

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

April 12 – PLENARY SESSION

**Marlene Finley**, Director, Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness Resources, Pacific Southwest Region, Forest Service

*Notes taken during the session:*

- Marlene Finley opened the summit at 8:00 a.m. and welcomed all. She will facilitate today's agenda.
- She explained that the idea for the summit started with national effort by the Forest Service to develop a broader, more cohesive strategy for managing OHV recreation on national forest lands. This work includes developing a national travel management policy and providing tools, techniques and best practices associated with managing motorized recreation. Recently the Forest Service proposed a national policy to allow OHV recreation on designated routes and to generally eliminate open cross country travel. The travel management regulations should be finalized soon and this summit was organized to offer the collaborative tools needed as OHV routes are designated.
- She credited the team members and partners that organized the summit and worked to gather examples of excellence in OHV management and collaboration.
- Agenda and logistics were reviewed.
- She asked participants to interact over the next few days and also to review and comment on the draft report "OHV Collaboration: Lessons Learned from Project Implementation". Comments on that report of case studies should be sent to Larry Fisher.

**David Holland**, Director, Recreation and Heritage Resources, Forest Service

*Notes taken during the session:*

- This conference is to set the stage for those interested in OHV recreational opportunities on public lands to find the common ground to make those happen on the ground.
- The proposed travel management regulations, which will direct OHV travel on designated routes only, were relatively easy in comparison to the coming work on the ground. And this will be a large effort nationally.
- The demand for OHV recreation has soared and public lands have suffered simply due to the tremendous number of people seeking that opportunity.
- The FS Chief, Dale Bosworth, will attend the conference on Wednesday to discuss his effort to turn Agency priorities and public dialog to the threats that confront land managers in the 21st century. One of these threats is the damage resulting from unmanaged cross-country travel by OHVs on some national forests.
- Holland summarized that new technologies bring recreationists looking for new experiences on public lands. But the essential motivation stays the same – finding a sense of freedom, a place to relax, or a test for outdoors skills.
- The Forest Service's challenge is offering all recreation opportunities in a sustainable manner. Some past methods have caused gridlock between the agency and interested parties. This summit is aimed at developing ways for the public and land managers to work together.
- Take the time at this summit to talk but take action in the field. What appears on the ground is what is important.

Question and Answer

Q: We see a need for areas where rock crawling or other extreme sports can be hosted, will the proposed rule allow for that?

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A: The proposed rule does allow for OHV areas; the specific activities that are allowed will be determined at the local level.

---

**Ruth Coleman**, Director, California State Parks

*Notes taken during the session:*

- The Director welcomed the group to California.
- California sets trend and the state's OHV program is an example of that. The state's program has its origins in the collaborative effort of two legislators. She discussed the two primary funding mechanisms – gas tax and green sticker program – developed to support this opportunity on state and federal lands in California.
- California is developing two new areas which both involve significant collaborative efforts. The plans include additional green space for the community; -an important contribution for the whole growing population in the state.
- Since OHV program began in 1971, over \$250 million has been allocated. Much of that was allocated to Federal lands (FS and BLM), which manage over 90% of the OHV recreation opportunities in the state.
- Recently the state program has committed about \$8 million to help the Forest Service in its effort to designate routes on lands that still allow cross country travel.
- Coleman explained the important role of the Stakeholders' Round Table which was created in the early-1990's to advise the state on OHV program development and funding. The Round Table includes all interested in OHV management – motorized enthusiasts, non-motorized recreationists and others interested in public land management. Bringing all together, at the same table, demonstrates that most share the same goals, values and mutual respect for the ways people want to enjoy the outdoors.
- The Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation program in California began with collaboration continues with collaboration and must have collaboration for future success.

---

**The Honorable Sarah Michael**, Commissioner, Blaine County, Idaho; Vice Chair, Gateway Communities Subcommittee, National Association of Counties

*Notes taken during the session:*

- As a county commissioner in Idaho, Michael was an integral player in the recent resolution by the National Association of Counties (NACo), which asked federal agencies to allow OHV recreation on designated routes only and to eliminate cross country travel. National Association of Counties represents over 3000 counties.
- After learning about FS Chief Bosworth's ideas on the threat of unmanaged OHV recreation, Michael began to discuss this with NACo and was surprised to find many counterparts across the nation who were also concerned. Gateway communities to public lands rely on recreation tourism broadly. A spectrum of recreation activities on healthy lands supports healthy economies. Unlimited OHV use is upsetting this balance. This was the central concern of the NACo resolution.
- Regarding the level of county interest in working with the Forest Service, every county is different. Some are participating directly in travel management process while others are not. But local resolutions are important.
- She summarized a successful collaborative effort in Sun Valley Idaho to manage winter recreation experiences where cross country skiing and snowmobile recreationists were in growing conflict. The Forest Service suggested that a collaborative effort between the two groups would make the best solution. Superior facilitation developed a relationship between

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

the two groups, which emphasized that values were very similar and each would not get 100% of what they want.

- Michael reflected that county commissioners who are busy worrying about the basic needs of communities --- police and sewage, etc. – would rather have recreationists working together toward solutions. This benefits the entire community.

---

**GROUP SHARING EXERCISE**

Finley asked the room to break into small groups to discuss what they had heard so far. Each group reported back to the whole audience. Comments and questions are listed below.

- Mix of meeting participants – industry as well as public land managers - is good.
- Funding and creativity is key. Collaboration is key. Getting all players including US Fish & Wildlife to the table is key.
- No exclusionary sense among the groups today.
- Access to the process for central players as well as other entities interested in public lands is important. Many folks are missing today that we need to share this collaborate summit ideas with.
- Awareness to bring counties and tribal interests into process.
- How to keep a neutral process and a lasting process?
- There are many examples of collaboration, not just OHV focused, that could really add.
- The travel management process must acknowledge the long haul. We cannot plan the OHV opportunities without looking holistically at the whole recreation process.
- Many solutions are like peeling an onion.
- Happy talk. The translation of ideas on collaboration into “collaboration” is important. For decades, we have been talking about the same issues. How we make this a reality, now, so we are not here in 10 years.
- “You fix it or we are going to fix it”. FS should not have to get to this point.
- Relationships that develop early on, before conflict starts, are the best.
- Grants used to manage a recreation program create a problem because those that provide the grant may now have a controlling interest.
- There are difficulties in implementing the proposed travel management regulations. We are stakeholders in travel management planning in the SD Black hills and are open to your suggestions and ideas.
- Access. Often public land is closed off because of a lack of the right to go through private ownership.
- The value of collaboration is a tremendous power. How do you build the group to know that they have more power together? Skilled facilitator, dogged persistence.
- Collaboration has a definition --- how do they manage expectations --- internal agreement in an agency is not collaboration.
- Arizona needs a stakeholders group.
- There is a risk for a group representative participating in the stakeholders group. Compromising is not what some in their group may want and it can make a very difficult situation.

---

**PANEL DISCUSSION**

**Scott Kovarovics**, Director, Natural Trails and Water Coalition

**Brian Hawthorne**, Public Lands Director, Blue Ribbon Coalition

**Ronald Price**, Oregon Trails and Travel Management Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management

**Tim Buche**, President, Special Vehicle Institute of America; President, Motorcycle Industry Council; President, Motorcycle Safety Foundation

*Notes taken during the session:*

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Ron Price

- Collaboration begins internally with mutual respect for people and what experience they want from the outdoors. Need proper stakeholders.
- Collaborative process on the Oregon Dunes area (endangered species, suburban neighbors noise issues) is ongoing.
- Funding example: gateway communities from forest land to designated trails, camping areas, and expected growth in the communities
- BLM and FS collaboration manage area together
- Collaboration needs to address issues that arise in the future

Tim Buche

- Encouraged as a taxpayer...a lot of the problem is the funding
- Why ride? Fun, recreation, to enjoy the outdoors, family, exercise, etc. 25% of use is for utility.
- Represents the industry, as a group of manufacturers
- Outdoor recreation plays an importance role in my life personally.
- Enthusiasts also fish, hunt camp, hike, and enjoy water sports
- Serve customer with safety, responsibility, and respect the environment
- Imperative to the industry that use is responsible --- safely and sustainability
- Let's not play to the strategy of missing funding and resulting environmental degradation taking away places to ride.

Brian Hawthorne

- Consider using collaboration in a route designation process. It helps
- Case studies are good. We need to identify the key stakeholders
- Charters are needed and the process as well as the product needs to be clear
- Define the rules of collaboration –negotiated and enforced
- Use outreach to engage users in the planning process
- Use the travel management plan to identify non motorized areas. This needs to be clear at the beginning
- Holistic process for recreation management—needs to be used appropriately & clearly scoped from beginning
- Object to OHV travel management to designate other trail use
- Supportive of designated trails but agencies have not done this successfully
- The OHV community is supportive of the effort to go to designated routes, however many see this as the demise of the sport
- The FS Chief referred to unmanaged recreation as a problem. It ignores the Agency's responsibility to what they should be doing all along. And it does not give acknowledgement to those places where OHV collaboration is working well

Scott Kovarovics

- Source of funding should not give control over management of public resources.
- Feds cannot depend totally on state laws
- Agency needs to be ready to collaborate
- Financial resources are needed
- Clear rules and sideboards are needed
- Legislation needs to be enforceable. You need people on the ground.
- The agency needs to lay out the science. The core science needs to be there and peer reviewed and not endlessly debated. Use facilitation and balanced representation
- Case Studies offer insight dealing with OHV issues and resource issues related to the new OHV rule
- Evaluation of whether or not collaboration is appropriate in each situation. Collaboration is not always the solution to making the decisions related to travel management

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Questions and Answers

Q: If science is critical... What does constitute good science vs. opinion? Peer review... the desert tortoises for example.

A (Scott): It is easy to sort peer reviewed science from personal opinion.

A (Tim): Science is applied to an agenda...it comes back to a value system.

A (Brian): Science has its role in the NEPA process but not the whole process.

Q: Education, particularly of children is important. User ethics is the key. What is the role of user education?

A (all): Education is important.

A (Tim): Children's programs are important. Protect yourself and protect the planet. Responsible Americans for recreation access, etc. Industry is addressing a number of efforts toward that end.

A (Ron): We have programs in Oregon. We think it is important for industry to help in getting this out... in different ways.

Q: No question about the desert tortoise and effects on it from OHV use. The issue of funding is very important. We have seen agencies turn down or lose funding because they are unwilling to see implementation carry through. They refuse to consider continuation of a balanced management system. Also fee money has not been used for conservation because of the industry. What is your response to agencies turning down or losing funding related to industry wishes?

A (?): Look to colleagues that are successful at leveraging funds and talk to them.

A (Brian): There is inconsistency even among neighboring units to finance and leverage spending. The recreationists want the money to go back into the facilities not to fund research

A (Tim): The biggest issue is parents being better parents... industry identifies what is safe and pays for folks to take the training.

Q: Safety training for children?

A (Tim): Special Vehicle Institute of America - incentive to have training for kids. 92% of accidents are because of misuse. The biggest problem is kids on adult size ATVs.

Q: Does Blue Ribbon support the holistic approach, including all recreationists, for travel management planning?

A (Brian): We are concerned that it's not communicated. Be up front in the beginning.

Q: All interest groups need to be at the table. Incorporate previous litigation experiences. I have a question for Brian Hawthorne – Science, should it not be in the discussion?

A (Brian): Endless discussion of the science is not helpful but the decision maker should consider and use it.

Q: Personal rider responsibility? Measuring effectiveness of education?

A: Industry expects return on investment. Industry can't control the choice of riders. 35% of new purchasers have training. The OHV management of an area is important in education.

