to coordinate summer and winter trails for multiple uses (2 dots).

MMM. There is a need for trail use in a variety of settings (urban to wilderness) within the region. Care should be taken to develop facilities based on actual user need (e.g. need for less developed facilities in certain areas of the region) (1 dot).

NNN. There is a need for larger parking areas for multi-use trailheads which accommodate equestrian or snowmobile use. Separate facilities for equestrian and snowmobile use should be considered where appropriate (1 dot).

OOO. Allow leashed dogs on all trails within the region (1 dot).

PPP. There is a need for more separate use trails to reduce the number of user conflicts occurring on multiple-use trails within the region (1 dot).

SOUTHCENTRAL REGION (Klamath Falls) 4/15/03

(South central Region includes Klamath and Lake Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Klamath Falls) (Daytime Session)

Attendance: 6 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
U.S. Forest Service
Klamath Rails to Trails
Jackson County Roads/Parks

Non-motorized Trail Issues

M. There is a need for statewide trail design and construction standards—particularly at roadway crossings. Current guidelines are being interpreted broadly and in a number of ways. For example, if you are dealing with multiple agencies on a trails project you get 3 or 4 applications on how to design trail roadway crossings. There is a need for specific statutes that support appropriate construction and crosswalk standards at multi-use roadway crossings (2 dots).

N. There is a need for additional funding for trail staffing, equipment, maintenance, development, law enforcement and education. As trail use increases, hard evidence is needed to justify staffing increases

for public agencies. Towards this end, there is a need for better documentation of the need for and benefits of trails to aid in making the case for appropriate funding increases to groups such as the state legislature (2 dots).

O. There is a need for increased law enforcement including code compliance officers, trail stewards and related visitor and educational information (2 dots).

P. There is a need for more trailheads suited to equestrian use. Proper site planning should include examining location in relation to other users groups, as well as providing the necessary space to handle modern equipment (2 dots).

Q. There is a 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 (2 dot).

R. There is a need for trail planning assistance (technical and financial) for multi-jurisdictional trail and trail system development. In the past, recreation providers have lived within a self-contained park unit philosophy. Such a management philosophy is not suited to the large-scale trail development projects currently being proposed and developed (1 dot).

S. There is a need to develop consistent policy and management approaches for addressing the use of motorized equipment use (e.g. Segways) on non-motorized trails (1 dot).

T. There is a need to recognize the various purposes of multiple-use trails such as commuting and recreation (1 dot).

U. There is a need for additional opportunities for both multi-use and dedicated-use trails. For example, some trails are simply not safe to have mountain bikers coming downhill towards other trail users (1 dot).

V. Enforcement on trails is difficult due to distances and variety of trail settings (from urban to wilderness) (1 dot).

W. There is a need for trail connectivity both within the urban area and to outlying public lands (1 dot).

X. There is a need for a more developed bicycle transportation system including connections to the existing recreational systems. The end goal is to develop a seamless connection between on-street bikeways and urban trail systems. Urban trails need to be considered as an important component of the urban transportation system (1 dot).

Y. As trail use continues to increase, lack of adequate trail funding will create increasing public provider liability exposure. To proactively address this situation, recreation providers must have additional funding for maintenance staffing, equipment, bridges, and fencing expenses (1 dot).

Z. There is a need to identify and develop more trailheads along trails and trail-related facilities such as campgrounds, restrooms, signage and potable water (1 dot).

AA. There is a need for information resources such as maps and brochures (0 dots).

BB. There is a need for additional mountain biking opportunities in a variety of settings—from flat trails to more technical riding opportunities (0 dots).

CC. There is a need to address potential user conflicts between equestrians and mountain bikers—especially on trails close to urban areas (0 dots).

DD. There is a need for standardized trail signing within the region (including design assistance, regulatory information and distance standards) (0 dots).

EE. There is a need for greater accountability for management of the 1% Bicycle Bill Fund (0 dots).

FF. There is a need to address the special challenge of providing emergency response on trails within the region. Trails have no specific address or location information necessary to identify the location of the injured party (0 dots).

GG. There is a need for increased levels of training, recruitment and resources for trail volunteers (0 dots).

