OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE AND COLLABORATION:

Lessons Learned From Project Implementation

August 26, 2005

Prepared for the
National OHV Implementation Team,
USDA Forest Service

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Morris K. Udall Foundation

Executive Summary

With few exceptions throughout the country, the fastest growing community the Forest Service works with is off-highway vehicle (OHV) users. These include the drivers, riders, and passengers of 4X4s, Jeeps, All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs or quads), and dirt bikes. They use their vehicles as the centerpiece of their recreational activities, or as a means of transportation for other experiences such as family camping in remote locations, rock climbing, hunting or fishing. The Forest Service recognizes the interest of OHV users to the country's 192 million acres of National Forests, as well as the drawbacks associated with this use if it is not managed responsibly.

Within the Forest Service, two national OHV teams are working to address the need for a broader, more cohesive strategy for managing OHV use. The first group has focused on developing a national policy framework, including proposed rules for designated routes and locations for OHV use. Another team, the National OHV Implementation Team, has focused on providing tools, techniques and best practices associated with managing OHVs. In compiling these best practice examples, the Team recognized the critical importance of collaborative approaches in implementing successful OHV programs.

The National OHV Implementation Team set out to document some of the more prominent examples of collaboration in the context of OHV activities, in order to share these cases as a means for highlighting best practices in collaboration, and for sharing the key lessons learned from this experience. The Team was not necessarily looking for "success stories," but more for a representative range of project management settings and experiences that could be examined for key lessons that would have wide national relevance and application. Cases selected for analysis included:

1) Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership
2) California Off-Highway Vehicle Stakeholders Roundtable
3) Caribou-Targhee Travel Management Collaborative Learning Workshop
4) Cromer Ridge OHV Management: Daniel Boone National Forest
5) Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir Multiple-Use Trail System Trails
6) Lewis and Clark National Forest: Big Snowies Access/Travel Management Plan
7) Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota Interagency Working Group
8) OHV Use and Forest Plan Revision on the Ouachita National Forest
9) Perry Stream All-Terrain Vehicle Trails
10) Southeast Idaho Trail System
11) Wenatchee National Forest Off-Road Vehicle Trails

The case studies provided a foundation for discussions during the National OHV Collaboration Summit, held in San Diego, CA on April 11 – 13, 2005. The Summit presented a unique opportunity for diverse interests to meet, reflect, discuss, and identify lessons and actions for achieving greater success in OHV management. The Summit's goals included:

- Convene public and private sector representatives to share lessons learned on the role of collaboration in OHV management
- Present the stages of the collaborative process – what works, who to engage, timing for collaboration
- Learn about collaboration pitfalls and how to navigate bumps in the road
- Share public involvement approaches to OHV route designation

This report presents the eleven case studies (revised based on conversations during the Summit as well as input received from readers of initial drafts) as well as some of the keynote presentations from the Summit. Authors of the case studies have offered their own synthesis of key lessons learned from the cases; to complement the authors' collective sense of key lessons, the report also includes a "perspectives" section, offering some of the diverse viewpoints on collaborative problem-solving in the context of OHV activities.

It is hoped that this report - the case studies, keynote presentations from the Summit, and the varied assessments of lessons learned from these analyses and discussions - will help broaden, elevate, and continue to encourage the important conversations and reflections about the application of collaborative approaches in the management of OHVs on America's public lands. And that the lessons learned from this experience can be widely shared and lead to the development of more effective OHV management programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A

INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS

INTRODUCTION: OHV USE AND COLLABORATION

BACKGROUND

The USDA Forest Service serves the needs of a diverse constituency by offering wide-ranging recreational opportunities on National Forests. The Forest Service is committed to providing these opportunities in a balanced, sustainable way for the enjoyment of all. With few exceptions throughout the country, the fastest growing community the Forest Service works with is off-highway vehicle (OHV) users.[1] These include the drivers, riders, and passengers of 4X4s, Jeeps, All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs or quads), and dirt bikes. They use their vehicles as the centerpiece of their recreational activities, or as a means of transportation for other experiences such as family camping in remote locations, rock climbing, hunting or fishing.

The Forest Service recognizes the interest of OHV users to the country's 192 million acres of National Forests, as well as the drawbacks associated with this use if it is not managed responsibly. To affirm the seriousness of these concerns, USDA Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth has identified unmanaged outdoor recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of off-highway vehicles, as one of the four major threats to forest health.[2] The Forest Service's role then, is to provide a diverse mix of recreation opportunities within the capability of the land. Other Federal and State land managers approach OHV similarly.

However, the planning, management, and regulation of OHVs on public lands have not kept pace with the rapid increase in use. Regulations concerning the use of OHVs vary considerably across land management agencies, as well as across regions and even individual land management units. As one example, until recently, some National Forests had developed travel plans that restrict motor vehicle use to designated routes or areas, while other Forests continued to allow cross-country travel.

The impacts from unmanaged OHV use can be severe – erosion, water degradation, habitat destruction, and damage to cultural sites (see, *inter alia*, Bowles, 2001; Meyer, 2003; Troyer, 2003). And in many cases, recreation use conflicts (especially between motorized and non-motorized recreationists) have intensified. Increased popularity of motorized recreation, coupled with growing concerns over impacts from unmanaged use, provide opportunities for the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and other federal, state, and local government agencies to focus energy on providing a quality system of designated routes, trails and areas for OHV enjoyment, as they continue to serve as stewards of the public's land and resources. Within the Forest Service, two national OHV teams are working to address the need for a broader, more cohesive strategy for managing OHV use. The first group has focused on developing a national policy framework, including proposed rules for designated routes and

[1] According to a recent USDA study, the number of OHV users in the United States has increased from 5 million in 1972 to nearly 36 million in 2000 (H. Cordell, J. Teasley, G. Super, J. Bergstrom, and B. McDonald, 2000).

[2] The four threats identified by Chief Bosworth include: 1) Forest fragmentation, a result of loss of open space, urban sprawl, transportation corridors, and changes in forest ownership, 2) imported forest pests and diseases, 3) fire and fuels, and 4) unmanaged outdoor recreation (For the full text of Chief Bosworth's speech, see: http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2003/speeches/07/bosworth.shtml

locations for OHV use. These new rules were released in draft form in July 2004. More than 80,000 comments have been received from the public. The Forest Service is currently reviewing these comments and a final rule is expected sometime in the coming year (2005).[3]

Another team, the National OHV Implementation Team, has focused on providing tools, techniques and best practices associated with managing OHVs. These best practices include: methods for route inventory and design, monitoring approaches, approaches to managing designated routes, recommendations for effective enforcement, communication tools and practices, and means for engaging and working with partners, other agencies and communities.

In compiling these best practice examples, the Team recognized the critical importance of collaborative approaches in implementing successful OHV programs. Many projects reviewed by the Team showed tremendous innovation and ingenuity in building broad-based participation and support for completing route inventories, planning and maintenance of OHV trail networks, and resolving existing problems or conflicts among stakeholders. It also became apparent that where unilateral, command-and-control approaches were pursued, the results were less than satisfactory or enduring.

With these initial observations in mind, the National OHV Implementation Team decided to document some of the more prominent examples of collaboration, in order to share these cases as a means for highlighting best practices in collaboration, and for sharing the key lessons learned from this experience. The description and analysis of these individual projects offers important insights that can translate into guidance for implementing effective OHV management efforts nationally.

The National OHV Implementation Team worked with a wide array of Forest Service staff, with the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and with numerous affected stakeholders in identifying and documenting a range of representative case studies, and in synthesizing the lessons from these projects into practical recommendations. The Team believes that the lessons learned from these cases will be useful for practitioners, policy makers, and participants who are eager to learn – both from the encouraging successes, as well as from some of the unfortunate missteps and failures. The Team is hopeful that these lessons and analyses can help stimulate broader reflection, discussion, and ultimately, greater success in implementing OHV management across the country.

This case study report was prepared and reviewed in anticipation of the National OHV Collaboration Summit, held in San Diego, California, from April 11 - 13, 2005. At this workshop, public land managers and affected stakeholders gathered to discuss the findings of the case studies, compare these with their own experiences, and identify next steps in implementing successful OHV management programs.

[3] For further information on the Forest Service's OHV policy, see: http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/ohv/index.shtml

SELECTION OF THE CASE STUDIES

The National OHV Implementation Team cast a wide net in seeking case studies for this analysis. A national call for nominations solicited initial descriptions of more than 50 potential cases for analysis. The Team was not necessarily looking for "success stories," but more for a representative range of project management settings and experiences that could be examined for key lessons that would have wide national relevance and application.

The extensive list of nominated projects was reviewed based on a number of suggested selection criteria:

- Broad regional/geographic diversity
- Various scales (local, multi-forest, state, multi-state, regional)
- Complexity (size, issues, number of stakeholders)
- Phase of development (mid-stream to fully completed)
- A mix of agency jurisdictions (e.g., Forest Service, BLM, State/private, multiple)
- Existing documentation
- Replicability/application
- Relevance of issues (e.g., route designation, restoration, decommissioning)

Based on the criteria above, the following cases were selected for analysis:

1) Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership
2) California Off-Highway Vehicle Stakeholders Roundtable
3) Caribou-Targhee National Forest Travel Management Collaborative Learning Workshop
4) Cromer Ridge OHV Management: Daniel Boone National Forest
5) Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir Multiple-Use Trail System Trails
6) Lewis and Clark National Forest: Big Snowies Access and Travel Management Plan
7) Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota Interagency Working Group
8) OHV Use and Forest Plan Revision on the Ouachita National Forest
9) Perry Stream All-Terrain Vehicle Trails
10) Southeast Idaho Trail System
11) Wenatchee National Forest Off-Road Vehicle Trails

ANALYSIS OF THE CASES

Three paired teams of Forest Service staff and other selected partners conducted the analysis and authored the case studies. Each of the teams took responsibility for three or four of the cases. Authors relied on information gathered from existing documentation (e.g., internal reports, correspondence, media coverage) and conducted in-depth interviews with key project participants (e.g., Forest Service staff, local government officials, OHV enthusiasts, environmental advocates, local landowners, and other affected stakeholders).

The case studies provide short summaries of this existing information, an assessment of stakeholder perspectives, and the authors' own synthesis of key lessons gleaned from the projects. It is important to emphasize that these studies are merely abbreviated, and somewhat superficial presentations of the experience. As such, they offer encapsulated descriptions of the context and setting of the project, key issues and stakeholders, achievements to date, and challenges ahead. The emphasis of the analysis – in reviewing documents and in the interviews with stakeholders – has been on the dynamics of collaboration and the lessons learned from this experience, particularly in terms of its potential wider relevance for readers. These case studies are not the place to look for detailed descriptions of the landscapes and resources, the technical aspects of route designation and inventory, or the complex legal, political, or interpersonal dynamics that have occurred within these settings.

Initial drafts of the cases were shared with all those interviewed for the analysis, and their comments and suggestions have been integrated into these final drafts of the cases. However, as is the case with many complex situations, the authors occasionally encountered differing points of view on many aspects of the cases – e.g., their history, meaning, accomplishments, and relevance – and therefore had to make choices as to how some of the information was presented. The authors do, therefore, take overall responsibility for the conclusions drawn in these brief case studies.

Members of the case study analysis team included:

1) Kathy Bond, Independent Facilitator (Olathe, CO)
2) Deborah Chavez, Research Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station (Riverside, CA)
3) Larry Fisher, Senior Program Manager, Public Lands Sector, US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (Tucson, AZ)
4) Robert Fitzhenry, Group Leader for Information, Management, and Analysis, USDA Forest Service, Durham Field Office (Durham, NH)
5) Cynthia Manning, Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Northern Region (Missoula, MT)
6) Sharon Metzler, Recreation Special Uses Program Manager, USDA Forest Service, (Milwaukee, WI)

National OHV Implementation Team members (Kevin Martin, Marlene Finley, and Kathy Mick) also contributed in important ways to this case study project. They helped with the design of the project, generated the initial list of candidate cases and assisted in the selection of cases, helped the study teams resolve a variety of methodological issues, and they reviewed and offered important comments on early drafts of the cases and of this report.

Larry Fisher served as overall editor for the case studies, and for this report.

THE NATIONAL OHV COLLABORATION SUMMIT

The National OHV Collaboration Summit, held in San Diego, CA on April 11 – 13, 2005 was convened as a gathering of public land management agencies, private sector groups, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders interested in OHV and related resource management issues. The Summit provided a unique opportunity for diverse interests to meet, reflect, discuss, and identify lessons and actions for achieving greater success in OHV management. The stated goals of the Summit included:

- Convene public and private sector representatives to share lessons learned on the role of collaboration in OHV management
- Present the stages of the collaborative process – what works, who to engage, timing for collaboration
- Learn about collaboration pitfalls and how to navigate bumps in the road
- Share public involvement approaches to OHV route designation

The Summit included a range of presentations, panels, and learning workshops. The case studies included in this report (presented in an earlier (draft) form), were used as an initial point of departure for the discussions, grounding participants in field-level examples of efforts to foster collaborative processes. A few of the case studies (Southeast Idaho Trail System, Caribou-Targhee) were also presented in "case clinic" formats – in which participants were engaged in more interactive analysis and discussion about these cases. The case presentations were complemented with several thematic discussion groups (e.g., emerging policies in OHV management, evolving images of off-road recreation, emerging tools for collaborative OHV management) and with two training workshops (Collaboration 101, Building Partnerships).