---

**Luther Propst**, Executive Director, Sonoran Institute

*Notes taken during the session:*

- Propst opened with good humor by claiming to know little about off-highway vehicle recreation but something about collaboration. His background is law and started the Sonoran institute to bring collaboration into communities working on environmental matters.
- His institute has small grants available for collaborative efforts (\$5000) as a mechanism to get groups started. Check for an application on his website. (<http://www.sonoran.org/>)

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Collaborative decision making should be focused on the place, not on an issue or activity.
- The shared values for the character of the community, for the vision of the place, helps move beyond issues to place-based approaches.
- Conflict is inherent and should be acknowledged. It is not about complete consensus, or making all into a bland mush. But rather to look for what we can agree on and not, what can't be agreed on.
- Population growth is a very real factor. People want to live in attractive places and this often overlaps with public lands.
- In reviewing the FS Chief, Dale Bosworth's, work on the four threats to public lands. The decisions related to public land management are not just about a recreation plan or a subdivision plan. Start rather to focus on the health of the land and the health of the community.
- The current political solutions are insufficient. "Sending more money" to solve a problem is often not the way to go. Often public managers or certain groups are made scapegoats.
- The central importance is the health of the place and the community. The Sonoran Institute is finding a reasonable basis for hope for the many issues communities face. And we see it on the ground.
- There are three guiding principles that have become apparent. [These are on their website with other good references.] Rapid population growth has separated people from the land and more people are showing up on public lands. Local economic prosperity is important and the management of public lands affects local economies. Tangible outcomes are not new rules and law enforcement. We can shift the focus from the lowest common denominator – rules, regulations - to the outcomes, which take care of place.
- Case studies were offered. The critical lessons are (1) a compelling shared vision will serve as the guide as details of the solution are developed and (2) "Coalitions of the Unlike" or the high diversity of groups in a coalition actually is better for a cohesive outcome.

Questions and Answers

Q: Where collaboration seems to work better on private lands, what are the differences between, federal vs. private land?

A: There actually is not a big difference in managing the collaborative process. Collaboration is based on the rule of law. All efforts should be clear about laws and sideboards. Know what is on the table.

Q: What about where recreationists are dispersed and there is not a neighboring community that says "this is my place"?

A: That brings bigger challenges and a broader outreach than one might initially consider.

---

CASE STUDIES

Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir Multiple-Use Trail System Trails and Perry Stream All-Terrain Vehicle Trails

Moderator: Bob Fitzhenry, Northeast Area State and Private Forestry, Forest Service  
**Chris Gamache**, Program Specialist, New Hampshire Bureau of Trails  
**Warren Chase**, Great North Woods Riders ATV Club, Inc.

*Notes taken during the first and second session:*

**Chris Gamache, Program Specialist, New Hampshire Bureau of Trails** was introduced to speak about transforming an Army Corps property marred by destructive trespass to a managed multiple use trail system. The property is located in southern New Hampshire and is near large urban areas.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Background: The NH Bureau of Trails oversees about 700 miles of ATV/motorcycle trails and many more snowmobile trail miles. The Bureau of Trails helps manage trails on Federal agencies. (Specifically, snowmobiles and winter travel for ATV's. Feds don't allow ATV's in the summer.)
- New Hampshire has many snowmobile routes that set the stage to develop ATV routes. The Bureau works with large private landowners to provide access on private lands and developed a statewide ATV plan. ATV clubs maintain these systems and about ½ of the users in the state are club members.
- The majority of trails in NH are on privately owned lands, which, under the Bureau's program, provide access to the public. 80% snowmobile trails are on private land and 85% of ATV trails.
- Mechanical in NH is not human powered. Mountain bike does not qualify as human powered.
- Strong recreational statutes cover landowners. The state also buys a \$2 million insurance policy, which includes those landowners who allow public ATV trails on their lands. No claims have been made to date.
- Noise is the biggest perceived problem in establishing trails. But the real problem is most likely protecting wetlands. Other issues include speed, dust, and noise.
- User education and regular club patrol is more effective with compliance than law enforcement.
- Track kits on ATVs are very popular and people are using them and they work.
- Compare Maine and VT: Maine manages for ATV's 2300 miles of trail (NH 700 miles). Vermont does not provide public riding activities. People have to join a club to ride private sites.
- Trail permission as opposed to trail right of way...Land owners don't want to sign an easement.
- Use clubs as a communication tools to provide information on some private land access
- Private land owners north of White Mt. NH don't want trail bikes, only ATV's
- Clubs do a lot of the trail and safety education.

**Case Study – Hopkinton Everett Reservoir Multi-use trail system**

Everett Reservoir was an Army Corps of Engineer reservoir. It is a dry flood reservoir on which that state manages timber /wildlife management and ATVs trails. 700 acre parcel – unmanaged before 1980.

- In the mid 1980, it was a violent lawless area with illegal partying, dumping and destructive motorized use. This activity was stopped and then later motorcycle events began.
- NHBT came into manage area for recreation
- Adopted existing trails (requires more maintenance)
- Local dirt bike club made it happen in beginning...efforts died off resulting in possible trail closure
- Due to their popularity and to the growing demand for ATV trails, the State worked with the Corps to establish an official state trail system. The Corps agreed, as it did not see that it could successfully change use pattern.
- Trail users maintain trails while the State provides materials and equipment. Most of the trails were original ones created by earlier use.
- New leadership has reenergized volunteer involvement. now major projects yearly
- Average 66 users per day on 25 miles of trail...one-way designation (very successful for this particular trail system)
- Considered a success because it was an “unmanaged horror show” that is now open to the public as a quality managed site.
- Population is centered around the SE NH...this site serves the population center. It is not a sufficient site. Looking to NH North Country

**Warren Chase, Great Northwoods Riders ATV Club**, was introduced to discuss the **Perry Stream ATV Trails** located in the northern reaches of rural New Hampshire. Landownership is mostly held by large private landowners. Private land is not locally owned but locally controlled.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

The timber economy has flagged and some community leaders want to build on the winter snowmobile economy. The community hopes to attract ATV recreationists in the summer. Pittsburg, NH is the largest township east of the Mississippi, land wise.

- A timber company owns the trail system property and some of its employees, including Chase, are ATV riders and strong supporters of the ATV trail development. Recreational use cannot interfere with timber operations.
- Initial idea for a trail system came from a local landowner who also was a motorcycle/ATV dealer. Others joined in and an ATV Club was created to obtain state funding and to maintain trails.
- Miles of skidder trails and roads existed and are the basis of the trail system but have proved problematic, as they do not stay dry. Now there are 65 miles of trail in the inventory on 8000 acres.
- First summer the goal was to get miles out there, and to create loops to eliminate problems created by dead ends.
- In retrospect, they should have created a better quality trail system. There are maintenance issues on those early trails.
- One trailhead and a very few feeder trails on private property.
- Use is geared toward the family, and not technical, riding. Children and seniors will not have a problem. Families are the target market.
- They have created links to adjoining property owners and the town center of Pittsburg.
- Although off to a solid start, the local club and community see that a much bigger system and, a direct link to the town of Pittsburg, are needed to create a tourist destination.
- A state property is centrally located but its use and availability for motorized trails has yet to be determined. There is a 200,000 + acre conservation easement around this area. The State owns the recreation rights on the easement. 2-year interim management of the area is allowed for traditional use (hunting, fishing, logging, and snowmobiling). Not non-traditional use such as ATVs and even hiking. We are 18 months into this and nothing has happened in terms of a new management plan. Public input into the future use of the property will start soon.
- Pittsburg, NH is a premiere destination in NH, possibly New England, for snowmobiling. Population goes from 800-900 weekdays to 5000 on weekends
- There is an economic shift from logging to tourism. Create summer tourism with ATVs on a smaller scale.
- Because of current management, we can't use existing trail system (snowmobile) for development of a quality ATV trails in the area because we can't reach the area from the town lodging area.
- Private land owners north of White Mt. NF don't want trail bikes - only ATV's. Clubs do a lot of the trail and safety education.

---

Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota Interagency Working Group *and* California Off-Highway Stakeholders Round Table

Moderator: Cynthia Manning, Social Scientist, Northern Region, Forest Service

**John Favro**, Regional Trails Coordinator, Northern Region, Forest Service

**Fred Bower**, Highway Engineer, Northern Region, Forest Service

**Jodi Kramer**, Public Affairs, Idaho Panhandle National Forest, Forest Service

**Daphne Greene**, Deputy Director, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation, California State Parks and Recreation Department

*Notes taken during the first and second sessions:*

**Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota Interagency Working Group**

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Working to better serve the public, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management created an interagency working group (IWG), October 1998. One issue that kept rising to the top was the management of off highway vehicle use.
- The two agencies signed a formal agreement; a team was chartered and issues identified. The team was composed of BLM and Forest Service Public Affairs Officers and team leaders.
- It became apparent that the agencies needed to eliminate cross country travel by motorized vehicles. The team saw the NEPA process as the primary decision making process. A specific EIS team was developed. There were logistical challenges such as travel distances and two separate computer technologies. They met the deadline of completing the EIS in two years.
- The standard NEPA public involvement process was followed but on a much larger scale. The two public affairs officers served as facilitators to this process. There were 35 open houses across the states. The preparation for these meetings included train-the-trainer sessions for government personnel in order to bring the public consistent information.
- Went through the process and decided to allow travel only on "existing trails and roads." (Interim step before road designation.)

Collaboration inside and out

Jan 1999 – Public Process began

Feb 1999 – 35 Open Houses on NOI

Trained District Rangers

Nov. 1999 – Draft EIS Issued

Dec. 1999 – 35 open houses on DEIS

Jan. 2001 – FEIS and Record of Decision

2003 – BLM decision

\*\* They built relationships through open houses.

Keys to Success

- The Forest Service Regional Forester and the BLM State Director strongly supported the mission
- Dedication and good communication between FS and BLM
- All believed in the mission: what we're doing now is for future generations.
- They had a focused goal.
- The working group met with several interest groups and agency leaders met with groups individually to support the effort. The group laid the foundation for better relationships among user groups.
  
- When the decision was made, the EIS team broke up.
- Interagency OHV Working Group has taken 2 monitoring trips each year since 2001. They look for hot spot issues, provide advice, and give reports to the Regional Forester and State Director for BLM.
- Education – OHV subcommittee on laws, and what ethical OHV riding is. Developed 70 displays and put in vendors across MT. Developed two tabletop displays for conferences, etc. Brochures, OHV youth curriculum
  - 12 OHV trunks that contain curriculum with role playing equipment (gear, bars, etc.). They are used in MT and out of state.
  - "On the Right Trail" video

The State, through their grant program, helped produce educational brochures, etc.

The group will next put together a strategy to identify routes for motorized use as these public lands move toward designated routes. Also provide training and help with implementation policy.

*First Session Questions:*

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Q: Tri-state process. What clear changes have you seen on the ground? Lessons learned from this? Where and how far have you gotten with implementation?

A: Monitoring trips. Go and look. Talk to managers. There are new routes that have been developed. Definitely a reduction of off-road traveling. Goal was to do site-specific planning on the local level. It would have been better to put time frames on designations, but due to budget constraints, it was difficult. It was planned to be an interim direction, followed by a close up suitability of local areas.

Q: Since the decision has been signed to limit off-road travel, how has it gone? Did it include enforcement?

A: There was nothing specific about enforcement. They did a lot within training about how to enforce and educate. The interagency working group has 2 law enforcement officers who have given presentations to law enforcement. It was established that it would be difficult to enforce. They were hoping that people would follow the rules. Developed new signs to post on new trails that read "not an authorized trail." Educational brochures – "this is what we mean by cross-country, off-trail, travel."

Q: When you develop education program – do you have a means of measuring success? Monitoring?

A: They have discussed it and are trying to see how effective education is. You measure success on the ground. Where they have user groups, they are self policing. They rely on the program leaders on the ground to give them feedback. There are less new trails.

Q: As you move into the route designation process, are you going to develop route designation criteria? Inventory? How will you bring user needs?

A: Yes – they are working on travel plans with groups. They are doing an inventory of trails. This includes the Montana EIS. It is difficult to display no action – it drives the forest to do inventories. "Here is our best effort to display the trails at the time of the rule." The national implementation team will be providing guidelines. No overreaching direction.

*Second Session Questions:*

Q: What is your sense of success in eliminating cross country travel?

A: Generally managers observe that there are much fewer new routes being created.

Q: Are the environmental educational efforts measured for effectiveness?

A: No, education is not currently being measured for effectiveness. Grant funds have been devoted to product development and not monitoring. Interagency Group did agree that monitoring was needed but has not undertaken it.

**Daphe Green, California Off-Highway Stakeholders Round Table**, followed with a discussion of California's sophisticated effort of agency and public interest groups – recreationists, ecological, law enforcement, private landowners and others - from across the state.

Daphne Greene has been Deputy Director for 1 year.