HH. There is a need for technical assistance in navigating the NEPA process required for qualifying for federal trail funding (0 dots).

II. There is a need for addressing a growing number of user conflicts on multiple-use trails within the region (0 dots).

General Public Session (Klamath Falls)
(Evening Session)

Attendance: 6 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

III. There is a need for better education/information on the sharing of multi-use trails within the region (e.g. multi-use coalition) (8 dots).

JJJ. There is a need for policies/assistance on properly handling the homeless on trails and trail related facilities within the region. There is a need to consider policies related to law enforcement, need to view trails as a family place and a community resource, and impacts on the availability of trail facilities (e.g. locked restrooms) (3 dots).

KKK. There are opportunities for sharing/multiple-use of trail facilities within the region (e.g. snowmobile, summer motorized, non-motorized- fire season closures) (3 dots).

LLL. There is a need for connectivity of trails systems within the region linking parks, public facilities and communities. There is also an opportunity to build connections between urban and wilderness trails (2 dots).

MMM. There is a need to prepare policy and management structures to accommodate personal mobility devices (Segways). We need to address the question of what trails will they be allowed on or restricted from use (1 dot).

NNN. There is a need to recognize that trails are an economic opportunity for communities because of their contribution of the overall quality of life (1 dot).

OOO. There is a need for trail etiquette information such as leave no trace, tread lightly, tolerance, respect and stewardship information (0 dots).

PPP. Urban trails need to be considered as an important component of the urban transportation system (0 dots).

QQQ. There is a need for a web site containing information on where existing trail opportunities are available within the region (0 dots).

RRR. There is a need for more diverse use (motorized and non-motorized) trails within the region (0 dots).

NORTHEAST REGION (Union) 4/1/03

(Northeast Region includes Wallowa, Union, Grant and Baker Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Union) (Daytime Session)

Attendance: 11 people attended the meeting including representation from:

- Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
- U.S. Forest Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Morrow County
- City of La Grande

Non-motorized Trail Issues

T. There is a need to secure long-term funding for non-motorized trail maintenance within the region. This issue is especially relevant with U.S. Forest Service trail maintenance. Currently, the agency is charged a burden assessment for every trails grant that they apply for—19.5% of the total grant request which goes directly to cover paperwork expenses. As a result, all U.S. Forest Service trail maintenance money within the region goes directly to cover burden assessment associated with motorized trail grants. Since OPRD administered grant programs do not pay for overhead expenses, there is literally no money left for non-motorized trail maintenance and law enforcement on Forest Service lands within the region (8 dots).

U. There is a need to minimize off-trail resource impacts associated with non-motorized trail use within the region. For example, trail users often take short cuts on switch back trail sections. Educational and interpretive programs can play an important role in reducing such impacts (7 dots).

V. There is a need for connectivity between community trail systems, greenways, outlying state parks and forestlands within the region. There are many opportunities to develop loops bridging the gap between urban and rural areas potentially providing economic opportunities for local communities within the region. Potential projects included connecting Clyde Holiday State Park and Mt. Vernon and

a Snake River Breaks Trail from Farewell Bend State Park up the Snake River to connect to the Hells Canyon Wilderness Area (6 dots).

W. There is a need to address equestrian/mountain biker/hiker user conflicts on non-motorized trails within the region (4 dots).

X. Northeastern Oregon contains an incredible resource-base for developing mountain biking opportunities. There is a need to identify and market mountain biking opportunities within the region. We should also strive to connect those mountain biking opportunities to communities where appropriate (4 dots).

Y. There are a different set of users for urban and wild land trails within the region. For example, large numbers of people who live in La Grande (particularly women and ethnic minorities) do not feel comfortable going out on a Forest Service gravel road or using maps to following existing non-motorized trails on federal lands. As a result, there is a need for well-marked day-use trails within the region to satisfy these types of urban residents. Interpretive features could also help to educate urban residents to encourage their use of wild land trails (3 dots).

Z. There is a need for good design standards for non-motorized trails within the region (0 dots).

AA. There is a need for non-motorized trail signing standards within the region (0 dots).