Following the vivid (and occasionally controversial) discussions at the Summit, the authors again reviewed and edited the cases, incorporating new insights and relevant comments received during the workshop sessions. Participants also suggested expanding the case study report to include the formal comments presented by the Chief of the Forest Service and those of other keynote speakers. Finally, we decided to incorporate a "perspectives" section, offering several different viewpoints on collaborative problem-solving in the context of OHV activities.

These additional pieces are now included in this final version of the report, and it is our hope that, collectively, the background materials on OHV and collaboration, the keynote presentations, the case studies, and the varied assessment of lessons learned from these cases will help broaden, elevate, and continue to encourage the important conversations and reflections that have already been stimulated by the analysis of the cases.

REFERENCES:

Bosworth, D. (2004). *We Need a New National Debate*, Speech to the Izaak Walton League's 81st Annual Convention, Pierre, SD, 7/17/03, (http://www.fs.fed.us/news/2003/speeches/07/bosworth.shtml)

Bowles, J. (2001). *Desert back roads closed.* Press-Enterprise (newspaper), October 31, 2001, B.10.

Meyer, K. G. (2002). *Managing degraded off-highway vehicle trails in wet, unstable, and sensitive environments.* Tech. Rep. 0223-2821-MTDC. Missoula. MT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center, 48 p.

H. Cordell, J. Teasley, G. Super, J. Bergstrom, and B. McDonald (200), *Outdoor Recreation in the United States: Results from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment*, Asheville, NC: USDA Forest Service, Southeastern Research Station.

Troyer, J. (2003). *Background paper with key messages and talking points: Unmanaged recreation – impacts from OHVs.* Personal communication, December 12, 2003.

FORGING A SUSTAINABLE SYSTEM OF ROUTES AND AREAS FOR MOTORIZED USE

Comments by Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth
OHV Collaborative Summit
San Diego, CA – April 12, 2005

It's a pleasure to be here at this collaborative summit. I guess I might be the first Forest Service Chief to have the honor of attending an occasion like this. I think it shows how far we've come in the last 20 to 30 years: Much of our focus at the Forest Service has shifted to outdoor recreation, and a lot of the recreation on national forest land is now motorized.

Let me say one thing right off the bat: We believe that off-highway vehicles are a legitimate use in the right place. That includes many places on national forest land. But it's a use that's got to be managed if we want to keep it. That's what our proposed new rule for OHV use on national forest land is all about: managing that use now to sustain it in the future. And if we want to sustain that use in a way that's responsible, then we've got to work together. So I welcome the *collaborative* spirit of this summit.

Focusing on What Matters Most

Let me start with some context. This year, the Forest Service is exactly a century old. We've been using this occasion to look back at where we've been and to reflect on where we're headed, and there are some huge challenges ahead – things like global warming and the loss of ecosystem services like carbon sequestration … things like population growth, where we expect to more than double our population by the end of this century … things like the need to balance our land ethic with a consumption ethic, since our consumption as a nation is vastly outstripping our production of things like energy and timber.

These are enormous challenges, and they are pressing. My biggest fear for a number of years now has been that we're not focusing on them enough. That's why we at the Forest Service started focusing on the Four Threats – fire and fuels, invasive species, loss of open space, and unmanaged outdoor recreation. These are long-term concerns that we as a nation urgently need to address.

The Four Threats are interconnected with the other issues I just mentioned. The huge fires and all the invasives we're getting, not to mention loss of working farms, forests, and ranches, mean that we are losing ecosystem services like clean air and water, biodiversity, and carbon sequestration. And population growth has to do with our growing consumption and the boom in outdoor recreation that is outstripping our management capacity. We need to focus national attention on these concerns, because whether or not we rise to the challenge will decide in the years ahead whether we will be able to conserve our natural resources for future generations.

Finding Collaborative Solutions

But it's not just a question of *what* we focus on, but also *how*. The Forest Service has had a whole century of experience in dealing with natural resource issues. Sometimes we've been wildly successful, like in getting our fire program to the point where we quickly suppress 99

percent of our fires. But we haven't always been quite so successful, particularly when it's not primarily a matter of technology and know-how.

And dealing with the Four Threats is not primarily a matter of finding technical solutions. Each threat has social, economic, and ecological components that are complex and extremely difficult to reconcile, whether it's fire and fuels, invasive species, loss of open space, or unmanaged outdoor recreation. We can't simply apply technical or regulatory solutions and hope to succeed – the OHV issue, for example, is not just a matter of law enforcement.

The last few decades have shown that dissatisfaction breeds conflict, litigation, and management by default through the courts. Nobody wins, least of all the environment. Our way of dealing with issues in the past through top-down approaches and through conflict and gridlock doesn't work. We need to find new models for dealing with the most pressing issues we face today.

There's hope. This year, we kicked off our hundredth anniversary with a Centennial Congress in January. Hundreds of people from all over the country attended, including many of our partners. One of their central tasks at this Congress was to think about the conservation challenges ahead and to come up with suggestions.

The response from our partners was tremendous. They focused on the big issues that will matter for years to come, like ecosystem services and what to do about loss of open space. They focused on building our role at the Forest Service as a convener and facilitator instead of a top-down director of everything that happens. They focused on the need for engaging our publics in finding solutions for themselves, because they are the ones who are out there on the land and can truly make a difference. They focused on community-based stewardship.

Serving People

And that collaborative spirit gives me hope that we *will* be able to overcome the Four Threats. Let me turn for a moment to the OHV issue, then come back to collaborative solutions.

Today, the Forest Service is squarely in the business of outdoor recreation. Since 1946, the number of visitors to the national forests and grasslands has grown about 18 times. In 2002, we had more than 214 million visits, with about the same number driving through just to enjoy the scenery. As I mentioned, these numbers are only going to grow as our population grows.

National forest recreation has therefore become the biggest contributor to many of our local economies, and recreation management accounts for much of our workforce. Recreation offers hope for our rural economies, whether it's cruise ships in Hoonah, Alaska, or ATV riders on the Hatfield-McCoy Trail in West Virginia.

OHV use has contributed to that recreational boom, and in many ways it's a plus. We now get something like 11 or 12 million visits a year on national forest land where OHVs are either the primary use or a secondary use. About half of the users travel more than 50 miles for the opportunity to ride on national forest land, and about a third of them say they have no other place to go.

So we have a tremendous obligation – and a great opportunity – to serve these folks, and through them our local communities and economies. We see it as part of our mission, and I think we've fulfilled it in a number of ways:

- According to a survey we did last year, more than 200,000 miles of forest roads are open to OHV use. That's more than 60 percent of our entire road system.
- We've also got more than 36,000 miles of OHV trails, or about 28 percent of our total trail system open to OHV use. That includes some premier riding opportunities, like the Paiute Trail in Utah, a huge loop around most of the Fishlake National Forest. Some of you might be familiar with it.

Irresponsible Use

Unfortunately, there's also been a downside to OHV use. I believe that the vast majority of our OHV users are responsible. They leave no lasting trace on the land. But if just one percent leave unacceptable damage, that's still an awful lot of damage: One percent of 11 or 12 million visits is 110 or 120,000 visits. If every one of those visits does damage, the cumulative impact is tremendous.

You don't have to go far to see it. I could show you slide after slide—tire tracks running through wetlands; riparian areas churned into mud; banks collapsed and bleeding into streams; ruts in trails so deep you can literally fall in; and sensitive meadows turned into dustbowls. Water quality deteriorates, soil erodes, and native plant communities decline, partly because invasive weeds are spread by tires going where they shouldn't be going. Such use also threatens habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, like the desert tortoise in areas east of here.

Noise alone is a huge issue. Noise can also pit users against each other or users against homeowners; it's maybe the single biggest source of social conflict we have when it comes to outdoor recreation.

This isn't just a matter of a few user conflicts or a few user-created trails here and there – not anymore. In 2003, we figure we had more than 14,000 miles of user-created trails on the National Forest System. That's a lot of unmanaged use, and it costs a lot to repair. It can lead to lasting damage.

That's why we've got to change the way we manage it. Our nation isn't the same place anymore. OHV use has reached critical mass. We can't just leave it alone anymore and hope it comes out all right. If we want all the benefits from OHV use to continue, then we have to make sure it is done in a way that is responsible. And that means better managing it.

A Better Way to Manage OHV Use

That's why we proposed a new rule for motorized use. We want responsible use to continue, and we need this rule to ensure that it does. This rule will give us a nationally consistent approach to

travel management. It will let us balance the public's enjoyment of OHVs with the best possible care of the land.

Let me be clear about one thing: The rule itself won't open or close a single trail or a single acre to OHV use. Those decisions will all be made after the final rule comes out. They'll be made at the local level as we revise our travel management plans. Any decisions will be fully open to the public, and we invite everyone to get engaged. If you care which trails or roads should be opened or closed, that's the time and place to get involved. Everyone will have the same chance to influence the outcome.

Our goal is a *sustainable* system of routes and areas designated for motorized use. That doesn't necessarily mean closing every user-created trail. If adding a user-created trail to the system would make it more sustainable by, say, completing a loop that riders want – and if the impacts are minimal – then that might make good sense. We will be carefully listening to local communities and user groups to identify the best locations for OHV trails and areas. That means taking our existing trail system and seeing what we need to add or subtract.

Ensuring that our road and trail system is sustainable means thinking through our recreation niche within the broader landscape. National forest lands probably can't meet every recreational demand from every potential visitor group. We need to look at what services other lands provide and what we have that's unique. We also need to avoid "bean counting." We should ask not how many routes and areas we close or open, but rather how well future generations are served.

We issued the proposed rule last July, and the comment period closed last September. We received more than 80,000 comments, including broad support for the concept of a designated system of routes and areas for motorized use. But there was also substantial concern about our commitment to the process and about funding and enforcement. Those concerns are partly what we're here to discuss.

Common Ground for Partnership

To make it work, we're going to need help. Fortunately, I see a lot of common ground, because most OHV users don't come just to ride. They come for the same things other people do. More than half say they come to experience nature and more than 40 percent to see wildlife. A lot of them don't come primarily to ride at all, but rather to hunt, camp, fish, or hike. They don't want to see trashed landscapes or be disturbed by unwanted noise any more than anyone else does.

They're often willing to help, and I could show you slide after slide of volunteers going out on their OHVs to clean up trash, fix trails, repair damaged meadows, and so forth. We've got some great partnerships with user groups. Some of them help out by teaching and reminding riders to be responsible. Some even help out with enforcement. Some have education programs for kids, and by reaching kids they also reach the adults who shepherd them through the program.

Moreover, we must be realistic. These are tight budget times; we've always had to set spending priorities, and we always will. Today, we wouldn't be able to maintain much of our trail system

without support from our volunteers and partners, and we will continue to need that support. That's part of collaboration, too.

The Challenge of Collaboration

The fact that we *do* get so much help and support gives me great hope. I believe we *can* rise to the challenge of managing outdoor recreation, including OHV use, but only if we work together in a truly collaborative spirit. I'll briefly recapitulate, then say a few words about collaboration before closing.

We believe that OHVs are a legitimate use in the right place, and that includes many places on national forest land. But the days are over when folks could just drive wherever they pleased. These days, there are just too many users having too much impact.

That's why we need a new rule governing OHV use. The new rule will lay the foundation for a *sustainable* system of routes and areas for motorized use, and everyone will have a fair say in determining where those routes and areas will be located.

But the OHV rule will be the easy part. The hard part will be all the decisions that will have to be made on the ground as we revise our travel management plans. That's where folks will have to come together to agree on a system that is truly sustainable in the long run.

And that's where we'll need a collaborative spirit. Of course, collaboration means different things to different people. To me, it doesn't mean "helping the enemy." It means coming together with those you disagree with, suspending your distrust, and accepting that they have a legitimate interest and role to play. Then it means finding common ground and coming to some agreement based on the goals you share.

These are hard things to do. No collaborative process I know of has ever succeeded without a lot of hard work and a gradual building of trust. But it's usually been well worth it, and I've often found that folks have been surprised by how much they have in common, despite their disagreements.

Rising to the Challenge

So I have great hope. I think people are tired of top-down approaches and management driven by conflict. They are looking to the Forest Service not to give them the answers, but to facilitate a consensus based on a shared love for the land. It will be up to all of us, working collaboratively, to find sustainable solutions on the ground. I believe we can and will find lasting local solutions based on our collective commitment to conservation.