- Complicated issues – large number of acres in system. There are 8 dedicated state vehicular recreation areas, 6 of which are highly managed. Give grants to local counties and federal agencies. It is a big program with lots of interest.
- The deputy director is appointed by the governor. Previous deputy director looked at the past problems, and decided that it would require collaborations. Set up working group

**Working Group**

- In the early 1990s, the state decided that a stakeholders group was needed to advise them on its large OHV program. The initial gathering was not an official act; it was just to get those who need to be there at the table.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Today this has grown to a formalized 50-member organization with 37 organizations (wide range – Law enforcement, environmental, mountain biking, user groups, industry, local rule, BLM, FS, etc.) It was formed as an advisory group and a lot of work has focused on legislation.
- First two meetings without facilitator were very split. Lisa Beutler came in as facilitator after this and developed a charter (goals, background, membership, rules of behavior/ ground rules). Group has been phenomenal. Set a sunset date – deadline they had to be successful by. Group split into workgroups. Has been instrumental. Members of legislature are interested in OHV issues. Consensus recommendations are well respected by the state legislature.
- This group works on legislation related to OHV funding and other issues including sound, trespass, etc. Also the group works to keep the dialog generally open across the state.
- Caucuses. Each group is a caucus (motorized, non-motorized). During some meetings, they identify 3 issues to discuss and split into caucuses. Some times groups are mixed up. They wanted to have consensus-based agreements.
- Grandfather clause and issues of noise.
- Money set aside for restoration of land. Issues may be difficult at first, but are vital for long-term. ATV safety – provide training.
- What are standards that people can work with? Support?
- Each member is responsible for having a dialog with his or her organizations.
- Growing pains?? Legislation and deputy director changes. What do we do about human waste where we can't provide facilities, how do we deal with advertising? Cyclical. Challenges – people not included. How do you recognize everyone that needs to be in the roundtable?
- Gets together once every two months. There are considering meeting more frequently. Large state. Group has been successful working with law enforcement. We meet in Sacramento. State will sometimes provide funding.
- Respect, friendship. Created an underlining respect for each other.
- Governor supports
- 18 million dollars are allocated to counties by a 7 member politically appointed commission. Slated to be abolished. Trying to get politics aside.
- Goal – try and get the best clarifying OHV plan possible.
- How were people selected? It was the decision of the past deputy director. He identified people he knew, and people that needed to be at the table. Maybe it's time to adjust who is at the table. Fundamentally it is about relationships, but change is good.
- Although the group is working well, there is always room for improvement. For example, because the population is growing quickly, it is difficult to get one member to represent the whole state.

*First Session Questions:*

Q: Is the roundtable open to the public? Agenda

A: The roundtable will be around for a long time. It is not open to the public. Members can bring a guest, as long as group knows in advance. The agenda is based on input from the group. It is important that the stakeholders develop the agenda. We know what the issues are that are driving us apart. Pressing issues from the outside. When time isn't used effectively, the stakeholders have not felt like they are respected. Keep in mind that people have different agendas. It is a division group and there is certain information that they need to get out of it.

Q: How much money has it cost to establish? What would it take for other states to do?

A: We recognize that we are privileged with funding. Currently being audited. Without it we end up in court. It costs a lot, but is invaluable. Demanding process because it is demanding. I think other states can do it. Funded by gas tax, green sticker fee, parks fee.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Stakeholders group has spawned new relationship. It has carried on into a non-stakeholder process. Trying to move all NF's in CA in one direction with the new designation. System to provide recreation opportunity and helping recreation as a whole.

Question and Answer:

Q for Montana group: Collaboration is about bringing everyone to the table. Stakeholders need to be involved early – participate in creating the NOI, monitoring. Why were they not involved?

A: We (FS) are learning how to work with the public. Traditionally we have put out the end result; ask for comments ahead of time. Now they are included well before. Regulations are the same across the agencies. Great success. It was different than a full collaboration.

Q for Daphne: In the FS we struggle to develop a stakeholder group limited. Did you have any problems with stakeholders being at the table, and then returning to their group and getting ostracized?

A: One of the requirements of stakeholders is that they had some decision-making power within their group. Leadership is vital. Representatives need to be leaders. Provided cohesiveness. They need to understand their communities before, so they won't have problems after.

*Second Session Questions:*

Q: Has the CA Round Table group size always been so big?

A: Yes. But the group has several committees so it does not seem that big.

Q: How often does the CA Round Table meet?

A: About every other month.

Q: How do changes in the organization's members affect stability of the CA Round Table?

A: Actually, it is very stable and only six changes have occurred in the past five years.

Q: What are some examples of decisions made by the CA Round Table?

A: Group has been very active in recommendations for the new legislation including setting funds aside for land restoration work, education, sound levels and bail schedules.

Q: How are the relationships of the CA Round Table?

A: The stakeholders have relationships away from the table and work together as a result of sitting at the table.

Q: How are the CA educational efforts being monitored for effectiveness?

A: They are not being monitored except, for example, by tracking OHV violations we identify hot spots that need focused educational efforts.

Q: What will be the next step for the CA Round Table? Will there be an effort to undertake, for example, looking at public lands and are they developing designated routes?

A: No. The group is focusing on other state wide issues like education.

Q: Does the CA Round Table seem to be at a stalemate now and do issues need to be updated?

A: After the recent legislative push and accomplishments, the group is in transition and looking at how to focus its work.

Q: In MT, SD, and ND, how is restricting travel to existing routes fair? How does one know where to ride and how is proliferation stopped?

A: There is not a map but written descriptions and pictures in a brochure demonstrate what routes to use; the public does understand it generally.

A participant commented that Student Conservation Association in Southern California has found adding public education along with trail restoration projects produces about a 90% success rate for the restoration work.

Q: Because the CA Round Table is so large, how do you bring new members in, if and when, they are needed? A: Originally the group was formed to bring the politicians together with interested public. At this point, identifying a long-range plan for the stakeholders group is probably needed and considering membership would be part of that. It would be a process sensitive to the needs of the group.

---

OHV Use and Forest Plan Revision on the Ouachita National Forest *and* Wenatchee National Forest Off-Road Vehicle Trails

Moderator: Kathleen Bond, Kathleen Bond Consulting

**Alett Little**, Forest Plan Revision Team Leader, Ouachita National Forest, Forest Service  
**Robert Flowers**, Landscape Architect, Ouachita National Forest, Forest Service  
**Vladimir Steblina**, Recreation, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Forest Service

OuachitaNF.ppt

*Notes taken during the first and second session:*

**OHV Use and Forest Plan Revision on the Ouachita National Forest**

Background:

- 1.8 million acres. 65% coniferous, 35% hardwood
- Two separate state OHV laws
- 1 of 3 National Forests in Arkansas
- OHV policy is open unless posted otherwise on the Ouachita NF
- OHV policy is closed unless posted open on the Ozark NF
- These differences cause conflict and confusion with the public. These Forests are within 5 miles of each other at one place.
- Identified OHV use as a major plan revision issue
- Consultant developed comprehensive public involvement plan.
  - Assisted with six public listening post meetings in draw areas
  - Established goals and the format for data gathering
  - Developed communication plan using free and paid media
  - Uniformed law enforcement and other FS employees
  - Results gave a clear idea of the public we served.
  - Contracted public relations company provided cookies, great icebreaker, etc. that the FS couldn't provide. They also helped with logistics
  - Hunting is considered a cultural activity. Favorite places were identified by specific a group of users.

**Wenatchee National Forest Off-Road Vehicle Trails**

What makes this program work?

Providing recreation opportunities

Quality environment for recreation

Make it easy for the person to do the right thing

Problems become less and less significant (there will always be problems)

Education is critical

Defining success. How do you know?

- The plan must be accepted by all of the participants.
- Forest Service will provide OHV opportunities.
- Trails will be FUN. \*If you don't make them fun, the public will make it fun.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Resource damage is unacceptable. If you go off trail, you will be ticketed for resource damage.
- Solve problems when they are small (don't let them get truly establish)
- Sweat the small stuff. You are dealing with future problems now (example, high speeds).
- Users will tell you (internet sites, field contact) if you are successful.

Continuing appropriations portion of budget is about 26%. For grant programs it should be around 50% to have better control and to be able to match funds.

Trail users: Trail bike, Mountain Bike, Horse Users, Hikers

- Biggest conflict is between hikers and OHM riders (more between clubs and groups than "on the ground" conflicts (because of displacement of use))
  - Mud Lake – Mountain biking has taken over OHV trail. 17% of users are hikers and backpackers, less than 2% OHV
  - No real use of quad (ATV) use.
- Lots of events (Sound checks at events)
  - Use equipment such as a speed detector, new signage (slow...education) used by OHV rangers to manage trail use. Battery powered radar gun was purchased to cut down on high-speed recreation
  - The key to avoid the creation of user-based trails is to stay ahead of the users demand
  - There are 100 forest protection officers.
  - The NW Forest Plan helped create communities.

"World class collaboration" "the standard" (more according to the OHV users)

*Questions during first session:*

Q: Thoughts about NEPA...scope of NEPA?

A: Cumulative impact issue is the big concern... environmental impacts and possibly EIS. Use conflicts are limited because routes will be added as OHV trails. Hiking and/or biking trails will remain specific to those uses. (ONF) Seasonal use issues on WNF.

Q: Enforcement?

A: County sheriffs write tickets...FS educates (WNF) Got to have a ground presence. Restoration work must be hit early before problem magnified.

*Questions during the second session:*

OHV Use and Forest Plan Revision on the Ouachita NF

Q: Is it currently completely open w/out restrictions?

A: Yes, but this will change with designations.

Q: What were the purposes of the meetings?

A: They realized that OHV policy would take over the Forest Plan timeline, so they distinguished the two. Meetings were set up (6) to prepare for the designation rules. After they discussed the designation rules, they set it aside and focused on finishing the forest plan timeline.

Q: Is there a need for wide based forest planning?

A: Our major conflict was misinformation. There was a press release inaccurately stated that all areas would close. The equestrian and OHV communities get along. There is one Jeep area in between two wilderness areas. There is a local active motorcycle group. They are working with equestrian groups on a joint project.

Q: on criteria handout

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A: They knew they needed an orderly process to designate. The recreation and engineering departments worked together. Criteria was given to districts. Districts are working on providing suggestions to the forest. Many people come from out of town during the weekend. We have a mailing list now.

*Questions and Answers - Wenatchee*

Q: What were the circumstances that allowed you to get ahead?

A: ISC Fund, and enthusiasts working with the Forest Service. Also civil engineering techs built the trails. They are well - built.

Q: How can you keep ahead of the technology?

A: Listen to people working on the ground. Quads are currently banned on roads in Washington.

Q: Bicycles? How do they pay?

A: All users pay a fee at the trailhead. (Recreation Fee Demo)

Q: If you are not ahead of the game, what can you do?

A: Go up and down the organization and do what you can with everyone. Find shared values. Same values apply to both. Use the people on the ground.

Q: What do you do [to make your program successful on the ground]?

A: I don't do anything - the people working on the ground do the work. Create a quality experience. Well-planned trails

Q: How does Mad Lake not have any social trails?

A: Motorcycle users are compliant. There are clubs with strong ethics. People don't fish and camp there, which leads to social trails.

Q: Have you had to close areas due to unacceptable use?

A: Yes, we closed one area.

Q: How do you "get the word out?"

A: Word of mouth, website, signage

Q: Do you anticipate issues when you officially designate routes?

A: Yes – NEPA part. Public consent, not agreement. Roadless areas

Q: How do you enforce rules and regulations?

A: ORV ranger is a rider on her own time. The people respect her. The most tickets issued in an area – 29 in one year.

Q: What is provided to the public at the district office?

A: Maps and brochures. (Also available on the web.)

Q: Why is funding for recreation low in the Forest Service?

A: In budget cuts, it is easier to cut funding rather than increase. It is hard for Congress to increase the Forest Service budget given other issues facing the nation.

Q: Recreation seems to be self-supporting and revenue generating. Is this advantageous or disadvantageous?

A: Collaboration. Peaceful chaos. Not process-oriented.

A bottom-up approach is successful. Consistent people are committed to the project. OHV community is funded - trails and education.

Q: Are there any volunteer groups in your area?

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A (Ouachita NF): There are no OHV groups in Arkansas – no volunteer program, adopt a trail, etc.

A (Wenatchee): Washington Trails Association – outstanding volunteers. They receive \$50,000 in funding and are trained to Forest Service standards. They go out on their own.

Q: Have you experienced opposition to the process?

A (Wenatchee): When users heard misinterpretations. Once they understood what was going on, they felt better. The key is to get problems worked out before.

Q for the Ouachita NF: Will you add trails that include user-defined trails?

A: There is a lot of logging on the Ouachita, so we have many logging roads. Our road density is high. There are not many user-defined trails.

Q for the Wenatchee: Are the trails open to all? Are all groups equally coming?