BB. At this time, we are providing a trail s for a traditional set of linear activities on wild lands within the region. There is a need to identify any new opportunities that people may wish to participate in, but current facilities and resources do not accommodate at this time. Perhaps the trails survey could be used to identify such latent trail demand (0 dots).

CC. There is a need for development of long-distance trails within the region. Unfortunately multiple ownership and easements barriers are difficult to overcome, and will limit the ability of federal agencies (USFS and BLM) to take a leadership role in developing long-distance trail opportunities in the region. Local communities will have to take a stronger lead in developing such trail opportunities. It would be helpful if the statewide trails plan could identify tools to use in working with private landowner to develop trail access across private lands (0 dots).

DD. There is an opportunity to purchase irrigation ditch corridors within the region for development of multi-use trails (0 dots).

General Public Session (Union)
(Evening Session)

Attendance: 22 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

ZZ. Need to maintain our existing inventory of non-motorized trails within the region (11 dots).

AAA. Need for improved trail head facilities including separate facilities for stock and other users (9 dots).

BBB. Need for greater cooperation between state and federal agencies in providing trail opportunities within the region (8 dots).

CCC. Need for more close-to-home trail opportunities—especially for children (4 dots).

DDD. Need to evaluate road closures/access easements for trail use. This evaluation process should include public input and agency review (2 dots).

EEE. Need for safety and leave-no-trace education to reduce conflicts between user groups (2 dots).

FFF. Need for connecting existing trails to form long-distance trails and trail loops (1 dot).

GGG. Need to develop additional trail opportunities within the region (1 dot).

HHH. Need for better follow through on trail development projects from planning to project implementation (1 dot).

SOUTHEAST REGION (Burns) 4/2/03

(Southeast Region includes Harney and Malheur Counties)

Public Recreation Provider Session (Burns)

(Daytime Session)

Attendance: 5 people attended the meeting including representation from:

Oregon Parks & Recreation Department
Bureau of Land Management
City of Burns

Non-motorized Trail Issues

J. There are a lack of non-motorized trails within the region (4 dots).

K. There is a lack of good information on existing non-motorized trail opportunities within the region (3 dots).

L. There is potential for urban area trail development within the region (e.g., trail from Clyde Holliday to Mt. Vernon). Such trails can serve a broad spectrum of users (youth to elderly) and others who can't or do not wish to get out to existing rural trails (2 dots).

M. There is potential to designate existing two-track roads (with little motorized use) for non-motorized trail use within the region—particularly for mountain bike use. All that will need to be done is simply to market these opportunities to the mountain bikers (1 dot).

N. There may be local resistance to developing non-motorized trail opportunities and encouraging more visitors to the region. A typical comment heard is that things are nice and quiet out here — and we want to keep it that way. As a result, recreation providers need to educate communities about the social and economic benefits associated with non-motorized trail development (1 dot).

O. Outside interest groups (from places like Boise, Bend and Portland) may strongly resist the development of new non-motorized trails on public lands within the region (in areas such as Steens Mountain) (1 dot).

P. There are a lot of untapped resources for developing non-motorized trails within Harney County (0 dots).

Q. There is an opportunity to develop non-motorized trails in remote settings within the region (0 dots).

R. There is a need to market existing regional non-motorized trail opportunities (0 dots).

S. There is great interest and potential within the region to develop non-motorized trails as a potential economic development strategy (0 dots).

T. Harney County does not have the amount of developed non-motorized trails and support facilities that exist in other counties in the state (0 dots).

General Public Session (Burns)
(Evening Session)

Attendance: 5 people attended the meeting.

Non-motorized Trail Issues

OO. There is a need to consider non-motorized use of roads proposed for closure or abandonment and to review recreational use on roads previously closed or abandoned (6 dots).

PP. There is a need to educate non-motorized trail users on user-conflict resolution techniques such as yielding requirements included in multiple use trail courtesy guidelines. It would also be beneficial to get user groups to come together to work out user-conflict issues (4 dots).

QQ. There is a need for trailside warming shelters to be used by all user groups (3 dots).

RR. There is a need for non-motorized trail connectivity connecting communities, parks and community trails with the outlying federal trails (2 dots).

SS. There is a need for non-motorized trail signing (0 dots).