It won't be easy. There's hardly an issue I can think of in national forest management today that is as contentious and emotionally charged as this one. But that makes it all the more important to try—all the more important to succeed—because this is only part of a much bigger picture. This is only one issue among many we face today—those major long-term challenges I mentioned at

the outset of my remarks: fire and fuels, invasive species, loss of open space, global warming, consumption issues, population growth, and all the rest.

But if we can succeed here, on the OHV issue, as contentious and seemingly intractable as it is, then we will have accomplished something enormous. If we can come together in the spirit of collaboration and forge a truly sustainable system of routes and areas for motorized use, then we will have passed a conservation milestone. We will have shown how other issues, too, can be resolved through collaborative governance.

So that's the challenge we face. It's up to all of us here to come together in a truly collaborative spirit, knowing how high the stakes are. Future generations will depend on us to rise to the occasion and find sustainable solutions on the ground.

PLACE-BASED COLLABORATION:
A PROMISING APPROACH FOR MANAGING OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE

Comments by Luther Propst, Executive Director, Sonoran Institute
OHV Collaborative Summit
San Diego, CA – April 12, 2005

The Sonoran Institute was founded in 1990 to assist communities conserve and restore important natural landscapes, wildlife, and cultural values in western North America. Our mission is to promote *healthy landscapes, vibrant economies, and livable communities* throughout the West. With offices in Tucson and Phoenix, Arizona and Bozeman, Montana, the Institute works with local citizens, public land management agencies, states, counties, communities, landowners, and businesses to shape the civic quality of growth. Our community-based approach is unique; it's called *collaborative conservation*. We have found that collaborative conservation efforts often produce the most effective, enduring results because strategies are homegrown, come from meaningful partnerships, and the investment in the process is high.

My principal theme today is that collaborative decision-making and a commitment to "place" together are a powerful tool for reconciling the conflicts over Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) issues. In some settings (obviously not all) this approach offers hope for enduring solutions. The challenge is to back away from the heated conflict of the moment long enough to work together with diverse groups to develop a shared set of values and shared vision for the condition of the landscape and to address OHV conflicts in the context of these values and this vision.

Conventional approaches for addressing this issue, of course, are necessary. National standards are essential. Self-regulation, public awareness, and industry responsibility are indispensable. Travel plans for specific forest districts or management are also essential.

OHV issues are indeed challenging to address with collaborative management. So are many other issues. Conflict is inherent in public land management and especially in recreation management. The potential for conflict over both specific decisions and over fundamental values must be explicitly acknowledged if it is to be managed. I commend the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for sponsoring this summit and I commend everyone here for participating. Dialogue is a necessary first step.

Three factors create a highly challenging environment for all public land management issues, including recreation use: (1) rapid population growth, especially in the West; (2) multiple and compound challenges to the health of public lands; and (3) the polarized and immature political culture surrounding public lands in the West.

Rapid Population Growth

As many of you know, the Intermountain West is growing faster than any region in the nation. In the 1990s, the nation grew at over thirteen percent. That's an increase of thirty two million people. This is a larger increase in a ten-year period than any other decade in the nation's history.

The five fastest growing states are all in the Intermountain West. Nevada grew sixty-six percent in ten years. Arizona, my home state, grew forty percent during this period. Colorado, Utah, and Idaho all grew at around thirty percent in that period. Wyoming surprised the demographers by posting a nine percent gain, still a very robust population gain. These numbers themselves make it difficult for states in the Intermountain West to deal with growth effectively, including the growing recreational use of public lands. But what is probably more important is buried beneath those numbers.

Why, for instance, is Wyoming lagging in population growth compared to other public land states? Primarily, I think, because growth in metropolitan areas drove the growth in the states that posted the largest increases. Almost all of the growth in Nevada was in Las Vegas. Almost all of the growth in Arizona was in Phoenix and Tucson. The situation is similar in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Idaho. Wyoming doesn't have metropolitan areas that attract that large-scale growth.

The other major growth factor relates to "high-amenity resort communities", or rural communities or counties that are growing rapidly due to their natural beauty, opportunity for recreation, and small town character. In Wyoming, for example, most of the growth occurred in high-amenity counties in Greater Yellowstone and in the Big Horn mountains. We saw Teton County, Wyoming grow sixty-three percent during this ten-year period. At the same time we see a fairly significant population decline in the resource-dependant counties—the far-rural counties. These counties are not experiencing the rapid in-migration from the rest of the country, and their population has declined over the last ten years.

Growth in high-amenity counties, which are spread throughout the West, significantly increases the level of recreational use, which changes the character of impacts, requires more intensive management, and often breaks down the social ties that are required for effective land-use management.

Pervasive Threats to Health of Public Lands

Second, the threats to the health of public lands are increasing in number and complexity, adding more challenges to effective land management. Last October, the United States Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth identified four major threats to forest health: forest fragmentation from urban and rural sprawl and transportation corridors; imported forest pests and diseases–-a quiet, insidious challenge; fire and fuels management; and unmanaged outdoor recreation.

The complexity and enormity of Bosworth's list of threats reinforces my perspective that progress is not to be found *entirely* issue-by-issue, but largely or partially through a rededication of public land managers, recreational users, conservation advocates, and local officials to the overall health of the special landscapes or places that we all value. The opportunity and the need is to address the challenge, to a certain extent, *place-by-place* and based upon the values and knowledge and energy of people who care for the health of our public lands.

Polarized and Immature Political Culture

Third, I would like to briefly describe the polarized, stalemated, and perhaps immature, political culture of the West. Wallace Stegner wrote in *Where the Bluebird Sings to the Lemonade Springs*: "Nothing would gratify me more than to see the West, in all its sub-regions and sub-cultures, both prosperous and environmentally healthy, with a society to match its scenery." Stegner later qualifies this view: "Yes, the West is hope's native home, but there are varieties and degrees of hope, and the wrong kinds, in excessive amounts, go with human failure and environmental damage as boom goes with bust."

Less poetically, Bernard DeVoto writes that the political culture of the West is characterized by its attitude toward Washington and that attitude is: "Get out and send us more money." That comment is perhaps a bit harsh, but we all recognize the kernel of truth. The polarized and over-simplified rhetoric that flows from both ends of the opinion spectrum makes it very difficult for people to recognize when real progress is being made, much less to make significant progress.

This political climate associated with public lands – characterized by conflict, vilification, and oversimplification of complex challenges – fans the flames of bitterness on land-use, recreation, and environmental issues and hinders the development of enduring solutions. On the one hand, we see groups – often conservation advocates and public land managers – made scapegoats for the region's deep and serious social and economic challenges. On the other hand, we see an "us-versus-them" mentality in which user groups are made scapegoats for the region's pervasive and complex ecological challenges. In this climate, no interest or perspective wins. The health of the lands and the vitality of our communities suffer.

My central point is this: At the same time that many politicians and the media focus on conflict, on polarized rhetoric, on over-simplification of complex issues, on the mythic debate over "jobs versus the environment" the world is changing in the West. This fundamental change is happening quietly, but we are seeing the emergence of a movement that is coming of age; that is proving itself on the ground; that is demonstrating that there is a better, more enduring way to solve these problems. This movement is proving that we can indeed protect and restore western landscapes; and that western communities can prosper. The movement is loosely called the *community stewardship* movement or the *local collaboration* movement. It is largely below the radar screen. It is not reported well because it does not make for good press. When it works, the results are often boring. When collaborative efforts fail, and some do, then it makes good press. This movement is deeply subversive. If your perspective is that conservation advocates are too powerful, it can be threatening and subversive. If your perspective is that conservation is being undermined, it can be threatening and subversive. This collaborative movement is just beginning to demonstrate its potential; we're beginning to see more evidence of case studies and examples that are working on the ground.

Community stewardship or local collaboration is certainly not a panacea. There will always be issues where people are going to fight about the proper use of lands in the West. But this approach is building momentum in an increasing variety of settings.

We see, for example, the development of "green business coalitions." For example, the Sierra Business Council has over 600 members in the Sierra Nevada of California. This is a coalition of business owners who are coming together to protect the landscape health and beauty that is essential for their businesses. In promoting their businesses, they want better land-use policies in the counties of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

We see this approach replicated in the Greater Yellowstone region with the creation of a fledgling group called the Yellowstone Business Partnership that advocates for sound land-use policies and rejects the myth of "jobs versus the environment." They are standing up for policies that allow them to prosper, recognizing the value of a healthy landscape to their own prosperity.

We see collaborative approaches for protecting working agricultural landscapes, where ranchers and conservation advocates -those traditional enemies – are increasingly working together. We see efforts in Colorado, California, and Wyoming where ranchers are now working to protect their ranch land by creating land trusts and forming coalitions that involve environmental advocates, sportsmen, outdoor users, and others.

We see collaborative approaches in a new breed of developers; people like Tom Gray in California, who envisioned a development project on 20,000 acres, of which 18,000 acres have been left as wildlife habitat and open space, and 260 lots are laid out on the remaining 2,000 acres, leaving over 95 percent of the community as open space, and creating a $25 million dollar endowment to restore ecological health on the site.

We see the fruits of community stewardship in many ways across the West. We see Chris Leinberger, a developer, working to restore downtown Albuquerque, because he wants to see a vital downtown as an alternative to sprawl.

We see it in Gallatin County, Montana where a coalition of ranchers, conservation advocates, and hunters have worked together to pass two $10 million dollar bond measures to protect wildlife habitat and open space, primarily through conservation easements. Imagine a county where half of the land is already public land, taxing itself ten million dollars to protect wildlife habitat and working agricultural landscapes.

We see it in groups like the Malpai Borderlands Group - innovators in the rural collaboration movement – where ranchers in southwestern New Mexico and southeast Arizona are working for landscape health over a huge landscape.

We see it in the diverse group that joined together to create *La Ruta de Sonora*, an award-winning ecotourism effort in southern Arizona and northern Sonora that brings tourists from North America into remote and economically marginalized *ejidos* (communities) and allows the *ejidos* to gain economic value from visitors. *La Ruta* also sets aside five percent of its gross revenues for community and conservation projects.

We see collaboration working all around the West, as people work together to integrate conservation and community values.

This community based and collaborative approach to public land management gives people a reasonable basis for hope for resolving land-use and growth-related conflict in the West. My experience, and the experience of the Sonoran Institute, convinces me that this approach works. There is a growing body of literature that describes this movement; however, in my experience, the opportunity boils down to three principles:

- Tap into the *power of place*;
- Articulate a compelling vision for the future of a community or a landscape that appeals to the hopes and aspirations of the public; and
- Produce tangible outcomes through collaborative partnerships.

Build upon the Power of Place

We see the *power of place* at work in many cases when people have gotten together and worked out their problems in a mutually beneficial manner, because they are focusing on their own community. The Sonoran Institute published a book entitled *Beyond the Hundredth Meeting*, *A Field Guide to Collaborative Conservation on the West's Public Lands* (with apologies to Wallace Stegner) that examines a range of these collaborative and community stewardship efforts. Our conclusion is that community stewardship efforts work best when the scale is small enough that people are dealing with each other as people and not as hired hands. We see higher probability of success when working on a manageable scale—a community or a small watershed or a ranger district, rather than on a scale where only the representatives from national trade associations or environmental groups are at the table. People do value their way of life in the West and it brings them together. It can bring people together who have very diverse perspectives on the future.

The power of *sense of place,* however, is too often overlooked. Local leadership allows conservation efforts, economic development efforts, efforts to reconcile competing uses of public lands, to tap into that powerful sense when people share concern about a landscape.

The love of the landscape – whether you work it, whether you visit only on weekends or annual vacations, whether you retire there – can unite people with disparate values and perspectives. Tapping into this is the impetus for better management of public lands, local economic development efforts, and certainty for users of public lands. By focusing on a landscape, people can move through the barriers to collaborative approaches toward solving problems.

Increasingly public lands are recognized as economic assets and the foundation of economic prosperity in a changing global economy. A recent Sonoran Institute report, *Prosperity in the 21st Century: The Role of Protected Public Lands,* investigated the connection between protected public lands and economic prosperity. The primary finding was that the presence of protected public lands and their associated amenities were correlated with economic prosperity in areas that were able to take advantage of broader markets (for example, in areas close to airports and universities). The amenities provided by protected public lands can serve as a strong draw to help communities attract highly qualified employees in knowledge-based industries, such as engineering, technology, and so forth.

Regulation and enforcement are necessary for maintaining our valued landscapes. However, regulation and enforcement, while essential in an orderly society, alone are insufficient to the task. Society cannot rely upon increasingly centralized decision-making and regulatory constraints to solve our disputes. Don't get me wrong, regulatory approaches, prohibitions, and mandates are absolutely essential both in public land management and county land-use controls. They are essential for establishing the minimum code of conduct. But to build livable, vibrant communities, and to protect and restore landscapes that are badly degraded for whatever reason, simply requires a degree of *inspiration, solidarity, and long-term commitment* that cannot be built or sustained, if we rely too much on prohibitions and constraints and not enough on the inspiration of people who care about the landscape.