A: Yes. It is obvious by the success.

In Washington, communities are learning about the value of trails. Homes built on or near trail systems are seeing an increase in value.

---

Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership *and* Lewis & Clark National Forest–Big Snowies Access  
Moderator, Larry Fisher, Ph.D., U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution  
**Tammy Pike**, OHV Coordinator, Tonto National Forest, Forest Service  
**Bill Gibson**, Bureau of Land Management  
**Sandee McCullen**, Arizona State Parks Advisory Group; Bureau of Land Management Resource  
Advisory Council  
**Allen Rowley**, Deputy Forest Supervisor, Lewis and Clark National Forest, Forest Service  
**Sharon Metzler**, Special Uses Program Manager, Eastern Region, Forest Service

*Notes taken during the first session:*

**Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership**

- The route inventory project is a partnership of Arizona State Parks, BLM, Arizona State Lands Department, and the Forest Service. Objectives:

- Inventory of existing OHV routes in AZ for planning and monitoring
  - Public access guides and maps
  - Develop a seamless recreation experience for OHV users in Arizona
- Others who came to the table and were key to the success of the project [not a complete list]:
- AZ Game and Fish Dept.
  - Advanced Resource Solutions (creators of the “evaluation tree”)
  - AZ OHV Coalition
  - AZ Trail Riders
  - Riding Arizona
  - AZ State Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs

Some of the routes and watersheds seemed too vast to manage. We subdivided and prioritized the various areas to be inventoried (agreement was made among the public and the various agencies as to what areas should be inventoried first).

Q from the audience: Are state trust lands embedded within the federal lands?

A: Yes. That was part of the challenge! OHV use in Arizona often crosses jurisdictional boundaries. How the various agencies use and interpret the inventory data for decision-making can differ. \*No official OHV route inventories or designated routes within Arizona existed prior to this partnership.

Q: What were the benefits of this partnership and route inventory?

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A: Baseline data for recreation planning, current and future monitoring, event permitting, photo history and documentation

Q: How many miles have been inventoried?

A: 26,000 miles so far.

Q: How many photos are/were used in this process and what was the ratio?

A: Rough equivalent was one photo per mile

Q: What was the cost involved?

A: Roughly \$2 million to inventory the routes thus far. A majority of the funding has come from grants (RTP – Federal Highways, Parks and Recreation, state gas tax, etc.). The BLM and the FS did contribute money but the various grants were key to the success of the project.

Q: A lot of conservation groups were not invited to be a part of the process. As a result of the inventory, were any changes made?

Comment from Audience: Everyone should be aware that great data is available from conservation organizations. Anyone involved in a similar collaborative planning or working group process, should contact local conservation organization for data.

A: Conservation groups were a part of the process.

Q: Whose decision was it to use the Evaluation Tree model?

A: That was an internal decision – the model is tested and has been used widely.

*Side note:* The facilitator asked that, in the interest of time, the next presenter be allowed to begin and if time allows afterwards, the issue can be discussed further.

A (Sandee): I had doubts about the Evaluation Tree also. However once I started to truly learn about it and saw its application, I thought it made good sense and it seemed fair.

Audience Comment: I don't think you presented the inventory process in an objective manner.

*Questions during the second session:*

Q: How did you buy in from private property owners to do the inventory?

A: There were and still are "right-of-way" access issues. We recognize that we have no right to make any decision regarding private property. However, there were some landowners who were willing to engage in the inventory process.

Q: How does the Arizona State Land Department fit into the equation? What property do they oversee?

A: Arizona State Land Department manages 9.3 million acres. State trust lands are managed for the benefit of 14 trust beneficiaries. They are not public lands. The public can obtain permits for recreation. State trust lands require a fee for use. Trust beneficiaries include public primary schools, prisons, and state hospitals.

Q: Does the state land department realize the potential of recreational use, particularly OHV use?

A: Not a major focus.

Q: Regarding the GIS mapping info shared and obtained across the various agencies. Have there been any problems?

A: There have been some issues – mostly routing and numbering related. There are multi platforms involved and sometimes downloaded software can be problematic.

Q: Have you gotten to the collaborative/consensus stage of the process yet? And have you started discussions on actual trail designation?

A (Tammy): This particular phase of the process was to gather data and assess where exactly the current usage is occurring.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A (Bill): There are currently 7 land use planning efforts going on within the BLM in Arizona. We are in the midst of the collaborative process.

Q: How extensive is the mapping system?

A (Bill): We are just in the beginning stages of comprehensive coverage of route designation in Arizona. There is much work to be done.

Q: Have the land management agencies coordinated smoothly with the process?

A: BLM and Forest Service work together and collaborate during their route designation processes. Particular consultation is necessary when trails cross jurisdictions. Data standards and protocols are a major challenge in multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional travel management planning. The partnership has worked very hard to develop a *route inventory data dictionary*, which is acceptable to all land management agencies. Consistency in use of the data is key.

Q: Do your plans consider and allow for extreme sports vehicles?

A: Yes. BLM and Forest Service

Q: Are non-motorized and conservation organization involved in the inventory process? Will they be involved with route designation?

A: Yes. Yes.

Q: Who is paying for the maps and access guides?

A: The various agencies have contributed and support has come from grants. The sale of the maps will generate income for reprinting them.

Q: Why was Advance Resource Solutions' Evaluation Tree chosen?

A: We wanted to standardize the route evaluation process. We liked the methodology of the Evaluation Tree – it seemed very adaptive to the situation in Arizona.

Audience Comment: From a conservation perspective, the Evaluation Tree is not sufficient. For example, out of all the possible outcomes, only one actually allows for closure.

Comment: Participants who are interested in discussing the positives and negatives of the Evaluation Tree model should talk with Mr. Les Weeks, of Advanced Resource Solutions, Inc. who is attending the summit and can be found on the attendee list in your conference packet.

*Notes from first session:*

**Lewis and Clark National Forest – Big Snowies Access**

In January 2002, Lewis and Clark National Forest signed an access and travel plan for the Big Snowies mountain range in central Montana. Eight groups and ten individuals appealed the plan. The Lewis and Clark NF staff approached a number of groups and representatives (Montana Wilderness Assoc., Montana Snowmobile Assoc., Great Falls Snowmobile Assoc., Great Falls Cross-country Club, etc.) and suggested trying a collaborative process, similar to the Flathead National Forest's collaboration process, which was a success.

In hopes of resolving the pending appeal and avoid lengthy, costly litigation, a group of individuals and representatives (stakeholders) of special interest groups agreed to meet. The Forest Service provided support and logistics for the meeting but was not an active participant in the process.

The group set clear objectives to 1) address the issues involving the appeals of Big Snowies Access and Travel Management Plan AND 2) address travel planning/access in the Little Bells, Castles, an Crazy Mt ranges.

The group set out to decide where winterized motor travel could occur, where non-motorized recreational use could occur, etc. The group soon determined that there were differences

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

between winter and summer recreational use and they could only handle winter use issues at the time.

The group met 13 times between August 2002 and January 2004. One of the parties represented dropped out of the process. An agreement was signed in April 2004, which addressed winter recreation management for the Big Snowies and the Little Belt Mountain Ranges. The agreement covered two out of the four mountain range areas being considered.

Additional positive outcome: The Montana Wilderness Association and the Montana Snowmobile Association will continue to collaborate and resolve issues concerning the designation of snowmobile use.

The Central Montana Wildlands Association – an original member of the group that appealed the 2002 decision had decided not to join the collaborative process and filed a lawsuit in 2004 against the 2002 decision and against the 2004 winter recreation agreement.

Both the Montana Wilderness Association and the Montana Snowmobile Association intervened in support of the Forest Service. They are official parties in the case. The collaborative process was what made such a show of support possible. Working relationships were established and common ground was established.

Allen Rowley:

The Lewis and Clark NF staff plans to gather another group to work on summer issues.

What worked? Why?

- A nucleus of key individuals and stakeholders willing to talk and come to the table.
- The Forest Service not getting emotionally attached to the final product (answer/agreement). As long as the natural resources are protected, social issues are not a concern, from my viewpoint.
- Providing a safe setting for discussions
- Parties willing to take a chance

Work to be done

- Finish the required NEPA analysis to finalize a durable solution
- Continue to build and maintain relationships
- Solve the summer recreation travel/access plan
- Resolve the current litigation from a group that chose not to collaborate or talk (work in progress).

Lessons I learned

- People expect us (FS and other land management agencies) to protect the natural resources
- Individuals and groups not at the table may not support the final product. But this is OK. You have to start somewhere and build upon success.
- Individuals at the table may become disenfranchised from their group. We need to prepare these individuals for this possibility
- Do not get emotionally attached to a single social solution
- You need to know and share what you want from the process (i.e. not your position, your interests)

Sharon Metzler:

What I heard from the participants in this collaborative process was that:

- No one wins when you go to court. It's best to settle the situation out of court.
- There was credibility in the process and effort since the Forest Service wasn't directly leading the process.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- The establishment of ground rules really helped. Expectations and guidelines were clearly defined. The process was well thought out and the atmosphere was one of respect and dedication to problem solving.
- The participants were willing to compromise – “I can live with this proposal.”

Q: You discussed the potential of a spokesperson being disenfranchised from their group. Have you ever experienced a local group becoming disenfranchised from their national group/office?

A: Yes. It does happen.

Q: The idea that “we can live with it” – Do you think it's possible because the people felt that procedural justice had been carried out?

A (Sharon): I believe the spirit of compromise is present because the parties are committed to a solution at some level. “I won't get everything I want but I am committed to some kind of resolution”

Q: NEPA discusses the significant impact on human environment and the social benefits of restoring/maintaining environmental quality. How can the social issues not be of concern to you?

A (Allen): I believe my job is to resolve natural resource issues. I would rather defer the social issues to the public. It's better if the public/society resolves such issues. The solution to these kinds of issues is only durable if everyone – or at least most of those involved – participates.

Q: Was there any Native American involvement in the collaboration process?

A: The Big Snowies Mountain Range area is the traditional cultural area of the Crow Nation. They were invited to the NEPA process but they decided not to participate.

Q: What was the role of the media if any in the collaborative process?

A (Allen): The private groups and interests involved jointly decided not to talk to the media.

Comment (Jerry Ingersoll): Regarding land management agencies' role on social questions and issues, I think the agencies DO have a proper role to play just as in the case with natural resource issues. We should have an open dialogue concerning this.

Comment (Sharon): The Forest Service should have a role in the social issues to some degree. The Forest Service (and other agencies) should try to ensure that most – if not all – voices are heard or represented. Even if a particular group refuses to come to the table.

*Questions during the second session*

Audience Comment: The threat of litigation seemed to be the tool that brought the parties to the table in this case.

A (Allen): Each stakeholder group has to ask whether it will be more productive to collaborate or litigate. Each party has to be open to alternatives.

A (Sharon): The sooner you start to engage the stakeholders in the process, the less inclination there may be to litigate.

Q: Do you deal with right-of-way public domain issues?

A (Allen): Yes. It is a slow process and not very productive.

---

WRAP UP

**Lyle Laverty**, Director, State of Colorado, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation

*Notes taken during the session:*

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Today's wrap up. No happy talk. We have been having these discussions for decades. The organized events today are spurring discussion outside the sessions. Luther Propst's discussion was significant. The theme to be captured – there is not a standard one size fits all. New Hampshire to Wenatchee to Ouachita. The conversations lead to decisions and let's all commit to do one action. ONE ACTION,

He has been having these discussions with his park directors.  
TRUST is collaboration.  
D W Y S Y W D - Do what you said you would do.

---

---

April 12 – PLENARY SESSION

**Dale Bosworth**, Chief, Forest Service  
**[ohv\\_summit\\_chief\\_speech.pdf](#)**

*Notes taken during the session:*

Questions & Answers

Q: Poor advertising is what kids see. What can the FS do with positive campaigns? People in the industry are interested in finding better ways. Can we undertake a public service announcement campaign to counter the industry advertisements? ...Ad Council?

A: Education is key to the success of OHV recreation. Kid's education is being weakened by the overwhelming ads of industry. I firmly believe it is a small percentage of people that create the damage, but bad ads will add to the problem. I agree, I have spoken with manufacturers; some are understanding, some not so. Public service announcements on TV are not required. We could talk to the Ad Council, we might be able to pursue through that avenue. Education will be the key; we have to let folks know the consequences.

Q: What financial resources will the FS put toward the implementation of the rule and what about training for the collaborative process?