I want to quote Donella Meadows who wrote a book called *The Local Politics of Global Sustainability*. She writes: "The trouble is the sustainable world generally offered by environmentalists is based on restriction, prohibition, regulation, and sacrifice. Hardly anyone seems to envision a sustainable world that would be a nice place to live in." If we start with a vision for that "nice place to live" instead of starting from the perspective of prohibitions and restrictions, we can often tap into that human desire to live well in the world. This approach is not a panacea, but it provides a foundation. With a focus on the ecological health of specific places and the livability of specific communities, we can shift the focus from the *lowest common denominator* based upon rules and mandates, to the highest shared interest in a shared landscape.

Las Cienegas National Conservation Area

A compelling example of the *power of place* is evidenced in a case study of collaborative conservation in the Sonoita Valley of southeastern Arizona. Las Cienegas National Conservation Area is a protected BLM unit in the Sonoita Valley, just a forty minute drive from downtown Tucson. Las Cienegas is the site of an historic ranch dating back to late 1870s and includes forty-seven thousand acres of native desert grasslands and rolling oak-studded hills. The site also has Cienega Creek, with areas of perennial water, snaking through.

In 1969, Las Cienegas ranch site was sold for real estate development, and though the development plan failed, the adjacent rural community woke up to the threat of large-scale landscape change in their quiet town. The ranch site was then sold to a mining company and in 1988 a series of land exchanges brought the ranch lands under BLM ownership. In 1995, at the invitation of the BLM, the community became intimately involved with planning for the future of Las Cienegas watershed. Those individuals committed to working with the BLM on a land-use plan for the site became known as the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership. A parallel group called the Sonoita Crossroads Community Forum also grew out of the process and began to address development on private land, which initiated a local dialogue process based upon values, vision, and actions.

In spite of stereotypes and long-held grudges, the people involved in these groups persevered to work out their differences. The impetus for this was a commitment to protect that which all stakeholders felt a shared ownership: clean water, abundant wildlife, wide open spaces, healthy grasslands, ranching, and rural character. This power of place was a driving force for everyone to develop a common vision for the future. I'll come back to this case study shortly, but now I'd

like to emphasize my second major point about community stewardship, which involves articulating a vision for the future.

Articulate a Compelling Shared Vision

We see success when people articulate an appealing, compelling, shared vision for the future of a community or a landscape at the scale that I have talked about. A well-articulated vision for the future allows the integration of national environmental and conservation goals with local values. It allows reduction in the polarization that undermines successful efforts. When a local vision is developed through an open process, we see situations where it provides a foundation that is positive, unifying, and healing. We see this approach work in many communities. We see a compelling local vision bring old-timers together with newcomers, environmental advocates with people who could care less about wildlife habitat. We see a popular local vision as the basis for significant progress.

The potential role of building upon a strong local vision is widely overlooked throughout the West as the starting point for resolving land use conflicts. The shared experience of people with differing perspectives talking, not about a conflict, but about what they want a community or a landscape to be in about 20 or 30 years, and what they want to do to get there, is a powerful tool. With an explicit emphasis on shared values and a shared vision for a landscape, a context develops for more effectively addressing specific conflicts such as those between OHV users and land managers or conservation advocates.

Looking again to the case study of Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, Karen Simms, BLM planner said: "The key that kept us together through everything, was the core vision – the shared goal we all agreed on, to which we could return whenever disputes over details threatened to get out of hand." The vision that everyone could agree on was to "*work together to perpetuate naturally functioning ecosystems while preserving the rural, grassland character of the Sonoita Valley for future generations."*

My contention is this: if we step back from the issue at hand, whether OHV use or real estate development or ranching, and start a sincere dialogue process about our shared values and shared vision for the future, then the Sonoran Institute's experience in Las Cienegas and dozens of other places offers hope that this dialogue often leads to agreement, among the strong majority of participants, that the health of the landscape is an important priority.

Almost everyone who uses public lands has a shared value in seeing that our children and grandchildren have the same opportunity that we have to enjoy the public lands: to get lost, to get found, to enjoy the blessings of our wild places, and to leave the public lands in a condition that makes us proud of what we pass on to our children. When this dialogue begins, answers are not easy, but they are more likely to emerge. The emphasis moves from conflict to consideration of the condition of the land, the impact of different uses and different levels of use, and the steps needed to protect or restore the condition of the land.

Produce Tangible Outcomes through Collaborative Partnerships

Don Snow, a writer and teacher, describes the power of "coalitions of the unlike" – bringing people together who normally wouldn't associate with one another. Has anybody ever really tried to work with someone with whom they disagree about almost every public policy issue? It is not easy. It can be difficult. And sometimes the most difficult thing is that you discover that you may like them.

The West is in a difficult transition period; we face many complex challenges. We simply must insist that public dialogue recognize this complexity. We must avoid demonizing people with whom we disagree. We must acknowledge that economic prosperity and landscape health are complementary and not conflicting objectives.

We need more emphasis on dialogue among the unlike. When people who have different life histories, different priorities and different values, sit down together, treating each other with respect, surprising solutions often emerge. Increased creativity can produce results that are often more effective, enduring, and equitable than when acting in isolation. The synergy can generate options that were never considered before, placing them on the table for discussion and analysis.

As I've mentioned, the Sonoran Institute has seen surprising results when local residents participate in a dialogue about local values, develop a shared vision for the future of a familiar place at a scale that works in people's minds, and create partnerships that lead to actions that help them to realize this vision.

Now back to Las Cienegas. I want to emphasize the diversity of this collaborative group. The Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership, for example, is made up of ranchers, environmentalists, hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians, OHV enthusiasts and motorcyclists, bird watchers, hunters, and several governmental agencies. And while the disparate nature of the Partnership made for frequent arguments, it also worked in their favor. One participant, a rancher, said: "The diversity kept us from degenerating into one faction against another. If one group lobbied for something unreasonable, four or five other groups could combine and convince them to settle down." And it was this coalition-building process, this realization of the vision and sense of place, which allowed the group to be so effective.

From 1995 to 2000, the Partnership worked with the BLM to develop a vision for the future of the landscape. Their vision included enhanced protection for natural and cultural resources and specific management goals to promote sustainable use, such as grazing and recreation, that does not degrade the resources. They then worked with the Sonoran Institute on a campaign to get Las Cienegas designated by Congress as a National Conservation Area. In 2000, Congress unanimously passed legislation establishing Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, with strong bipartisan support, mostly because of the broad support base found at home. The NCA designation not only afforded the area more resource protection, but it elevated the significance of the area to a national level. In 2003, the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership helped the BLM write the resource management plan for the area. The Partnership is now working with the

Sonoran Institute and the BLM to help implement the management plan and improve protection of nearby lands.

To conclude, I would like to underscore again that the most extraordinary results have come about, in my experience, when:

- Local residents and users participate in dialogue about local values and local places;
- They develop a shared vision for the future of a community, watershed, or landscape; and
- People from various backgrounds come together to identify the actions necessary to realize this vision.

The love of our special places can gain broad support for effective management of the landscape. In the West, change is inevitable. At this point, change in the Intermountain West is especially rapid; it is especially bewildering; it is especially threatening to many. Change can divide us and as a result it can conquer our landscapes. It can conquer our community values. It can produce a future that is the lowest common denominator. We can call it sprawl; we can call it whatever you will. We can either be conquered by that or we can tap into the places that inspire us.

Responding to Wallace Stegner's commentary on the West, I believe that the civilization of the West will better match its scenery when we better articulate a compelling shared vision for the future of our landscapes and communities, when we design policies that more effectively tap into the power of place that defines the West, and when we put more energy into building relationships and partnerships that bring together "coalitions of the unlike." We *can* create an inspiring future that matches the inspiration that many of us find in this landscape. We can shape change so that our landscapes and our communities are better off.

SECTION B

CASE STUDIES

THE ARIZONA OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE INVENTORY PARTNERSHIP

By Larry Fisher and Kathy Bond

"[We] took the approach that it's better to get as many people as possible involved at the beginning instead of asking for apologies later."

BACKGROUND

According to industry experts, more than half of all vehicles sold in Arizona are sport utility vehicles (SUVs) or light trucks, and in the past few years, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) have increased in sales an average of 29 per cent per year. In a recent survey conducted by Arizona State University, 21 per cent of Arizonans (or 1.1 million people) identified themselves as Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) enthusiasts,[4] and the total economic impact to the state from recreational OHV use was estimated at more than $4 billion. These economic benefits are spent directly on vehicles and equipment (e.g., purchase of OHVs, trailers, accessories, insurance, maintenance costs), as well as indirectly, through the money spent in local communities close to areas where people recreate - for lodging, meals, gasoline, and other goods and services.[5]

As OHVs have become more prevalent, their use has also led to increasing impacts to land and resources within Arizona's extensive system of public lands, creating new challenges for public land management agencies. Increasing OHV use has generated concerns over resource impacts (e.g., erosion, water degradation, and habitat destruction, damage to cultural sites, and violation of sites sacred to Native Americans), and led to increased conflicts with other public land uses.

The rapid expansion of OHV use was certainly not considered in the scope of these agencies' existing management plans, and the varied Federal, State, and local land management agencies promote different policies regarding OHV use. This is true even within individual agencies – where different sites may have different policies and regulations. As an example, the six National Forests in Arizona have until recently had different policies for cross-country use by OHVs.[6] This diversity of approaches has led to some confusion by the public as to where and how they may use OHVs.

Off Highway Vehicle use often crosses jurisdictional boundaries (from federal to state to local, and even to private), and many observers have long noted the need for consistency in approach among public land management agencies. It is this recognition that led to the formation of the Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership.

---

[4] There is considerable overlap, inconsistency, and controversy over the use of the terms SUV, ATV, and OHV, and they are often used interchangeably. For the purposes of this report, we use OHV to refer to all-terrain vehicles that can travel without roads or trails and such vehicles as four-wheel drive vehicles originally intended for highway use but capable of traveling off-road

[5] Results of the study, *Economic Importance of Off Highway Vehicle Recreation in Arizona*, can be viewed at: http://www.pr.state.az.us/partnerships/ohv/OHVEcon/az_ohv_econ.pdf

[6] To remedy this inconsistency, the Forest Service recently issued an environmental impact statement to address cross-country travel by OHVs and to offer guidance for standardizing road and trail signing conventions.

The Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership was created in January 2000 to develop an interagency effort to complete a comprehensive inventory of existing OHV routes on all Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and State Trust Lands within the state of Arizona. Along with the inventory, the partnership is creating a series of public access guides as well as a jointly accepted system for signage and marking of trails across the state. The ultimate goal of the partnership is the development of a seamless recreation experience for OHV users in Arizona.

Route inventory using a GPS unit and motorcycle

The OHV Inventory Partnership is comprised of four agencies: the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the USDA Forest Service, Arizona State Parks, and the Arizona State Land Department; however, a number of additional agencies and organizations are active participants: 1) Arizona Game and Fish Department, 2) Advance Resource Solutions, Inc., 3) Arizona OHV Coalition, 4) Arizona State Association of 4 Wheel Drive Clubs, 5) Arizona ATV Riders, 6) Arizona Trail Riders, and 7) Riding Arizona. Funding for the effort has been provided primarily through a state fuel tax that is used to fund OHV projects (the fund is administered by Arizona State Parks). However, each of the agencies and participating organizations has also offered contributions, both in funding and in kind, to support the effort.

Collaboration among these key agencies presents an opportunity for public land management agencies to inventory and designate routes throughout the state of Arizona, including all land management jurisdictions. Prior to the creation of this partnership, there were no official OHV route inventories or designated route networks within the state of Arizona.

HOW THE PARTNERSHIP WORKS

Inventory data needs are identified collectively by participating agencies, and collection of appropriate data is coordinated by the Forest Service. Global Positioning Systems (GPS) data is gathered by motorcycle, on foot and horseback, with ATVs, and with four wheel drive vehicles. This information is often collected with the assistance of citizen volunteers recruited from local recreation organizations. The inventory data includes route type, width, name/number, observed uses, hazards, and various types of encountered sites and activities (e.g., campsites). Photo points are also recorded for future monitoring studies.

Based on this data, the Partnership produces Access Guides, which identify appropriate routes for public use. The funds obtained from the sale of the Guides help continue to support the work of the Partnership, including the publication of additional Access Guides.

The Partnership is also working on the development of uniform signage and use regulations for all routes within Arizona. This work is being furthered through a uniform process for

designating route networks, combining the legal sideboards and public input through a computer-assisted tool, the Evaluation Tree (developed by Advance Resource Solutions, Inc.) that produces alternatives for agencies' planning processes.