A: Training for collaboration is required for many issues. FS needs to get better. Collaboration is difficult to teach - almost an approach of collaborative learning. Recreation dollars shouldn't pay for the all of travel planning because the rule helps other ecosystem. We have limited budgets and therefore need to do better to prioritize budgets. We need to set expectations and give flexibility on where the money comes from and more efficient use of technology. We need to prioritize. Two major priorities: watershed restoration and dealing with recreation OHV management now. We need to modernize our processes so that we get better

Q: What immediate steps can we take on the ground for existing damage? Enforcement and restoration?

A: We are not getting new Law Enforcement Officers, but we can work with states and do a better job in how we use law enforcement staff. For example allowing Fish and Game to enforce OHV regulations on FS lands. We need to do a better job of using law enforcement – hitting a hot spot and being more strategic. Restoration of user created trails...need to figure out what is out there. Once our system is established, there will be restoration needs. We know how, we just need resources. Partnering is what we need. Partners will invest if results will be sustainable. Last year we matched \$500 million to our partners' \$1 billion investment. We can do even better.

Q: Our enforcement laws, especially prohibitions, need changes – Can we get support for this?

A: Look to change the definitions and regulation...will work to change. I am supportive of making our regulations better to enforce.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Q: Concern is rule by litigation. We need a national dialog with our stakeholders to understand what they want so we do not have rule by litigation. How do we avoid this with the collaborative process?

A: Litigation is a right of groups who are dissatisfied. Litigation can become a deterrent to collaboration. Finding better ways to work together – over time, using good science, and effective techniques, should reduce litigation. Maybe we can figure out a national dialog, we are all searching for this - all want to not use litigation exclusively

Q: Are there constraints with the FS entering regional planning...is there anything that deters FS from working on a greater scale with parks, counties etc. How can we participate in a broader scale planning --- on and off forest service lands?

A: Planning works in assessment, community involvement, information gathering—all successful—but decision-making process becomes difficult, not supported. Separating out decision making is often needed. The Southern Appalachian assessment worked. The Pacific NW plan, but if we have to have the President pushing to get something every time . . .

Q: With most case studies, conservation interests were excluded or on the margins of collaboration process. Respond on exclusion? Seems that the Forest Service thinks that we are not responsible for the social conflicts.

A: FS must deal with social, environmental and economic impacts. We need more efforts in social research. Planning is a social effort. Dialogue among groups and interests. We need to have everyone at the table that wants to be there. We need to develop a way to have a respectful process.

Q: What is the FS doing to direct regional foresters to talk to interest groups?  
What is the timeline for route designation?

A: Probably around 4 years. Need a yearly schedule, follow-up and communicate. I expect a timeline, a schedule for accountability, and that there will periodic discussions and feedback on the process.

Q: How does this rule affect snowmobiles? Where are we going with snowmobile management?

A: The current rulemaking does not affect snowmobiles. We need to have consistency in dealing with snowmobile use and managing conflict. OHV has the greatest need because of the potential of the long lasting damage. We did not want to wrap too many things into the OHV rule. We certainly can better manage snowmobiles. Whether that requires a national rulemaking, I do not know. Part of the challenge is to figure out the national role.

Q: What role do you envision for the agency...what role does the public play in that vision?

A: We should not only be responding to public opinion. It should be incorporated but not drive the FS vision. Should not be smug that my values are the right values. Core value should be based on what is available for the next generations.

Q: Population disconnected from the landscape. How can the FS help rebuild a land ethic?

A: Using the National Forests as a model or classroom. By helping to educate people in land ethic. Too many people think water comes from the tap and wood comes from Home Depot. Programs that are not funded well...e.g. community and urban forestry. Use these areas to show people value of green spaces and planting trees. We shouldn't be building FS offices that are not green. We need to be a demonstration or model. Responsibility to provide leadership.

## THEMED DISCUSSION GROUPS

### BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS

**Debra Whittall**, Collaboration and Policy Analyst, National Partnership Office, Forest Service

**Cindy Pandini**, Director of Marketing and Communications, National Forest Foundation

*Notes taken during the session:*

**Debra Whitall, National Partnership Office, National Forest Service**

- Discussed the importance of partnerships and the ways the national partnership office supports the FS.
- Check out the Partnership Resource Center: [www.partnershipresourcecenter.org](http://www.partnershipresourcecenter.org) A great resource for all of you. It includes tools for developing, evaluating and maintaining partnerships.
- One of the tools- Partnership Guide was written for FS employees and existing or potential partners. It conveys what partnerships are, answers common questions about the agency's policies and procedures, helps partnerships anticipate potential hurdles, and provides contacts and other resources to help users find more specific guidance.
- The Partnership Assessment

**Cindy Pandini, National Forest Foundation (NFF)**

- NFF is a key cooperater in building capacity with local partners and can assist with fund raising, donor recognition policies, leveraging the private sector and reaching out to new audiences.
- Review of various types of grants including the Matching Awards Program (MAP) and the Community Assistance Program.
- **"Friends of the Forest" Program** is web-based information about national forest issues to the interested public. See [www.becomeafriend.org](http://www.becomeafriend.org)
- **The Centennial Conservation Awards Program** This particular program (\$3 million) targets projects, which are addressing "four threat" issues. Corporate matches will be immediately met.

Questions / Discussion

Q: What about strings attached to corporate partnerships?

A: NFF has very clear limits about the expectations for sponsorship. The better business bureau has a rating system and judges non-government organizations on success of using partnerships and the NFF scores well.

Q: How can we set up stakeholders groups with less bureaucracy and not crossing FACA laws?

A: NFF can help organize a coalition to discuss issues; Forest Service is a participant along with others and NFF organizes the meetings. If interested, please explore further with NFF.

Q: How can NFF help with more holistic planning – FS and all other landowners?

A: An example of the Rogue River Basin was discussed. A council realized that similar data and information was needed and group first worked to achieve seamless data and maps. This coordinated effort helped look at the whole of the watershed.

Q: What are incentives for the public to participate in OHV collaboration?

A: A general brief discussion that there must be benefits and they really exist. For example, the business owners that perceive that designation will change the economic contribution by OHV recreations. The group discussed the possibility of bringing in an outside consultant to present information and discuss the change. Also, that we need more flexible partnerships to allow OHV volunteer groups to manage, not just maintain, OHV trail systems. The San Bernardino NF volunteer program was discussed as a model for volunteering and compliance.

What else? The Washington Office is considering developing a national cadre to help set up partnerships. What about under-represented groups – how do we incorporate them through partnerships into the OHV management and other forest programs?

EVOLVING IMAGES OF OFF-ROAD RECREATION

Moderators: Lyle Laverty, State of Colorado, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation; Sharon Metzler, Forest Service

**Lori Davis**, Executive Director, TreadLightly!

**Bethanie Walder** (First Session), Executive Director, Wildlands CPR

**Vera Smith** (Second Session), Conservation Director, Colorado Mountain Club

**Dana Bell**, Project Coordinator, National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council

**Jason Laws**, Account Executive, Toyota Trucks and Motorsports

*Notes taken during the first session:*

**Lyle Laverty**

The theme of the evolving image of OHV includes the current image; what is it and why, and if it is evolving what is evolving to? The current image at best is a mixed image as to how people perceive OHV. I have been involved in numerous instances where people trash the landscape. On the opposite end I have dealt with groups that put in 1000 hours of time volunteering. Desired image folks enjoying OHV activities in a desired way. Mixed messages people receive, especially the media. People see people plow through streams. Need a consistent message.

**Dana Bell**

There are several different images for different groups. The general public is seeing the OHV community as a group with a lack of respect. Recreation groups want extreme activity. Advertising drives the image for the general public. Agency sees OHV community as demanding and don't understand the complexity and constraints of management. They also see them as good workers and help with cost of management. Agency needs to do outreach and education and interpretive information to help understand the values. Advocacy environment—demanding group is uncaring and uneducated. More leadership from the agencies is needed to bring the groups together and be facilitated by an outside entity. OHV communities see themselves as underserved, pay more than their share, and branded by a few bad apples. OHV communities need self-education, and to exert a lot more peer pressures. We need to establish more relationships. Select people to represent us. Ask agencies for the education materials. Agencies need volunteer programs available for those that want to help. Start with easy issues, for example, the needed education.

**Lori Davis**

Want to walk away with ideas for tools. Lists of actions and events TreadLightly! (TL) has held. We have not found a magic bullet. Advertising guidelines from TL. Media plays a role not just in advertising.

**Jason Laws**

Advertising is a self-monitored group with cultural sensitivity, TL approval and attorneys. Doesn't catch everything. We are doing advertising to a target market. The image should be totally blamed on the OHV industry. A few letters get a lot attention.

**Bethanie Walder**

Can't you do something about the advertising? Environmentalists see advertising as a big issue. Jeep had a 5 page add in National Geographic with a Jeep in a puddle. Snowmobile ads that are about speed. They are about the exploitation of nature by vehicles. Promoting a type of use that people think is the expected use. It is not just the ads; it is the media (pictures in magazines). What can we do about that? Guidelines (collaboration). Collaborate more on the easy things. Leadership needs to come from the OHV communities. Environmentalist can't lead the challenge. Create a forum for bad advertisers and not make it a thrill to get the award. Heavy use of public

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

service announcements. Legislations for advertising. ORV instead of OHV until they stay on the road. Defined by use and action of vehicles. Change in behavior.

Participants of the Fishbowl:

- Bulk of motorized use goes off road or trails (image in magazine). How do we change the image? What is the shared vision of what the image/behavior should be?
- Societal behavior is brought to the trail. Road rage = trail rage.
- Tools to change behavior.
- Good opportunity to bring diverse groups together. What is expectable behavior for all recreation activities?
- Want mental image of responsible use.
- All recreationists should accept limits. We need to look at the land and what it can handle.
- Advertising has gotten sensationalist. It catches attention. Jeeps fully covered. Incorporate manufacturers into your collaboration and there can be a change. If you're going to complain about a group they need to be involved in the collaboration.
- You need the perception of what is appropriate when you buy these vehicles. Irresponsible advertising gives the wrong perception
- ORV representatives need to change the culture so that there is more disapproval of the damaging behavior. Peer pressure. It needs to be self-policing. In advertising - gets to place; gets off vehicle; and gets off to hike. You have access if you hike. Society is not going to allow maximum saturation of natural areas by OHV. There has to be limits.
- Problem is that when they are sold, the buyer doesn't know where they can and can't go.
- Public pays attention. The environmental community does not believe the 1% of bad apples. There are conflicting feelings that the OHV community is cleaning up their act. OHV is visible form recreation, very small form of recreation. Most people see OHV users extremist.
- Images are defined by the public. Extreme behavior has become the norm. Nintendo generation is coming of age...those games are extreme. Need to bring the industry on board. For example, the alcoholic beverage industry and the drinking and driving issue.
- Should the agencies issue permits for ads made on land? Agencies responsibilities? Yes they need permits from county government and land management agencies.
- How can you improve the image of vehicles that do violence to the land, air, soundscape, etc.? It will be hard to clean up the image.
- The majority of OHV users don't belong to clubs. There is a lack of leadership within the ORV community. Peers will lesson to other riders. OHV needs to come up with
- OHV users are their own worst enemy. Still the majority of users are responsible. Industry wants the land to remain healthy. Advertising is unacceptable. Land Rover has been relatively good with advertising but involved with agencies. Manufactures need to educate advertising agencies.
- Educating ad agencies is difficult. There are lots of turnover and lots of agencies to have systems that protect the client.
- There are places that are legitimate for OHV use.
- Mixed feelings about advertising. Do ads create values or do the values create the ad? Maybe it is truly the loss of the land ethic and a relationship with the land. Land management agencies need to re-examine the land ethic message and modify it for today's society.
- Today our society is so disconnected with the land.
- New ATV riders don't have the right compass. People are not joiners.
- Education and its values. Want to change behavior. We need to tell them more about the why on rules and regulations.
- We live in a sound byte society. 15 seconds to communicate the why
- Website issues: threatened and offensive materials on the web. That is where new users are going. This leads to attitude of lawlessness and recklessness. Atmosphere of us vs. them
- Courts are not supportive of law enforcement actions in some areas. Pick on the judicial step as well as. It is important to sustainability of the recreation.
- OHV community needs to be a lot more proactive than they have been.
- Why isn't a drivers licenses required?

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Dealers need to be proactive and education.
- MIC is working for consistent laws fines and penalties across land management agencies for every user group.
- Utilize programs that are in place.
- Common signing over different managed lands to help in the education.
- Some type of program to educate users...for instance to get a pass you go through a class.

*Notes taken during the second session:*

**Dana Bell**

Different groups have different images of OHV recreation. The general public perceives us as a community who has lack of respect of others and the environment - extreme action and behavior. OHV public needs to educate groups and use peer pressure. Establish relationships with media and other groups. Land agencies perceive OHV users as a demanding group and don't understand the complexities of their job. Need education in land ethic and to rules and regulations. Environmentalists think we are uncaring and uneducated. OHV users are demanding. OHV interests need environmentalist participation to understand their needs. OHV users see themselves as underserved, pay more than their share, and bad apples brand the group. We need more self-education and to select leaders to participate in collaborative processes when those arise. Education from agencies and volunteer opportunities are available. Start with the easy.

**Lori Davis**

Image of advertising is conversation in itself. When you close your eyes what is your image of OHV users? Who is it and what are they riding. We are lumping the various users together...one group may be doing more damage to the image than another. Media role in image. What's in between the ads in magazine, and the commercials on TV? Huge complex issue. It is education...the feds, corporations, ad agencies, and media.

**Vera Smith**

Obvious advertising...the land speaks for itself. Our communities' perception of the OHV community is that they play on the ground and leave a "wake" behind them. The image is exasperated by what they see out there. It may result from one encounter. Advertising--these machines are marketed for thrill. Conclude that the advertisers use tools and public input to drive advertising. This is a perception. The general perception is that the work of OHV community on the trail is to serve their own community not for the whole. Not for the next generation as a holistic approach. Until behavior shifts the image will not shift. One action item - users groups should create an annual award for worst advertising.

**Lyle Laverty**

Image is changing...what are the perceived images? What is the desired image? What should it be? What actions to achieve that image? Image is perhaps mixed...print media, perception of the ads. You buy that machine and the buyer thinks that is what you expect to do. Still we have responsible users...volunteerism 1000 of hours towards restoration work. Comes down to social values. Road rage translates to trail rage.

**Jason Laws**

Advertising is a self-monitored industry. Job is about sales. Target market is the ADD generation. They are all over the place. It is ok to go overboard. It's not ok to jump a truck but its ok to jump 40 feet because it is not realistic. Cultural sensitivity, Tread Lightly, legal before it goes to the client...to engage the customer but not offend anyone (not necessarily the target market for the sake of the larger market). Media has a responsibly also. Consumers have power...write a letter to manufacturer to get an advertisement pulled.

Participants of the Fishbowl:

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- We live in a sound byte environment. We need to affect and change behavior. No land ethic. People are separated from the land.
- This is not just unique to the OHV community. The ethic goes to a broader group of users.
- ADD generation...Instant thrill
- Advertisers and media are driving the thrill. People are going out and trying.
- Image= perception; Value = belief.
- Image is driven by the dollar. Look at it in a broader spectrum. How does industry become relevant to society with a land ethic?
- What are the long-term consequences? The consequence is going to be that these lands are going to be closed unless we change behavior. We need to everyone to change the behavior.
- What is expected out recreation? How is it expected to impact the land, industry?
- General public has a certain image of OHV users. Outside of users or those that care about OHV users and their impacts--General public doesn't know or care. Real problem is not advertising but the 1-5% of people who are irresponsible.
- Back to values...we live in a throw away society...no land ethic.
- Maybe provide an area that it is acceptable for them extreme sports and other areas where it is not appropriate. Provide different activities to hit every interest.
- How do you educate the 5% that they will grudgingly respect the environment?
- Every group has bad apples. OHV community needs to blacklist those that are the bad apples.
- Advertising is a part of the image. Those that don't recreate with or around OHV use are getting the image from media.
- Disconnect between how the product is used and how it is showed.
- Peer pressure can work to change behavior.
- Why not require special licenses or other required education program? Find channels to implement education program. Use incentives to education programs
- Responsible use. Never defined responsible. OHV groups damage control to limit loss of access. Is educating responsible use or bad advertising?
- Responsibility goes beyond staying on the trail including respect for others.
- How can we move from damage control to the land ethic?
- Need collaboration to close pioneered trails and improve opportunities else where on maintained trails. There is a deep regard for the outdoors and the environment in OHV users.
- Solution needs to across agency boundaries.
- OHV users are our own worst enemies. Peer pressure is enormous. If closures are there because of abuse it is our own fault.
- Bad advertising should be penalized. For manufacturers, hit them in the wallet to change advertising agencies.
- Outreach from agencies to public...OHV community needs to reach to the agencies. Generalize perceptions ...we reach below the expectations. If we raise our expectations maybe behavior will change.
- Challenge...user community does great job volunteering...maybe improve advocacy. OHV community can step up to change the image. Self-policing on the trail and in policy.
- Why can't states partner with feds...with regulations managed by state...whether paid or not? Get the regulations to the public. Number one problem is, where to go and not go.
- Need to have the opportunity to educate the public.
- Issues of balance...in CA provide enforcement, restoration, and education. Collectively we need to look at recreation as a whole.
- All comes back to the land ethic...can the next generation use the land?
- Maybe we look at capacity and carrying capacity in OHV use on trails. Limits on use to protect the resource
- OHV use is an urgent problem. Can we wait for the solutions? It is an issue everyone is struggling with because it is new and isn't part of the framework of the agencies management.

---

EMERGING POLICIES IN OHV MANAGEMENT

Moderator: Kathy Mick, California State Parks

**Daphne Greene**, Deputy Director, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation, California State Parks and Recreation Department

**Jerry Ingersoll**, OHV Program Manager, Recreation and Heritage Resources, Forest Service

**Anna Atkinson**, National OHV Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management

[Emerging\\_Policies.ppt](#)

[BLM Land Management Strategies.ppt](#)

*Notes taken during the session:*

**Anna Atkinson**, National OHV Program Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management

[BLM Land Management Strategies.ppt](#)

- Will talk about Travel Management
- Anna's background – worked with OHV issues on the local level (field offices – Palm Springs), state level (Nevada – 48 million acres, 39 of which are open to cross country travel, air quality issues), and currently on the national level.
- On the national level, she is working on the challenges ahead in travel management. The west has changed, the population has increased and demographics have switched. Urban expansion. Public lands provide opportunities and conflict.
- 2001 National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use – received 14,000 public comment letters.
- The National Mountain Bicycling Strategy Action Plan (November 2002) helped the ground with direction for management on ethics, education, and trails.
- Priorities for Recreation and Visitors Services (purple book). Goals – improving access and partnerships
- 2004 National Recreation Forum held to have people help the BLM set priorities.
- Goal for 2006 – try to get money to the field (\$2.2 million), improve access and transportation
- Seamless signing strategy. Colorado has been a front-runner.
- BLM wants to put more maps on the website, like the Forest Service has done.
- Comprehensive Travel Management. What is it? How do we accomplish it? Addresses all resource use and accompanying modes and conditions.
- Land Use – BLM is updating land use plans. 70 of 162 Resource Management Plans have Travel Management as an issue.
- Travel Management proposes a big workload. Funding is necessary. We will continue to work with partners and to share a vision.

Clarifying Questions:

Q: Regarding Special Use Permits – new guidance. Will there be clarification?

A: Handbook isn't as specific as needed. There is a team of people working on specific issues.

Q: Funding for travel management planning?

A: No new money. Encourage finding money and utilizing volunteers. Plan to work with the Forest Service 2006-2007. Pulling in other disciplines other than recreation.

Q: The Forest Service Chief mentioned imposing schedules and accountability to Forest Service Districts. Is there similar leadership within the BLM?

A: [No comment]

Q: Referring to an internal memo and RMP that may conflict with new handbook, which says to do it if you have time, rather than comprehensive direction. How do you respond to offices?

A: Travel Management is new. BLM hasn't put out good guidance yet. We are working on it. Training. We need to get guidance to the field. There is flexibility in the field offices. We will encourage developing management route and trails. We are still allowing the field to take time, if they are setting up criteria.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Q: Is there any talk of converting old open pit coalmines into recreation areas?

A: I haven't heard of any. Good Point

**Jerry Ingersoll**, OHV Program Manager, Recreation and Heritage Resources, Forest Service  
[Emerging\\_Policies.ppt](#)

- Has worked for 18 years, mostly as a Forest Planner (Arkansas, Nevada, Colorado); last 6 years as the District Ranger in Ketchikan, Alaska
- Current position – OHV Program Manager – is a new position in the Forest Service. During the last few years, the Chief and others have been talking about unmanaged recreation, especially OHV recreation. They made the priority real by creating this position to spearhead the final rule.
- Planning Rule changes paradigm. Forest plans will be strategic goal-setting documents, not rules and regulations. More emphasis is on projects. Requires different ways of engaging the public.
- 4 Threats (unmanaged recreation is one)
- New OHV Rule (final rule later this year). Key themes. Maps with national consistency (symbols, etc.). Maps on the web.
- Funding – In the past, the BLM and Forest Service managed roads through timber. Now, roads are part of recreation needs.

#### Clarifying Questions

Q: Recreation Fees. What state are the guidelines for implementing the Recreation Enhancement Act?

A: Major effort in the last few months. Internal and Agency directives. The Chief is encouraging us to move forward, but be cautious and conservative.

Q: Are there cost concerns with the new OHV rule? Direction on NEPA?

A: Huge discussion. Huge variation from National Forest to National Forest. If route designation has been recently incorporated into travel plans, there will be no need to redo. In areas that are completely open, there will be a need for public involvement. It doesn't get us out of legal obligations (NEPA).

Q: I am worried about rapid implementation with no or little funding?

A: The Forest Service budget won't change. We will be prioritizing and reallocating to take care of it. Other work may be deferred.

Q: Penalty for failure to complete designation?

A: We won't manage by penalty. Stress accountability within the Forest Service. We need to put consequence on management, not the public.

Long term funding. We have a maintenance back log. For designating new trails (from user-created), there needs to be money for maintenance. We need to work together.

Q: Is the cost of NEPA a stumbling block?

A: If we see trails as mitigation of other goals (water, etc.). Trails become mitigation and a solution. Creative thinking and commitment is needed.

**Daphne Greene**, Deputy Director, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation, California State Parks and Recreation Department

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Comes from the private sector. Transition to the state government has been difficult. Private sector philosophy – “we need to get it done.” Learning that there is a reason why we need to go slow sometimes.
- 278 California State Parks. 8 OHV Recreation Areas, 6 of which are highly managed.
- Allocates funds, partners with BLM and FS. This is important because a lot of land is federal.
- The change in population has had an impact. By 2036, it is estimated that the population will grow by 19 million.
- We are proud of the work that we have done with the FS in Region 5 on route designation funds. \$8 million. 80% of inventory is complete.
- Establishment of Restoration Account. How do we maintain trails? If a trail is put to bed, it needs to stay that way. Funding for the long term needs to be there.
- Noise standard. How do we and Law Enforcement work with manufacturers? We have almost completed a noise study – how much lower can we go?
- Grants. Program started as an understanding that there is a partnership. The commission is going to change (political appointees). Improving. Now apply for a truly competitive program. It will have an impact – criteria, scoring, funding guidelines. This will have an impact on the ground. Good quality programs. Volunteers are important.
- Illegally made vehicles are an extremely important issue. Funding source (fuel tax). When we don't have accounting on vehicles, it is difficult. It is important to work with all private organizations.
- Grants Program has had a sunset. It will in 2007. There is a possibility that there needs to be a permanent part of the program established.
- Private land trespass issues. Legislation is looking at crime for trespass.
- Try to get issues back to stakeholders – we need to make sure legislation works.
- We have many challenges

Clarifying Questions

Q: In California, 90% of OHV use is on public lands. 1 million OHV produced per year. We are running out of space. Any movement for planning for the future? Additional land?

A: Problem with checker boarding. Looking at ways to secure land. Identified 3 parks for establishment. Discussion necessary. Speaks to need for developing a collaborative process. Ethic – respect – needs to be established.

Q: Restoration money. Does money go unused due to the difficulty of paying for EAs?

A: Last year \$5.8 million spent in restoration. All had proper documents. Funds can be used towards NEPA. All money was used. If projects are there, then money can be sent.

Q: Applaud Daphne on her efforts and the benefits to the state. Trail maintenance is so important. Is there an emphasis?

A: Moving forward to change. What is the point of maintaining a trail that is a bad trail? Joint project. If there is a problem with the trail, you can put it to bed, but with a new sustainable well-made re-route.