ONGOING CHALLENGES

While consistency and standardization were cited as major contributions and successes of the partnership, some voiced concerns about the loss of local decision making and responsiveness, and criticized the time and effort that were sometimes sacrificed in the name of coordination. Several people acknowledged these important trade-offs and they are continuing to seek ways to resolve these occasional tensions. Building in flexibility between the state- and local-level decision processes will likely continue to be a challenge for the Partnership.

The Partnership's important inventory work must still be complemented with appropriate decision processes, and with planning and implementation activities, and interviewees acknowledged that there remains much work to be done in these areas. These steps require a growing participation, and sense of ownership, by a wide range of interest and user groups. While there is general public support for a more systematic approach to the inventory, evaluation, and eventual designation of routes, the process is not without controversy, particularly within the broader context of land use planning. The procedures used to inventory routes, as well as the use of the Evaluation Tree technology (computer software that evaluates inventoried routes and provides the basis for the development of a preferred alternative), have been challenged in meetings and open houses by tribal, state, county officials, and by environmental groups. The Partnership, and the individual agencies working within this framework, will have to continue to educate and inform the public, and to adapt the tools and approaches to meet the needs of these public processes.

The biggest hurdle remains the trust from the public as well as within the agencies. Many view the inventory with suspicion and have assumed that this is an effort to restrict access and institute closures; some are concerned about the potential problems of institutionalizing too much standardization and uniformity. And there are many with strong biases and values – both for and against increased control over OHV use on public lands. These concerns have been noted in the mixed public responses to the inventory (especially in the context of ongoing revisions to existing Resource Management or Forest Plans). Agency staff have also raised concerns because of the remaining differences in approaches to inventory, designation, and planning in general.

Even with agreement on data standards, a looming challenge for the land management agencies is using the data consistently. Here again, the differences among agencies, and opinions of individual staff and specialists, suggest that some will not accept the validity of the data, and others will use different criteria in interpreting the data for decision making.

LESSONS LEARNED

A) Data protocols and standards present a major challenge in multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional travel management. The Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership has worked hard to negotiate and develop a "route inventory data dictionary" that is acceptable and used by all land management agencies. It offers consistency in the collection and analysis of data, and is viewed as a major contribution by many participating agencies and transportation specialists.

B) Flexible funding has been another key aspect of the Partnership's success. While access to State Parks funding had initially been a principle source of support for Partnership activities, the ability of each of the agencies to tap into their own budgets, and also generate funds through the publication of the access guides, has helped sustain the Partnership over time. The interagency partnership is cited as a major plus for leveraging grant funding, because potential donors see the broader applications of the Partnership's work.

C) Volunteers, secured through strong working relationships with local OHV groups, have contributed enormously to the Partnership's success. Many of these volunteers have intimate knowledge of the lands and routes, and are an invaluable local resource – both for their familiarity with local conditions as well as for the volunteer time, labor, and resources they contribute. Volunteers have provided important preliminary route information (e.g., location, condition), assisted with inventory work, and generally created greater efficiencies for land management agency staff. Concerns about the reliability and credibility of the data have been addressed having the Forest Service directly responsible for the supervision of all data collection.

D) The right personalities and strong, committed leadership (including designated staff positions) were often cited as key factors for the Partnership's success. The idealism, optimism, openness, and sheer energy of key Partnership leaders were mentioned by interviewees as fundamental elements that contributed to the effort's achievements.

E) Initial suspicion and resistance – of OHV groups, environmentalists, and even agency staff – is an ongoing challenge for the Partnership. The Partnership has attempted to build understanding and trust by actively engaging people in the inventory process, through continued education and awareness building, and in general by helping people understand the importance of the inventory in clarifying, legalizing, and providing improved management for appropriate routes and uses. However, there is a wide diversity of opinions about OHV use – even within the OHV "community" – and many internal conflicts continue to present challenges, as well as opportunities, for the Partnership.

CALIFORNIA OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE STAKEHOLDERS ROUNDTABLE

By Deborah Chavez and Robert Fitzhenry

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

In May 2000, the State of California's Department of Parks and Recreation Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation (OHMVR) Division established the Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Stakeholders Roundtable and convened a precedent setting series of meetings to address reauthorization of the OHV program and the efforts necessary to develop the optimum off-highway motor vehicle recreation program in California. The purpose of the OHV Stakeholders Roundtable is to enhance the OHMVR Division's ability to provide quality off-highway recreation opportunities in a safe and environmentally responsible manner. The Division and OHMRV Commission consider Stakeholder recommendations for incorporation into legislation, regulations, Commission policy and the Division action plan. The Division initially formed the OHV Stakeholders Roundtable to inform and ensure a consensus-oriented process, respecting the needs of all affected parties, and focused on identifying the best methods to manage OHV programs.

Not all went as planned in early meetings. In the first meeting, OHV people sat on one side of the table and environmental people on the other. Still it was productive in that they developed a list of issues. Unfortunately, the second meeting was more problematic. The facilitators used a standard problem-solving process, which turned out not to be useful for this particular group. After the second meeting, the Division brought in a new facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy (California State University, Sacramento). The Center used a process called mind-mapping/charting to develop a categorized shopping list. Mind mapping is a physical exercise – participants outline the optimum OHV program in the center of a big wall, and then write and place chapters of a book around it. This exercise helps participants identify the universe of issues involved in the topic; issues are expanded and contracted until participants feel they have something clear enough to work with.

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

California Off-Highway Vehicle Stakeholders Roundtable

The Off-Highway Vehicle Stakeholders Roundtable is a state-wide program that now has approximately 50 participants, representing 37 organizations. In general, the Stakeholders consist of OHV enthusiasts, environmental organizations, non-motorized enthusiasts (such as equestrians and mountain bikers), private property owners, public land management agencies, law enforcement agencies, local communities, businesses, and local government agencies.

California Parks and Recreation is the lead and has the authority. Each constituency has a caucus to represent issues under discussion (e.g., the law enforcement caucus). The structure of it can change to meet the needs of the issues they are working on. The group describes themselves as a "consensus seeking" effort.

Individual members communicate information to and from their organizations and contribute data/information as necessary. The OHMVR Division provides staff support, collects and organizes data, acts as a liaison to the OHMVR Commission, and provides technical support. The facilitators provide meeting support and process advice.

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The initial goals of the OHV Stakeholders Roundtable were to:

- Act as an advisory board to the OHMVR Division
- Act as an on-going forum for communication
- Identify and prioritize the issues and challenges facing OHV recreation
- Eliminate false assumptions

In general, the Roundtable's goal is to encourage more cooperative spirit and have everyone engaged in the process. They seek 100 per cent consensus on text of legislation they put forward. And they have had several successes, so they are currently changing the goals they are working toward. This may mean that some members of the group will change over time.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The group has focused primarily on legislative change. The first major accomplishment was their support for the Department's legislative proposal to extend the OHMVR Program's sunset date from January 1, 2003 to January 1, 2007 (Assembly Bill 723, Ch. 227-2001). This extension allows the Roundtable sufficient time to thoroughly examine all aspects of California's OHMVR Program and to make more far-reaching legislative and policy recommendations. The second achievement was the passage of Assembly Bill 2274 (Ch. 563-2002) which included a) amendments to the conservation and enforcement services act (CESA), b) lowering of California off-highway vehicle noise emissions level to 96 decibels, c) changes to OHV-related law enforcement violations, d) education and training for OHV safety, e) broadened representation on the OHMVR Commission makeup, f) requirements for the OHV grants program, and g) reporting requirements developed by the OHMVR Division. The third success was Assembly Bill 2666, a companion bill to AB 2274. Significant aspects of this bill include clarification regarding the distribution of in-lieu fees to cities and counties, improvements to the ATV safety certification process, and adjustments to the California Vehicle Code regarding use of emergency lights. The group currently has a fourth bill in process.

FOSTERING PROGRESS

There is a good combination of leadership and a good facilitator. There is support, companionship, and the commitment to work together.

KEY CHALLENGES

There was an important initial education phase for the group, during which time they had to work together on each of the chapters of the book identified in the mind-mapping exercise. It was extremely difficult to get people to appreciate that they were living in two worlds — they served as representatives for their group, yet at the same time were part of the Roundtable's collaborative effort. But they continued to look for opportunities to do good work together.

Setting standards for off-highway sound emission was an important issue. The issue includes environmental concerns as well as the impacts of urbanization, because increased urbanization in California can result in use conflict over a finite land base. In considering the issue, the group became discouraged because federal law precluded the state from setting a manufacturing standard. This would be an obvious approach to solve the problem. What was needed was a reframing – an attempt to define clearly what the group wanted. As it turned out, the group wanted vehicles used off-highway (in particular, motorcycles, ATVs, and snowmobiles) to be quieter. The state does have a right to regulate how state land is used. The negotiation involved land use criteria rather than manufacturing standards. Reframing therefore became a critical aspect of the work, and this reframing needed to happen at two levels: first, in definition of the presenting problem, and second, in shifting the focus of collaborative action from getting past "what I don't want" (problem solving) to creating "what I do want."

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

The Roundtable used a caucus structure, in which a sub-group of leaders decide on an action plan. Who they use depends on who has the information needed to get the job done. Members of the caucus might be from law enforcement, industry, government, user groups, etc. Some members participate more often because they have information to share on many topics.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Expectations should be outlined
- Charters should be used
- Process must be clear
- Rules of engagement and ground rules must be negotiated and enforced
- Setting a timeline for when and how to end membership on the roundtable should have been set
- Leadership rises to the top

- Each person needs to make a commitment to educate themselves and really study the problems and understand the ramifications of decisions
- Everyone should be given a chance to speak up

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

The Roundtable is in the midst of ongoing change. The mission on legislation has been met, and the group is now moving toward programmatic issues, such as looking at the larger picture of all recreation in California. Membership may change based on the needs of the Division and the skill sets of individual participants. Ongoing efforts include work on advertising (concern over irresponsible advertising), soil standards, law enforcement, allocation of funds, and a fuel tax study.

CARIBOU-TARGHEE NATIONAL FOREST:
TRAVEL MANAGEMENT COLLABORATIVE LEARNING WORKSHOP

By Sharon Metzler and Cynthia Manning

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Caribou-Targhee National Forest occupies more than 3 million acres, stretching across southeastern Idaho from the Montana, Utah, and Wyoming borders. The Forest recently completed its revised Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP, or Forest Plan) and is currently in the process of developing a Travel Management Plan that is consistent with the revised LRMP and addresses changes in travel use. The Caribou-Targhee NF is experiencing increased Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use and recognizes the need to better and consistently manage this increase.

Prior to the Caribou-Targhee National Forest (CTNF) initiating the scoping process for the Travel Management Plan, a concerned citizen contacted the Wildlife Management Institute (WMI), asking them to be involved with the upcoming travel plan revision. The WMI works towards ensuring the conservation and professional management of North American wildlife. The WMI agreed to request grant funds from the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP). TRCP is a coalition of conservation organizations dedicated to assuring access to public lands for hunters and anglers. WMI members were aware of the diversity of opinion regarding access on the CTNF, and of the consequent polarization of some forest users. TRCP agreed to fund efforts to bring forest users together to discuss travel management on the east side of the forest. TRCP consequently contacted faculty at Utah State University's Department of Environment and Society and the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism (USU) and explored the potential for USU to convene and facilitate a public dialogue regarding access, travel and OHVs on national forest lands. TRCP then contracted with USU faculty to lead a Collaborative Learning Workshop for persons interested in travel management issues facing the CTNF.

The USU facilitation team met with a number of natural resource managers prior to the workshop to learn about the Forest and the particular challenges of natural resource management on the CTNF. These natural resource managers represented Wyoming Game and Fish, Idaho Fish and Game, Idaho State Parks and the US Forest Service. When asked by TRCD, CTNF personnel helped identify possible workshop participants. The USU team administered a pre-meeting questionnaire regarding issues in the identified area. They also conducted a map exercise.

More than 40 people met in Soda Springs, Idaho on January 9 – 10, 2004 to participate in Utah State University's Collaborative Learning Workshop. The workshop was conducted the evening of January 9 and all day January 10.

The workshop was a "hands-on" experience. The participants represented three stakeholder groups: motorized users, non-motorized users, and natural resource managers. The natural resources managers had two roles in the process – providers of data and information about the forest, and stakeholders with an interest in the outcome.

On Friday evening participants were divided into four discussion groups by the workshop facilitation team, two each for motorized users and non-motorized users. The groups were charged with determining: 1) What is important to them about recreation use on the forest, 2) their vision for future recreation use, and 3) areas of past recreation use and those areas of concern. As the result of these discussions, the group identified several points of agreement. These include the need to care for the land, along with preserving fish and wildlife, and the concern for the future of the forest given the desire to ensure that participants' children and grandchildren are able to enjoy similar recreation settings on the forest that are available today.