Projects are contingent upon funding. The gas tax study will have serious implications and impacts.

Q: When will the preliminary results of the gas tax study be released?

A: Probably September/October

Question & Answer

Q for Anna: Cost Share (cost recovery cost for permitted events on BLM land). How and when will it be used? Guidelines? Caps?

A: Costs are forcing small groups not to do events due to the high cost share. That is not the intent. We are working hard to get guidelines out. It is expensive to monitor big events. With smaller groups, hopefully we can work with them.

Q for Jerry: The BLM is embracing comprehensive Travel Management. Is there guidance for comprehensive planning in the upcoming Forest Service OHV Rule? This robs stakeholders of collaboration.

A: Forest Plans are more comprehensive. Forest Plans trying to make specific plans at that level get gridlocked. Try not to make detailed decisions in forest plans. OHV Rule – we believe there is a need for framework focusing on motorized use. In designating this, there are trade-offs and benefits for other uses and users.

Q: A few forests are doing travel management plans and Forest Plans. The travel plans are driving the forest plan. When we do broad plans, we don't want to rethink the individual plans.

A: We have to do both. Make programmatic and site-specific decisions. You can't wait until the Forest Plan is finished to do anything on the ground. Think at both levels and the same time.

Q: What are the main differences between the Forest Service and BLM plans?

A (Anna): Snowmobiles are part of the Travel Management Plan.

A (Jerry): Snowmobiles are included under an executive order that we all follow. The proposed new OHV rule doesn't include snowmobiles in designations.

Q: Designation concerns with the differences between agencies. I would like to see consistency between the FS and BLM in process. How will changes be made in the future?

A: BLM route system can be made in RMP and are appealable. Change through EA, not plan amendment.

A: FS. Not a system for all time. There are provisions for revision. The idea is to establish a baseline. Policies won't be identical but are working to be consistent.

---

CASE CLINIC: SOUTHEAST IDAHO TRAIL SYSTEM (Lost River Recreation Trailway)

Moderators: Kathleen Bond, Kathleen Bond Consulting and Larry Fisher, Ph.D., U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

**Lahsha Johnston**, Regional Conservation Associate, Idaho Office, The Wilderness Society

**Dave Claycomb**, Off Highway Recreation Coordinator, Idaho Parks and Recreation

**Ernest Lombard**, Chairman, Idaho Parks and Recreation Board

*Notes taken during the session:*

Larry: This case study is still a work in progress. The session will take an informal problem-solving approach, where in all comments, suggestions and recommendations are welcome.

Dave Claycomb asks the group: Who here feels it is a good idea to have designated routes on Forest Service lands? [Everyone raised his/her hand] At least we all agree on one point before we delve into the topic further.

There is a rapid growth of OHV use in Idaho. Idaho Parks and Recreation (IDPR) began to look at this trend of increased use and decided to explore the creation of a trail system, which would provide designated OHV opportunities and help manage such use.

- In 2002, IDPR proposed a joint effort with federal and state land management agencies, cities, counties, other interest groups and stakeholders to develop an OHV management plan for the Lost River Basin.
- The IDPR staff looked at other trail systems and felt the Paiute trail system in Utah would be a good model because it is popular with OHV enthusiasts.
- The committee of agencies and other interest groups identified a specific route (500 mile loop trail system which would consist of existing roads and trails) and then hosted a series of public meetings for feedback.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- The idea behind the designated trail system was to help manage current and future OHV use on public lands and while providing economic opportunities for the rural, local communities (which could provide services to trail users).
- The series of public meetings provided a wide range of responses. The public requested more time and opportunity to formulate their thoughts and concerns. IDPR allowed for written comments to be submitted. Many issues became apparent from the public feedback:
  - Concerns for wildlife was the most prevalent issue
  - Enforcement of issues – manpower and money
  - The proposed trail's proximity to a Wilderness Study Area
  - Some of the public wanted only non-motorized travel.
  - Impact on resources

It also became apparent from the public meetings that a baseline inventory or collection of data was necessary and funding sources needed to be explored and secured.

- The necessary baseline information was obtained from the various land management agencies and the start-up costs and funding was secured through grants.
- IDPR then submitted a formal proposal.
- BLM indicated that they would require some level of NEPA analysis.
- FS stated the proposal was compliant with their travel plan so no NEPA analysis was required from their perspective.
- Idaho Transportation Department stated that the necessary permits needed to be obtained.
- The Lost River Highway District stated that the proposed route couldn't cross over a highway.  
\*\* This is a serious barrier to their proposal and needs to be addressed further.
- Visit [www.idahoparks.org](http://www.idahoparks.org) and type in "Lost River" in the search function field to get more information on this subject.

Lahsha Johnston

Trail Proposal Concerns:

- Are the economic costs vs. benefits of the trail worth it?
- Would there even be a benefit to the local communities?
- Impact concerns on natural resources and wildlife.
- Would the land management agencies truly have the funds to manage a 500-mile trail system?
- Concerns for existing trails. There is no current route-by-route assessment and designation of the existing trails. No NEPA analysis has ever been conducted. The current trails have been grandfathered in. Hence, a thorough analysis, which identifies current problems and cumulative impact effects on existing trails, is lacking.
- The agencies can't manage the existing/ current use now – How will they manage and maintain a new route?
- Many rural communities feel the trail system will negatively impact their way of life.
- Alternatives need to be discussed and considered with all the stakeholders. We need to take a step back and ask: Is designating a large route the best way to address existing use?

In summary, the key is; location, location, location.

- Only one location and trail system was presented.
- Local communities and counties are hurting economically. The trail system could negatively impact the communities and resources.
- If you build it, they will come. People outside the area and state will come and heavy traffic will ensue.

Dave argued that it would provide some economic opportunity. People are coming regardless. We need to manage the unprecedented growth in OHV use.

Ernest

- The concern Lahsha raises can all be turned into positives. The area is economically depressed; the designated trail system would bring business to the area.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- The biggest challenge to the proposal is tackling all the different jurisdictions the trail system covers. Highway crossing and access is a serious issue and gaining permits will be challenging.
- The trail system addresses the needs of OHV users in the area. It's better to map designated areas for management rather than have the current situation – open use with no parameters.

Questions and Answers

Q: We have a 200-mile cross-country ski system. Held up as a model out of 35 fee areas in our state. When you designate an OHV route, many users tend to wander and explore off the trails. Surrounding areas are affected. How do you enforce the damage of surrounding areas?

A: Cross-country skiing has less of an impact (non-motorized).

Q: Has any NEPA analysis been done on that cross-country ski trail?

A: No.

Q: Why is the Wilderness Society fighting this route designation?

A: No NEPA analysis has been done on the BLM routes currently used (grandfathered). The cumulative impact to the surrounding area is not known. For the California statewide motorized trail system, NEPA analysis was done. The environmental community looked at the environmental impact on the areas currently in use.

Dave: Whether you designate trail system or not, people will come. Let's prepare for it.

Audience Comment: NEPA requires analysis of the best possible data. Involve the public. Decision should be made by the authorized officer who can take responsibility.

Kathy: There is a challenge of dealing with multiple jurisdictions and public opinion.

Lahsha: The decision making mechanism is lacking if issues arise. The problem is a lack of accountability by multi-agencies and multi jurisdictions.

Audience Comment: There seems to be a lack of tools and mechanisms to assess and analyze such a large area. The Scenic Byways process may be a good model to use. How it is designated is a very collaborative process. Seems to be some trust issues with conservationists regarding the agencies and their decision making process.

Dave: Trust issues do go both ways. Probably should have included the Wilderness Society sooner in the process but did not want to get stalled.

Q: Does the interior west all have to look the same? There are differences between a water-based community and a cross-country community. The state wants to promote economic opportunity and tourism. What is the problem?

A (Lahsha): Our concerns include the impact on the communities' rural way of life and location issues. Is a motorized trail the highest and best use of the current land? Does it meet the needs of the community? Ranching communities and logging communities do not want to be effected. Looking at the impact to livelihood and way of life, including environmental and economic impacts on the land is important. The Forest Service and BLM have a 500-mile trail that needs to be analyzed. I am disappointed by their response.

Kathy: I would like to compliment you on your "agree to disagree" disposition. Does this case trigger NEPA?

Q: Was NEPA analysis done on the Paiute Trail?

A (Dave): I don't believe so.

A (Ernest): It evolved over time.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Q: The question then, was it piecemeal NEPA or the overall big picture NEPA?

A: We had to do a Cumulative Effects analysis first on the outside area of the actual route designation in our trail designation efforts.

Lahsha: The Forest Service and BLM talk to one another about the current trail system and existing use. IDPR has taken the lead, not the agencies. Do we solve the problem by designating this trail? Let's look at possible alternatives. I would like the agencies to look at the current use and then look at next steps. I would like to see a commitment to money, enforcement, and looking at actual impacts.

Audience Comment: A giant step backward is needed to look at the needs and interests of the local communities. The agencies should focus on an agreement of an overall vision and solution with effected communities, rather than a specific proposal.

Dave: My focus is to propose opportunities for off-highway vehicle use. No one is offering solutions. Rather, people seem to just respond to proposals and then criticize it.

Audience: Maybe a convener is needed to help develop a larger vision. Leadership is needed.

Ernest: You can't issue a citation unless the violation occurs on a designated trailway.

Dave: Community involvement is ideal. The fact is that not everyone is going to buy in.  
- 10 to 15% increase in OHV recreation annually.  
- 8 years out at least for BLM to have a designated trail system  
- We have to do something.

Neutral facilitators can be a true asset in the collaborative process.

---

COLLABORATION 101

**Lisa Beutler**, Managing Senior Mediator, Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento and McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific  
[Collaboration101.doc](#)

*Notes taken during the session:*

- Lisa discussed with the group that collaborative behaviors can be distinguished from a collaborative process. An effort may incorporate some collaborative practices and not actually set out to be full-scale collaborative effort. She will discuss when best to use the collaborative process vs. collaborative behaviors.
- Discussion of Ground Rules for group discussion is a foundation.
- Lisa has 8 ground rules for participants in meetings: 1) use common conversational courtesy; 2) humor is welcome and important; 3) all ideas and points of view have value; 4) the 50 mile rule – turn cell phone etc. off; 5) be comfortable; 6) spelling doesn't count 7) honor time; and 8) avoid editorials.
- Group discussed the importance of room set up which can actually structure how participants interact
- Use of breaks --- not only comfort, but building relationships. Even eating together
- She recommended asking a group "why the people are in the room" – it is because generally people come to here to change something. Clarify and pay attention to what is said.
- She reviewed the process of working in groups and know what you are trying to achieve in a meeting or public process. Is it to exchange information? Develop recommendations? Develop agreements?
- Know what the role of participants and the role of the Agency.
- Check out a "gold mine" website. Internal Association for Public Participation for many helpful tools and references <http://iap2.org/practitionertools/index.shtml>.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- Group separated into smaller groups for a group exercise which demonstrated meeting and process development before “setting out to solve a problem”.
  - She reviewed what conditions are favorable to initiate a collaborative process and stakeholder selection and criteria.
  - To identify stakeholders start with the product and work backwards. Ask stakeholders whom you know to identify.
  - Lisa ran done a list of best collaborative practices which she developed through a literature review.
  - Remember there is a spectrum of skills. A good facilitator is fine with most issues. Save the best facilitator for the most contentious issues.
  - “The cost of change needs to be less than the cost of staying the same”.
- 

EMERGING TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGY FOR COLLABORATIVE OHV MANAGEMENT

Moderator: Kristen Thrall, Recreation Solutions Enterprise Team, Forest Service  
**Bill Gibson**, Bureau of Land Management  
**Tammy Pike**, OHV Coordinator, Tonto National Forest, Forest Service  
**Jeni Bradley**, CEO/Owner, Recreation Solutions Enterprise Team, Forest Service

---

CASE CLINIC: CARIBOU TARGHEE NATIONAL FOREST TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Moderators: Kathleen Bond, Kathleen Bond Consulting and Larry Fisher, Ph.D., U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution  
**Debrah Tiller**, Landscape Architect, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Forest Service  
**Terry Sharik, Ph.D.**, Professor and Head, Department of Environment and Society, College of Natural Resources, Utah State University

*Notes taken during the session:*

The Caribou and the Targhee National Forests were administratively combined in 2000. Located in southeast Idaho, the Caribou Targhee National Forest (CTNF) contains over 3 million acres.