Discussion Group at a Workshop

The following day, four different groups were formed, using in part the information gained from the Friday evening discussions. Each group consisted of a mix of motorized users, non-motorized users and natural resource managers. Each group was assigned to look at one geographic area on the Forest, of four areas designated to be high priority. While the Friday evening groups were able to identify several points of agreement, members of the Saturday groups were unable to do so. This may have been largely due to the brevity of the workshop rather than the groups' reluctance or inability to find agreement.

Those involved in the workshop developed an appreciation of the challenges the Forest Service encounters when making a decision. Participants also appreciated that a number of Forest Service people participated in the workshop, not only lending technical expertise but also demonstrating their commitment to working with people and communities to manage conflict.

PRIMARY PARTICIPANTS AND ROLES

Drs. Terry Sharik, Steven Burr, and Michael Butkus were the three USU faculty members who designed and facilitated the workshop. They also took on the role of helping participants see that conflict is natural, and that an important first step in managing conflict is to surface and identify what the conflict actually is. "It's not realistic to believe that travel management on the national forest is free of conflict among forest users; conflict is natural, and it's important to surface this conflict if it is to be managed."

Natural resource agency participants included representatives from the Caribou-Targhee NF, Idaho Department of Game and Fish, Wyoming Game and Fish, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation. The sponsoring group TRCP is a non-governmental organization. The citizen participants were invited based on their involvement with and use of that area of the CTNF or their interest in issues associated with travel management. Some participants were known to be affiliated with particular organizations: sportsmen's groups, off highway vehicle groups, non-motorized user groups (hiking and equestrian), and conservation organizations. Ninety percent of the invited participants were regular users of the CTNF.

USU facilitators designed the workshop and led the discussion. Some workshop participants noted that "most agency people had never experienced having an 'equal role' in natural resource discussions. Usually they are in the leadership role." Since TRCP sponsored the workshop, and USU facilitated, the Forest Service's role was to listen, participate in the discussion, and provide resource information and data as needed. Some participants found this to be favorable.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIVES

The stated objectives for the workshop, as expressed by the USU facilitators, were to: 1) understand and appreciate the diversity of recreation activities on the forest, 2) understand the potential impacts of these activities on natural resources, 3) provide input for the development of a new Travel Management Plan, and 4) establish working groups for future input to the Travel Management Plan efforts.

RESULTS

As the workshop progressed on Saturday there were attempts on the part of the USU facilitators to get the groups to begin the process of identifying those areas or routes where motorized use was acceptable and where only non-motorized use was appropriate. The groups were reluctant to do so. It is not clear why that was so. In retrospect, some participants suggested that a single workshop only a matter of hours long did not allow adequate time for participants to begin to make such recommendations. However, it was clear that participants felt that there was a need to manage travel uses on the forest. Participants also stated how they valued the National Forest and "wanted it to be available for their children and grandchildren."

The Forest Service staff heard many specific concerns. They believe that the dialogue helped them formulate strong Purpose and Need and Proposed Action Statements for the environmental assessment.

USU completed a comprehensive report for this workshop. It can be found at:
http://extension.usu.edu/cooperative/iort/files/PDF/caribou.pdf

FOSTERING PROGRESS

It is uncommon, in southeastern Idaho, for a non-governmental organization such as TRPC to take such an interest in travel planning, or to work with and fund an academic institution (USU) to set up a facilitated workshop. Some workshop participants were skeptical of TRCP's motives, wondering if the outcome of the workshop would be biased toward TRCP perspectives of travel management. Participants appreciated USU's design and facilitation of the workshop – they were generally viewed as neutral and unbiased.

KEY CHALLENGES

The day-and-a-half workshop was definitely too short of a timeframe to accomplish specific targets. The USU facilitators tried to get participants to make recommendations on uses of trails on the forest, but the group just was not willing or able to do that. USU facilitators felt the time constraint was the limiting factor. However, one of the participants interviewed for this case study thought that even though time was short, the inclusion of people who were not well acquainted with some of the trails further limited the group's capacity to offer recommendations.

Some months following the workshop, a group of participants met informally to identify trails they felt were suitable for motorized and non-motorized use. The group came together out of a sense that they were ready to document what *they* thought about trail use. For them, this was the logical next step in following up on the workshop's limited accomplishments. The group used Forest Service maps and completed a criteria process and format provided by the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. The result of this exercise was shared with the Soda Springs District Ranger. This document was considered as part of the formal scoping for the Travel Management Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Workshop participants clearly identified the next steps to be taken. Many left with an enhanced understanding of collaborative processes and the usefulness of the collaborative approach to planning efforts, and all but two indicated they would be interested in working on future collaborative endeavors. However, that did not occur. USU and participants alike expressed disappointment.

LESSONS LEARNED

1) Make certain all participants understand the rules of engagement. While this workshop was very civil in the way it was conducted, interactions occurred much later in the travel planning process between the user groups, which were intimidating and unacceptable to some participants. A principal ground rule is to respect each other's points of view.

2) Select a meeting facility that is regarded as "neutral" by all participants. The building used for this meeting was the office of Monsanto Corporation. Some of the people invited to participate in the workshop were offended by the meeting location and chose not to participate. The facility, however, was the only place in Soda Springs large enough to handle a group of 40 people and was provided without fee.

3) Perceived or real agendas can affect collaborative efforts. Some participants were concerned that since the workshop was sponsored by the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, an overall bias could be cast over the proceedings.

4) Set the expectations for results and follow through with those expectations. The workshop provided a collaborative learning experience and the opportunity for people to voice issues, but there was limited actual follow-through. What were the expectations for the participants in using their newly acquired skills? It appears that the Caribou-Targhee NF, while interested in the process, did not integrate the participants (as a recognized collaborative group) into the development of the Forest's Travel Management Plan. That left the participants wondering what had been expected of them. Even though several indicated that the workshop provided a quality experience, they acknowledged that it produced little and seemed to be an end unto itself. The USU facilitators shared the sense of disappointment that there was no follow-through on the event.

5) When working in a collaborative process, the probability of achieving participants' objectives is enhanced when participants have a similar level of understanding of resource conditions and agency processes. Some of the people attending the workshop were unacquainted with local land and resource issues, and this lack of knowledge or insight proved frustrating. This issue might not have seemed so important if additional meetings had been scheduled by the group.

Cromer Ridge OHV Management: Daniel Boone National Forest

By Kathy Bond and Larry Fisher

BACKGROUND

Daniel Boone National Forest

The Daniel Boone National Forest [DBNF] is located in the mountains of eastern Kentucky and encompasses over 700,000 acres of land. Created in 1933 by a proclamation by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the national forest is characterized by steep forested ridges, narrow valleys, numerous rivers and streams, two wilderness areas and the 269-mile Sheltowee Trace National Recreation Trail. The DBNF is one of the most heavily used forests in the southern U.S., with over 5 million visitors annually.[7]

In contrast to national forests in the western United States, which were formed from public domain lands, eastern forests were formed by an act of Congress giving permission to acquire patented lands to form a national forest.[8] Since its inception in 1933, DBNF has grown incrementally with the acquisition of private lands that have watershed tracts, high levels of biodiversity, need for restoration, or other criteria developed by the forest. The result of this historical land acquisition is a fragmented landscape where tracts of private land are intermixed with National Forest System lands.

CROMER RIDGE: AN OVERVIEW

The Cromer Ridge OHV management project was intended to protect a watershed from unregulated OHV use in a 7,000 acre area in the London District.[9] The watershed provided habitat to known threatened and endangered species and was being affected by severe erosion and impacts to soil and water resources. Located in rural Laurel County, Cromer Ridge is an area that had been used since the late 1960s by motocross, jeep and ATV enthusiasts, with dune buggies being one of the most popular 4-wheel drive vehicles. In the past 30 years, there were few residents in the area and virtually no regulation or enforcement of trespass or road use laws and regulations. During this period, use was primarily on private property, but some use spilled over on national forest land. From 1969-1998, DBNF OHV policy was "Open unless ordered closed." Both local and out-of-town enthusiasts became accustomed to the unregulated use in the remote area, characterized by old timber and mining roads, unmarked land boundaries, and a large number of absentee landowners. Cromer Ridge was a popular site because of its steep inclines and the riding experience it offered, and, in part, because of its proximity to I-75 and its

[7] http://www.southernregion.fs.fed.us/boone
[8] Weeks Act, 1911
[9] DBNF has six districts: Morehead, Stanton, London, Somerset, Stearns and Redbird

relatively short driving time from large population centers.[10] The dynamic of fragmented landownership, remote location, and lack of residents made the area attractive to OHV users. The land ownership pattern was described: "It's like throwing a can of paint against a wall and you see the splatter with federal land and private land all messed up."

A CATALYST FOR CHANGE

The situation at Cromer Ridge began to change in the 1990s, however. Over time, DBNF acquired tracts of land from The Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Lands, and private landowners in the Cromer Ridge area, along with the purchased land's existing OHV use pattern. In some cases, the land had been used for two generations of OHV users with little or no interference from landowners. In recognition that the area could not be managed under the existing Forest policy, the Forest Supervisor signed a closure order for national forest lands in the Cromer Ridge area in 1993. On this "Limited Use Area", OHV use on national forest land was confined to public roads. From 1993 forward, London District personnel and law enforcement staff made an effort to contact the OHV enthusiasts through the distribution of leaflets, signage, and posting of maps and information at public locations in the area to communicate: 1) use on private land was by permission of landowner only; 2) there was no use on national forest land except on designated roads; and, 3) there was no use on roads except by street legal vehicles. OHV restoration projects were initiated in selected areas of National Forest lands. Forest Service staff took note that while the "Limited Use Area" order had the desired effect of reducing OHV use on national forest lands in the Cromer Ridge area, use was increasing on the privately owned areas in the Laurel Branch watershed.

Cromer Ridge

The Cromer Ridge area experienced more use in the 1990s, following the national trend of an increasing number of OHVs sold and the concurrent increased demand for places to ride. In 1998, when the DBNF OHV Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was completed, there was a reversal of the existing policy on the forest to "Closed unless designated open." By closing off previously-used areas, the forest closure contributed to increased OHV use on private lands in the Cromer Ridge area and it "became a major playground area." London District staff reports that on any given holiday weekend, there could be as many as 5,000 OHV users in that area, some of whom traveled from as far as Michigan, Indiana, Tennessee and West Virginia, in addition to local enthusiasts. The Forest Service completed a GIS project to bring all boundaries up to current standards so both user and law enforcement officers could locate forest land.

[10] I-75 is a north-south interstate highway that connects regional population centers of Cincinnati, Ohio, Lexington, Kentucky, and Knoxville and Chattanooga, Tennessee.

The acquisition of a long-planned 400-acre tract in 2002 placed the mouth of the Laurel Branch watershed – one of the primary OHV playgrounds – under forest management. Habitat for federally listed Threatened and Endangered (T & E) mussel populations exist downstream. This acquisition became the catalyst for the Forest Service to begin an active OHV management plan for Cromer Ridge.

OHV MANAGEMENT OF CROMER RIDGE

Initially, Forest Service staff posted the National Forest boundaries in the Cromer Ridge area and made appropriate changes to maps and signage in a transitional phase "to get [OHV] users used to the idea of U.S. ownership." Warnings were given to OHV users but "lacked teeth" in that there was no fine attached to the warnings; illegal use continued to increase. Signing and enforcement on national forest lands alone was not curtailing the existing use pattern, which originated on private land. There was a general acknowledgement on the part of the Forest Service that enforcement was going to be an issue, given the history of use in the area and the perception among users that the area was a designated open area. In addition, the Forest Service recognized that issues on national forest lands could not be adequately addressed without clarifying the status of OHV use on private lands in the area.

The Forest Service began to identify, map and contact resident and absentee landowners an effort to define road and access issues and to determine if the landowners had given permission for OHV use (in some cases, absentee landowners had inherited the property and did not know where the property lines were located). Documented conversations with approximately 35 landowners revealed a consensus that they did not support or allow unregulated public use of their land for OHV recreation. In addition, the Forest Service informed local county and other law enforcement agencies to make them aware of its plan to enforce road use and Forest Service rules and regulations in the area.

The landowners asked the Forest Service to host a meeting to take a leadership role in regulating OHV use in the area, citing "not wanting to get involved" and "afraid of becoming a target" as reasons why they did not assume leadership. One landowner interviewed described a five-year period where he patrolled his property boundary on weekends, wearing a pistol for personal protection. Cases of vandalism and "at least 2-3 deaths of OHV users a year" contributed to the landowners' reluctance to take a leadership role. In response, as the lead by default, the Forest Service hosted two meetings and began to bring together a multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approach that included the local Laurel County government, the State of Kentucky, private landowners, the Kentucky Division of Water, Appalachian Science in the Public Interest (ASPI), The Nature Conservancy, and other interested parties to address the unregulated use. Law enforcement efforts were coordinated between the Forest Service, State of Kentucky, and Laurel County in order to enforce rules and regulations. Several months after the meetings, an OHV club apparently offered to help reclaim the Cromer Ridge area and engaged two of the landowners in a conversation about turning their land into a pay area for OHV use.

In 2003, the Forest Service posted appropriate travel management signs on forest lands and roads and distributed a notice and map in public areas. Information about the effort to enforce existing

rules and regulations was communicated to a broad audience of users through an OHV club internet website. Forest Service law enforcement officers partnered with other law enforcement agencies to enforce the regulations and issue citations to illegal OHV users who were driving on county roads. Word of citations being issued "spread like wildfire" and according to the Forest Service, non-street legal OHV use in the Cromer Ridge area declined 90 per cent between Memorial Day and July 4, 2003.

ONGOING CHALLENGES

Restricted use in the Cromer Ridge has led to increased legal and illegal OHV use on other areas of the forest and private lands in the area. Private fee areas in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Windrock, Tennessee, as well as public land areas are experiencing increased use. A challenge lies in how to continue law enforcement to "maintain the situation"—no small feat in a forest that has ten law enforcement officers for 700,000 acres. The number of users who do not belong to an organized group makes the task of communicating available trails, rules and regulations a daunting one. Issuing a citation is "like putting a band aid on a cut 10 inches long" when the numbers of users are expanding at the existing rate. While issuing citations has had "a major impact" in controlling unauthorized use across the forest, there is a need to increase law enforcement efforts.

In its capacity to provide recreational opportunities, the DBNF is attempting to enhance existing trails and provide a meaningful experience for OHV users that have a variety of skills and objectives. There is a challenge to provide a range of opportunities on designated routes and to maintain those trails with limited Forest Service resources. Other jurisdictions in Kentucky appear to be responding to the increased demand: state legislation allows OHV use up to .2 miles on some secondary roads (dirt, gravel) where the volume of traffic is low in order to access legal OHV trails. Also, the State of Kentucky has given authority for the counties to designate some roads as open to OHV use.

A turning point for Cromer Ridge is the beginning of restoration efforts; however, as is the case with other public land management agencies, these efforts are dependent upon available funding and resources. Changing ownership patterns in adjacent areas to Cromer Ridge may either help or hinder restoration efforts, depending on to whom a landowner may sell and what may occur on the land. On some land where timber and coal have already been extracted, the landowners may lease some tracts to OHV groups. The economics of OHV recreation is well documented and the initial investment for an OHV has a cascading effect. One person interviewed commented, "When someone invests $6,000 for an ATV and has purchased a trailer and/or truck to haul it on, then paying $2,000-$3,000 to lease a tract of land to ride on doesn't present a problem for most OHV enthusiasts."

There is an ongoing sense of distrust and betrayal from members of the OHV community who state that if there had been cooperation and trust on the part of the Forest Service and the OHV community, something could have been done to keep at least part of the area available to OHV use. "We didn't even get throwed a bone, so to speak," said an OHV enthusiast. However, as a counterpoint, the Forest Service continues to communicate that keeping part of the Cromer Ridge

area available was "simply not an option" given the existing laws and regulations.[11] Misunderstandings and ineffective communication have served to increase what one person view as "the perception gap."

LESSONS LEARNED

A. Addressing the perception gap between the OHV community and the Forest Service has been an ongoing challenge. While efforts have been made to clarify rules, regulations and actions, misinformation and misunderstanding is widespread. There are several examples of how differing perceptions have created tension. There is a perception in the OHV community that they were excluded and "weren't invited to the table" during the discussion and planning to enforce the existing regulations at Cromer Ridge. However, based on those existing regulations, the OHV community was not viewed by the Forest Service (or other entities) as a relevant stakeholder in the collaborative process, as it had no legal standing; thus, they were not invited to the table. While the OHV community said it suffered "a net loss" by losing total access to the Cromer Ridge area, the Forest Service's perspective is that illegal motorized use on public and private land was never negotiable. In another example, the OHV community has the perception that the Forest Service "made an end-run" with the Cromer Ridge private landowners in order to thwart an OHV club's efforts to negotiate with them about a potential fee area on their private lands. In the Forest Service's view, it was performing its duty to enforce rules and regulations.

There are also different perceptions about a proposed "good will" cleanup by the OHV community of the Cromer Ridge area. While the OHV enthusiasts feel the Forest Service cancelled the cleanup arbitrarily, the Forest Service and Laurel County declined to become involved because the requisite coordination between the landowners and the OHV community had not been done and there wasn't adequate time for planning.

B. Effective, far-reaching communication about rules, regulations and actions remains a challenge. Forest Service communication with the OHV community was complicated by the inability to access the non-organized users who came to the Cromer Ridge from a wide geographic area. Mid-stream in the Cromer Ridge project, the Forest Service recognized their rules and regulations were being posted on an OHV website; in hindsight, this medium could have been utilized earlier to complement other strategies for education and information. Posters and literature distributed at OHV/motorcycle retailers have not proven to be successful as "it isn't in their best interests" to communicate closures, rules and regulations that could impact sales. Avenues for consistent, ongoing communication remain to be explored and accessed.

C. A collaborative process, by some definitions, engages affected stakeholders in a problem solving effort. The Cromer Ridge OHV Management collaborative process involved a number of stakeholders (Forest Service, county government, Kentucky State environmental agencies, private landowners and other entities) to "gain control" of a major illegal use area. Although affected by the Cromer Ridge OHV Management collaborative process, OHV users were not

[11] Existing laws and regulations cited include: 1) public roads are subject to state regulations, beyond the jurisdiction of the Forest Service; 2) motorized use on private lands was subject to a 1977 Kentucky regulation requiring permission of the landowners; and, 3) national forest lands in the area had been closed to motorized use since 1993.

viewed as legitimate stakeholders because their use was illegal. Outside of the actual collaborative process, OHV users could provide information validating their rights to use that land (via landowner permission) and were encouraged to communicate rules and regulations through their networks. In retrospect, casting a wider net to include affected stakeholders in the process may have been beneficial to achieving the long-term goal of enforcing rules and regulations to curtail illegal activity.

D. In spite of the OHV community's reaction to the enforcement effort at Cromer Ridge, there appears to be an opportunity for the Forest Service to collaborate with the OHV community on specific projects on the DBNF. As Forest Service budgets continue to remain flat (or are reduced) and there are increasing demands on its staff and fiscal resources, partnerships with interest groups (in this case, organized OHV groups) may improve the agency's capacity for restoration activities, monitoring and maintenance of trails, and other identified and mutually agreed-upon activities. There is a potential to develop partnerships and improve relationships in the process.

HOPKINTON-EVERETT RESERVOIR MULTIPLE-USE TRAIL SYSTEM TRAILS

By Robert Fitzhenry and Debbie Chavez

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir (Hop-Ev), near Hopkinton, New Hampshire, serves as a dry flood control reservoir for the Merrimack River. Prior to 1987, Hop-Ev land had been abused by 4X4 trucks and Jeep users, who destroyed vegetation and created significant erosion. There was even an incident in which a small crane was on site to pull out trucks that had become mired in the mud. Trash dumping and drinking parties were also issues. Local law enforcement in this rural community would not answer calls to the area without backup.

During the early to mid-80s, the Merrimack Valley Trail Riders (MVTR) sought and received permission from the landowner (Army Corps of Engineers) to run a dirt bike event on the property. However, once those riders discovered the trails they began to return to ride them. Today's multi-use trail network grew from existing dirt roads and the new trails cut for these events.

A meeting of mutual needs drove the designation of the Hop-Ev Reservoir as a multi-use trail system. The State and users wanted official trails open on a daily basis and the Corps needed greater control over the area. The first proposal was developed in 1987. Soon after, the NH Bureau of Trails (at that time known as the Bureau of Off Highway Vehicles) stepped in as the land manager. The New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED) is licensed by the Corps of Engineers to manage most of the land in the Reservoir for wildlife and forestry. The Bureau of Trails (part of DRED) set out to:

- Stabilize and recover damaged areas
- Establish and mark a legal trail network for ATVs and dirt bikes
- Maintain and enforce the network and the ban on 4X4 trucks and jeeps

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

The US Army Corps of Engineers and the State of New Hampshire (Department of Resources and Economic Development, Bureau of Trails (NH-BT)) are the primary stakeholders. The Army Corps offers its land for the State-run trail network. Army Corps stays distanced from day-to-day administration, which is the responsibility of NH-BT. Army Corps does act in a law enforcement capacity, as do local police and NH Fish and Game officers.

Issues are resolved in a cooperative fashion between the Army Corps and NH-BT. This does not change the understanding that Army Corps is the final authority on the use of its land. Federal regulations (including Title 36 USC, Sect 327 and applicable Army regulations) and the flood control mission of the reservoir property and staff take precedence over any recreational demand on resources.

A critical partner of NH-BT is the local user group, the Merrimack Valley Trail Riders (MVTR). MVTR has little or no contact with the Army Corps, instead working through NH-BT for permission to initiate significant changes to the trail network. MVTR also receives grant funding from NH-BT for specific trail maintenance or improvement projects. NH-BT and MVTR perform the majority of work on the trails.

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The initial objectives were clear: bring the area from unmanaged use to managed recreation and expand the designated, legal place to ride OHVs in the State. These met landowner, land manager, and user needs.

The trail system contributed to the Army Corps' ability to regain control of the land from its unmanaged use of the 1980s, and the NH-BT/MVTR partnership is providing multiple user groups with legal trails offering diverse levels of challenge. While these initial objectives brought the parties together and were apparently met, the Army Corps feels that, although a trail system might be brought in for other reasons, it would not necessarily be their solution today to control lawlessness on an undeveloped property. While this approach worked at that point in time, given the existing leadership and social climate, it would not likely be repeated today on this property if starting from scratch.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The trail system and management of the trails has matured to a steady state, with roles and expectations among the 3 primary parties understood and fulfilled. User opinion of the network and satisfaction with their riding experience is high. Use of the trail network is significant, with more than 100 trucks/trailers in the lot on a busy Saturday or Sunday, equating to more than 150 riders in the woods.

FOSTERING PROGRESS

Leadership support at the inception of the project drove its progress – everyone involved wanted to make it happen. The NH-BT Chief wrote the initial proposal, with support from local legislators and the NH Fish and Game (law enforcement interest). NH-BT prioritized funding to move the project forward, both with operational funds and with grant monies for user clubs.

Initial support or opposition from local communities and local law enforcement cannot be quantified. They were neither involved nor were they opposed to the plan.

KEY CHALLENGES

Off-trail riding is the primary challenge. This appears to be a case of "One per cent of users wrecking things for the 99 per cent doing things right." Regardless, off-trail use is the single most significant area of concern for all parties, particularly the Army Corps. Off-trail use that causes environmental damage or impacts the integrity of flood control structures (e.g., earthen dams) would force them to close access to the land.

A number of tools are used to control off-trail use and foster responsible riding:

- Education: NH-BT worked with the NH legislature to bring about laws requiring rider responsibility literature to be issued to all purchasers of new ATVs.
- Law enforcement, from the Army Corps, NH Fish and Game, and local police to manage proper use. Resources for law enforcement are limited, however, and law enforcement is not an active stakeholder in management of the trail system. The level of authority among law enforcement parties also differs.
- Trail patrols: MVTR runs a trail patrol force whose mission is to assist riders in need. They are there to help and educate, not enforce. However, since they are distinguishable by the vests they wear, their visibility in and of itself tends to make others behave by the rules.

Bridge construction

Off-property use can also be a problem, as local riders use abandoned roads, snowmobile trails, and other routes to reach Hop-Ev or transit through Hop-Ev from point to point. It is unclear whether this is a result of the interest in the legal trail network or simply a fact of life in rural areas where private land ownership dominates.

User conflict is not a significant issue at Hop-Ev. It is an established area for motorized recreation, so others have "ceded" its use, according to the evaluation of one interviewee. Among the motorized community, ATVs and dirt bike users tend to seek different experiences from the trails, and their machines offer different capabilities. The design of the trails and MVTR's approach seeks to accommodate this, with tight single-track trails for the dirt bikes, and wider paths for the ATVs. These users are intentionally directed away from one another by physical design.

It is critical to note that Hop-Ev is a loop, day-use network with no point-to-point trails. The area is well signed and narrow routes are one-way. MVTR points to signage and the one-way designation as the single most significant factor in creating a safe network that balances the experiences sought by ATV and dirt bike users. The opportunity for head-on collisions and surprises must be kept to an absolute minimum.

Turnpike construction

Illegal trash dumping remains a perpetual problem to the property, though to a lesser extent than was the case in the 1980s, and this is unrelated to the trail network and its legitimate users.

On a broader level, interviewees expressed opinions that the ATV and dirt bike industry and manufacturers are not doing enough to advocate for responsible riding. Users feel that the American Motorcyclist Association limits its messages to street bikes, while others are concerned about the images of reckless, environmentally damaging riding depicted in many magazines and in advertising in other media.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

As mentioned, the parties were united by issues they could help each other solve. They had a mutual need to cooperate and this grew to the solid relationships that have developed today.