The CTNF completed its revised Forest Plan in 2003 and is currently developing a Travel Management Plan to address increased travel use issues. The Travel Management Plan must be consistent with the revised Forest Plan.

The Wildlife Management Institute, a national non-profit organization, was contacted by local trail users and asked to get involved in the travel plan process. They met with the Forest Service staff and then contracted the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, requesting funds and staff time to promote a collaborative process among all the trail users or interest groups. The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership ended up contracting with Utah State University's Department of Environment and Society in the College of Natural Resources to facilitate a collaborative workshop for people interested in travel management issues in the CTNF.

Due to the limited funds available, a two-day workshop was planned. The facilitation team met with various natural resource managers and land management agencies to learn about the CTNF and the issues involved with travel management and recreational activities.

Workshop Objectives

- 1) Understand the diversity of recreational travel and the variety of users on the CTNF.
- 2) Understand the potential impacts of recreational travel on CTNF.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

- 3) Provide input on travel planning process which minimizes conflict among users (motorized vs. non-motorized use) and maintains the integrity of local ecosystems.
- 4) Establish future working groups for travel planning.

Debrah Tiller

- The contractors (Utah State University Faculty) were brought into the process later – not at the beginning.
- The workshop was by invitation only. The Forest Service staff provided the names of the participants and invitees. The Forest Service did not attempt to have a diverse representation of trail users and interests.
- The invitees received a detailed agenda with objectives and goals of the workshop and a survey to be completed prior to attending.
- Over 90% of the participants were regular users of the CTNF. The 40 participants were separated into 3 groups on the first day. 1) Motorized recreationists 2) Non-motorized recreationists 3) Natural resource managers (federal and state agencies)
- The facilitators treated the agency representatives as playing two distinct roles. 1) Providers of learning resources 2) Stakeholders with an interest in the outcome

\*Facilitation team clearly laid out the ground rules or rules of engagement on the first day

- Civility
- Listen to each group. Do not interrupt.
- Questions are OK but only for clarification purposes. Cannot challenge a speaker
- The first workshop session discussions helped identify areas of agreement or common ground.
- The second day of the workshop separated the participants into mixed stakeholder groups. The groups were asked to determine travel routes and modes of travel, including alternatives, for one of the four areas identified as a key location or as being of special concern. The groups were unable to come to any kind of agreement on this exercise.
- A confidential evaluation was administered at the end of the workshop.

#### Areas of Common Agreement

Care for the land

The need for a complete inventory of roads and trails

Adequate financial resources

Increased trust and openness

Inability to determine travel routes and modes of travel was attributed to a number of reasons, such as:

- Lack of time
- Insufficient information
- Lack of trust
- Lack of accountability
- Lack of on-site visits
- Lack of enforcement (funding)
- Legal appeals
- The participants only represented a portion of users and stakeholders
- Different values

Future gains would require 1) increased trust and understanding 2) Consideration of each trail on a case-by-case basis.

\*All of the participants were willing to meet again to review the Forest Service's recommendations and to attempt to reach agreement on proposed routes.

\* The workshop proceedings were published on the Utah State University: Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism website (<http://extension.usu.edu/cooperative/iort> select "Professional

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Reports” on left side column of web page) as promised and hard copies were distributed in several public locations for comment.

Based on the post-workshop survey results the facilitators concluded that the workshop was a success in that:

- Participants had determined “next steps” to be taken
- Participants gained an appreciation for diverse perspectives
- Most participants gained a better understanding of and appreciation for the collaborative approach to planning
- Most developed an appreciation and understanding of the challenges the Forest Service faces when making decisions.
- Some participants liked the fact that the Forest Service was not leading the workshop rather it was a participant and an informational resource when necessary. However, the workshop was lacking in that a non site-specific impact was obtained for the revised travel management planning process.

Debrah: The workshop was very, very valuable. The participants were willing to learn and it was a great opportunity for the Forest Service not to be the driver, but to be a participant in the learning process. The workshop was designed to allow the participants to be the decision makers and to understand that others at the table have very different perspectives. A long-term sustainable, durable decision is needed and it can only occur if all the stakeholders are at the table and involved in the process.

Terry: Based on the follow-up evaluations, there was a clear mandate from the workshop participants to have timely follow-up. The participants were disappointed that no follow-up meetings had occurred.

Debrah: Unfortunately, the Forest Service has no resources and staff available to carry out any follow-up at this time.

Terry: Non-motorized recreationists felt they weren’t fully represented. They also stated the need for more information to make truly educated, knowledgeable decisions.

#### Questions and Answers

Q: How did you avoid FACA requirements? Even the Forest Service staff provided the names of participants to invite.

A (Debrah): It was not a Forest Service sponsored and facilitated workshop. The Forest Service was a participant and an informational resource. The Wildlife Management Institute and the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership were responsible and sponsors for the workshop. The Forest Service helped provide names for the invitation list.

Audience Comment: It’s easy to obtain agreement on the general principles, but consensus on the real specific issues becomes the major barrier. The Wildlife Management Institute website posted some very adversarial comments.

A: Both Deborah and Terry agreed and commented that the occurrence was unfortunate. However, because stakeholders can become emotionally involved and invested in their cause and viewpoint, it can be best to employ outside facilitators who will remain neutral in the collaboration process. This is why Utah State University Faculty were contracted to run the workshop. The Wildlife Management Institute agreed to the use of outside facilitators.

Audience Comment: More people are needed at the table. It is much better to have a full, open, collaborative process in the very beginning before a proposed plan of action is released.

A (Debrah): The workshop was an exercise that was limited in time and funds. Again, this was not a Forest Service sponsored event.

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

Q: Were the workshop participants made fully aware of what was actually on the table for discussion?

A: Yes. The parameters were set in advance and announced prior to the actual workshop. The focus was on route designation.

A (Debrah): The executive summary, Draft EIS, detailed appendices are on the CTNF website – Travel Management Planning Section.

Q: Was there any discussion, within Wildlife Management Institute or the land management agencies, about the risks of only having a 2-day workshop without future plans for a follow-up meetings?

A: From the Forest Service's perspective, they were a participant invited to the workshop and it was unknown as to whether future meetings would occur. The Forest Service was heavily involved with GPS routes and it did not have the resources (staff, money) to oversee or carry out any follow-up.

Q: What were the Forest Service's next steps directly after the workshop?

A: The Forest Service finished the inventory process and released a proposed action for the travel plan.

Q: How do the new Forest Service Planning Regulations affect your Forest's Travel Management Plan?

A: The new Planning Regulations are not site specific. They are generalized regulations. The ground rule is that a travel plan must work within the guidelines and regulations of the Forest Service Plan.

Q: The facilitators set the rules of engagement for the workshop. How did the participants buy into these rules?

A (Terry): The rules were clearly laid out. The participants were asked if they agreed with the rules or if they had any issues or concerns. The workshop would proceed only if there was consensus on the rules of engagement first.

Q: Did they participants have ownership in the process?

A: Yes. The process was almost all participatory.

Audience Comment: Although, in theory, the workshop participants agree to the rules of engagement, the rules or guidelines were not always honored – particularly outside of the actual meetings.

Another participant/ attendee followed up: There is always a basic agreement among the stakeholders and various groups represented regarding proper meeting etiquette and civility. However you can count on the different groups meeting separately and strategizing outside of the larger public meetings. What is critical is to let each viewpoint be heard and then have the collective whole negotiate, collaborate on what the final product will be. Outcomes and expectations need to be clearly defined.

Larry: As you listen and think about this and all of the case studies, consider how they may have been planned differently. For example, we just completed a project, which was a place-based assessment process in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in Colorado. OHV Summit Moderator Kathy Bond was the contracted, independent facilitator. The assessments were a very large undertaking that involved 55 public meetings of numerous and various stakeholders. This was a pre-NEPA convening process prior to the Forest Plan Revision. The proceedings were initially focused heavily on the social aspects and not on the substantive issues. They had to make an adjustment. During any process the participants should be willing to take a step back, re-evaluate, look at the issues in the larger context, and make any necessary modifications.

Q: What was the breakdown of the workshop participants?

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

A: There were 40 participants which were equally divided among three groups: 1) motorized recreationists 2) non-motorized recreationists 3) Forest Service and natural resource managers from federal and state agencies.

A (Terry): One interesting point is that the hunters and fishers were equally divided between motorized and non-motorized recreationists.

Comment: This workshop revealed that the public was and still is hungry for a collaborative process.

Terry: Participants need to realize that it is an evolutionary process and the way an agency may interact in the collaborative process can and usually does change.

Q: What makes the Palisades Ranger District project so different?

A (Debrah): There are a number of reasons: 1) the District Ranger is not driving the process. 2) a third party is involved (country) 3) everyone was invited to be a part of the process and everyone came to the table, and 4) the issues were not quite as polarizing.

You may never reach total consensus but you can see all the issues and hear the different perspectives and concerns. The hope and objective is that a durable sustainable decision is achieved. Sometimes the process will also clarify and possibly avoid potential litigation. All parties need to be committed to the process and the goal – no matter how difficult it may seem.

Terry: The workshop participants are still willing, and want to, meet again for collaborative purposes. The lack of follow-up or continuation has been a disappointment. Most felt the workshop was worthwhile and informative but they were left hanging. Communication and clarity about expectations, outcomes, and next steps should be defined in the future to avoid misunderstandings.

Debrah: The Forest Service, acting as a participant, believed the workshop was an invaluable learning experience. One of the positive outcomes was that the range of alternatives came from the workshop participants.

---

WRAP UP

**Dana Bell**, Project Coordinator, National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council  
**Jim Hasenauer**, Board Member and Former President, International Mountain Bicycling Association

**Daphne Greene**, Deputy Director, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation, California State Parks and Recreation Department

*Notes taken during the session:*

Three speakers were asked to summarize what their impressions of the past two days.

**Dana Bell, National, Off Highway Vehicle Conservation Council** led off with these comments: The OHV recreationists need to do a better job too. There are big challenges for the Agency and public. There is a new public out there, which is difficult to reach. It is a growing public and lands are limited. OHV recreationists can provide the leadership to bring the groups together.

**Jim Hasenauer, International Mountain Bicycling Association** continued: As a mountain biker, the meeting was a great opportunity to hear about management of public lands across those who attended. Also, as a university professor, he saw that communication has a behavior component as well as a content component. Is the language of collaboration the term de jour? What is collaboration? He noted that a democratic society demands that the public participate. He summarized some of the case studies presented and the four challenges identified: (1) working with folks that disagree is hard but it is important to acknowledge differences and conflicts (2) find

NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS  
APRIL 11-13, 2005, BAHIA RESORT HOTEL, SAN DIEGO, CA

that sense of the future and common value (3) find that specific attachment and it becomes common ground (4) time and patience are needed.

**Daphne Greene, CA State Parks and Recreation Dept.** recapped that we heard about a commitment to the land on which we recreate. Outdoor recreationists, motorized and non-motorized, need to invest in collaborative efforts to help avoid litigation. What about that 5% of the recreationists that do not act responsibly? That is still a lot of people – so all parties need to consider creative solutions to protect the landscape so that a few do not penalize the whole. Manufacturers need to advertise responsibly but also, how do the land managers make issues relevant to the young public? All need to pay attention to population growth and how growing demand will effect what opportunities are provided. Also consider if we are relevant to that growing population as demographics - racial age, etc. change. A failure to look at the future population demands is a failure to the land. The group has shown a commitment to provide a riding opportunity and to work together to do so.

### CLOSE OF CONFERENCE

**David Holland**, Director, Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resources, Washington Office,  
Forest Service

*Notes taken during the session:*

He thanked all who made the past few days possible including California State Parks, the many presenters, those who prepared case studies, and those in charge of logistics.

The Chief's presentation showed an Agency's commitment to providing OHV recreation and that the new rulemaking is an Agency priority. It is important to frame all work that we do in the context of our stewardship.

The conference showcased a lot of solutions. It is important to get all at the table, including the 900 lb. litigant. A balanced discussion is needed even though that balance comes from those who disagree. Often Western culture is identified as having a bias for action, but talk is needed. Start relationships early.

To keep up the awareness of collaborative successes, an awards program might be considered which promote good work similar to the "Green Slopes" program for skiing.

The case studies are unique. These studies inform but there is no cookbook.

USFS is committed to designating routes and committing the resources to achieve this. The Agency is asking our partners to participate and to commit resources.

Let it all not be talk though. The bias for action is now. As you leave here, act. For what happens on the ground is the only measurement of our success.