LESSONS LEARNED

Bridge construction

The most important lesson from the Hop-Ed experience is the old adage: "If you build it, they will come." OHV use has skyrocketed in this area because the trails are excellent and within one hour of NH's population center and the Massachusetts border.

For this reason, growth projections must drive the initial design, because it is much harder to establish new trails once a network is in place. The initial network grew from existing dirt roads and trails cut for dirt bike events, and the opportunity to plan routes with a broader picture in mind never presented itself. The design of the network might have been much different if the parties began with a "blank sheet of paper."

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

The draft revision to the Hop-Ev multi-use trail network strategic plan is under review. While the State and user groups would like more miles of trail, they are constrained by the boundaries of the Army Corps land and Army Corp's responsibility to meet Federal environmental and land management law.

Stronger user education and better support from manufacturers and the industry remain a broader need expressed by interviewees.

LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL FOREST, MONTANA: BIG SNOWIES ACCESS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN

By Cynthia Manning

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

In January 2002, the Lewis and Clark National Forest (LCNF) signed an Access and Travel Plan for the Big Snowies mountain range, located in central Montana. Eight groups and ten individuals appealed the plan. Instead of working through the standard administrative appeal and litigation processes, LCNF staff, working with the Montana Snowmobile Association (MSA) and the Montana Wilderness Association (MWA), suggested trying the collaborative process that had proved successful on the Flathead National Forest. All parties agreed it might be worthwhile to attempt some sort of collaborative process – to arrive at a negotiated, cooperative agreement between the appellants – in order to resolve the pending appeal.

Between July 2002 and April 2003, a group of individuals and representatives of special interest groups met to address appeals of the Big Snowies Access and Travel Management Plan (BSATMP). The group decided to address this plan, and in addition, access and travel planning in the Little Belts, Castles, and Crazy Mountains ranges. This group was indeed modeled after the collaborative approach used on the Flathead NF. In that process, the Montana Wilderness Association (MWA) and the Montana Snowmobile Association (MSA) agreed upon certain areas being deemed appropriate and open for snowmobile use, and certain areas where snowmobile use was not appropriate.

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

The MWA, represented primarily by John Gatchell, and the MSA, represented primarily by Alan Brown, were the principal participants in this collaborative process. These two individuals served as the project's facilitators. This is of particular interest, as these two groups have traditionally been at odds with each other. But given other successes working together, they felt they could pull together, along with the local interest groups, and see what points of agreement they could reach.

Other groups involved in the effort included local snowmobile clubs, the local chapter of MWA (the Central Montana Wildlands Association, or CMWA), and the Great Falls Cross Country Ski Club. The Forest Service also participated throughout the project. Forest Service personnel did not participate in the discussions per se, nor lead or facilitate the meetings. They did provide leadership and "the glue" for keeping the process going, as well as technical support, maps, public notification and note taking, and a meeting place.

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The group set rather clearly defined objectives: 1) delineate rather large areas on a map where winter motorized use could or could not occur, 2) identify where snowmobilers could recreate virtually unhampered, and 3) identify where non-motorized opportunities would be considered. The next step would have been to do the same for summertime use. However, as noted below, the group was unable to address summertime management issues.

In identifying large areas of motorized and non-motorized use, the group sought to protect groomed trails and play areas, while also ensuring secure wildlife habitat and quiet areas for non-motorized uses. The group worked under the general assumptions that points of agreement would be carried forward as the Proposed Action, and that they were to maintain a strongly pragmatic orientation.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The group was able to negotiate an agreement, which was finalized in April of 2004. The Great Falls Cross Country Ski Club, two of the snowmobile clubs, MSA, MWA and their local chapter signed the agreement. The agreement initially covered four of the mountain ranges in the area, but ultimately ended up addressing only two of the ranges – the Big Snowies and the Little Belts. The agreement allocates large blocks of land for snowmobile use as well as large blocks of land that are to remain in a roadless, non-motorized state.

KEY CHALLENGES

The group faced major challenges distinguishing between winter and summer uses. People interviewed could not pinpoint why this occurred – but the group was not at all successful working collaboratively towards designating areas for summer motorized use (e.g., motorcycle, ATV) and areas to be maintained for non-motorized use. The group had decided to first work toward blocking out areas for winter uses and then to take on the summer uses. But it seemed that the summer users were not comfortable with the concept of "blocking out" substantial acreages for one use or another. In addition, MSA stated from the beginning that they did not represent summer users nor have any authority to address summer uses, and thus would not be able to lend their dedicated leadership to the effort.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

This collaborative process was well thought out prior to its inception, particularly since it had a previous example, from the Flathead National Forest, to use as a model. It was important to the participants that an atmosphere of respect and dedication was fostered. The group decided not to work towards consensus per se, but toward answering the question: "can you live with it?"

The group began by first by not looking at the Big Belts, where the BSAMTP had been appealed, but by looking at the three other mountain ranges in the area. These ranges, the Little Belts, Crazies and Castles, all receive more snowmobiling activity than the Snowies. They agreed to return to discussions regarding the Snowies after working to resolve most of their concerns across the larger landscape. Agreement seemed to be progressing, but unfortunately just before the agreement was to be signed, one of the snowmobile groups elected against signing, as it did not feel it could represent uses by other snowmobile groups in the southern Crazies and Castles.

LESSONS LEARNED

1) Participants should take a positive approach – become advocates for success, and consider failure not to be an option. Participants should work in a problem-solving mode, share a common belief in the process, and they should work together toward what is best for the resource and for the public. The collaborative approach gives some ownership to participants and to the overall public. Acknowledge that people have their own individual personalities and that that's acceptable and appropriate.

2) The group should establish guiding principles or ground rules and stick to them. Each group should identify a spokesperson who can act in the role of "negotiator." The overall group should establish a common understanding that their selected negotiators should have authority for their groups; they should provide leadership, take a facilitative approach, and establish mechanisms for accountability. Insist upon a commitment (towards the stated objectives and of participation) prior to initiating.

3) Clarify the role of the Forest Service, how the Forest Service will use outcomes of the process as well as any limitations or constraints (sideboards). The Forest Service must set the stage for collaboration; the agency regains trust when it lives up to its word.

4) Sometimes the people or group perceived to be the "worst adversary" becomes your best ally in a collaborative process. This gives these efforts power.

5) The collaborative process took about twice as long as was originally planned. But most participants felt that it was better to spend the time upfront, as opposed to later on. For this reason, the collaborative process may ultimately be the cheaper option.

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

The Montana Wilderness Association and the Montana Snowmobile Association plan to continue working collaboratively to help designate areas where snowmobile use appears appropriate and where wilderness qualities are important to retain. They are currently working on completing their fifth winter agreement, this one on the Lincoln Ranger District, Helena National Forest; they will then work toward completing the rest of the Helena NF.

Disagreement over travel management within the Big Snowies now involves the judicial system. The Central Montana Wildlands Association (CMWA) was one of the appellants of the 2002 decision. CMWA declined to participate in the collaborative process that was later initiated in 2002. In September 2004, CMWA filed a lawsuit against implementation of the original 2002 decision for the Big Snowies, and also against implementation of the 2004 winter recreation agreement for the Big Snowies and Little Belt mountain ranges. Both MSA and MWA asked to intervene in support of the Forest Service in respect to implementation of the winter recreation agreement. In addition, MWA filed a cross-claim in support of CMWA's opposition to implementing any part of the original 2002 decision involving management of summer recreation. The District Court (Judge Donald Malloy, presiding) granted intervener status to both MSA and MWA, and they are both parties to the case; however, the Court has not yet ruled on the cross-claim by MWA. In a preliminary hearing, the District Court denied CMWA's request for a Preliminary Injunction against implementing the winter recreation agreement and the 2002 decision, thus ruling in favor of the Forest Service and the interveners. Because the Big Snowies is a Wilderness Study Area, the District Court denied the request for a change in venue from Missoula to Great Falls. Litigation on this effort is expected to continue throughout 2005.

MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP

By Cynthia Manning

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota Interagency Working Group (IWG) began forming in 1996. Managing for Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) had become an increasing challenge for all land and resource management agencies, State and Federal alike. The IWG saw opportunities for various agencies to work toward a common understanding of OHV use, misuse, and direction regarding OHV usage, and believed they could develop a consistent approach regarding OHV use on Federal lands. They also foresaw the opportunity to provide a resource for OHV information and education. An added benefit would be the exchange of information and cooperation among the various agencies.

The IWG collaborated on the development of a strategy for OHV use, and pursued this through the formal NEPA process, including the completion of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The decisions made as a result of this environmental analysis pertain to all Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management managed lands in the state of Montana, and in western South Dakota and North Dakota. While other state and federal agencies were and remain active participants in the group, the decision pertains only to those two federal agencies.

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

Three primary agencies were (and continue to be) involved in the IWG: the Bureau of Land Management (the Montana State Office, which also serves North and South Dakota), the USDA Forest Service, Northern Region (with the exclusion of Northern Idaho), including representation from the Regional Office and individuals representing various National Forests and Grasslands, and the Montana State Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP).

The IWG is governed by two co-chairs, representing two of the three primary agencies. These positions have been filled by various people over the years, and participation in the overall IWG has also changed over time.

Each agency worked with the public and with appropriate stakeholder groups through their respective public involvement strategies. The FWP provided special opportunities to work with affected groups, such as the Montana Snowmobile Association and the Montana Trail Riders Association. In addition, OHV use and management issues were identified as a high priority by various BLM Resource Advisory Committees (RACs), multi-stakeholder groups chartered under the Federal Advisory Communication Act (FACA), which work closely with the BLM regarding land and resource management issues.

An interdisciplinary team (IDT) was formed to conduct the Environmental Impact Statement. A BLM employee initially served as Team Leader, followed by a Forest Service employee. The IDT conducted formal public involvement activities. In order to evaluate site-specific routes, the team also conducted an inventory of designated routes.

Interdisciplinary team

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The IWG decided right from the start that they wanted to take a functional approach to this collaborative effort. They agreed that their first priority would be to devise a strategy to manage OHV use, and that the best way to accomplish this would be via an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to address cross-country OHV travel.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The IWG worked with a BLM and Forest Service EIS team to produce an EIS and two Records of Decision (one for the BLM and another for the FS). The EIS decisions mandate that OHVs stay on existing routes; wheeled, cross-country travel is eliminated. The Forest Service decision served as an amendment to all of the Forest and Grassland Plans within Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Prior to this decision, each Forest Plan had different ways of dealing with OHV management. Most areas were open for cross-country OHV travel unless they were otherwise posted. Cross-country OHV travel is now prohibited in most areas.

The IWG developed both an implementation and a monitoring program. They developed training events and materials for managers, created OHV education "trunks" for schools as well as general OHV education and information programs. They produced signs, posters, key chains, and brochures with various messages regarding responsible OHV use.

The Group also believes that they were able to bring the issue of better management of OHV use to light, and takes pride in the fact that the Chief of the Forest Service has recognized improper OHV use as one of the four main threats facing the Forest Service. They also continue to serve as a "sounding board" for OHV and travel and access issues on public land.

Communication between OHV user groups and other groups (e.g., Back Country Horsemen) and the agencies has improved. As one interviewee commented: "We're listening to them and they're listening to us."

After the EIS was signed, a decision was reached by the State of Montana, through the Montana Fish and Game Commission, regarding law enforcement. OHV-related law enforcement is a major challenge in this region, given the extensive area and the presence of limited law enforcement personnel. The Fish and Game Commission adopted Federal OHV Prohibitions by

making a violation of these Federal Regulations also a violation of Commission Rule. This allows FWP wardens to write a State ticket on federal lands, if the OHV violation occurs during a hunting season. This has virtually tripled the number of law enforcement officers with authority over OHV regulations on federal lands.

KEY CHALLENGES

The key challenges for the IWG have been, and continue to be:

1) Enforcement of the decision made in the EISs – to disallow OHV cross-country travel. There are just not enough law enforcement personnel available.
2) Personnel changes – keeping leadership and membership going and active.
3) "Keeping the focus."

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

The IWG formed in response to an animated discussion among Forest Service District Rangers in Region 1 regarding the challenges of OHV use, and the desire and need to devise a strategy to manage OHV use. The group had a clear mission, and this allowed them to form an efficient and dedicated team. They recognized that representation from all the various resource management agencies needed (and continues to need) to be at the table and working together.

During the implementation phase (beginning in about 1997), the IWG met once a month. The EIS team worked together continuously throughout the NEPA process. The team now meets twice a year; they also conduct monitoring trips twice a year. The information and education subcommittee meets an additional three to four times per year.

The Group functioned with a somewhat standard leadership structure and operating procedures. A Chairperson ran the meetings, and specific tasks were undertaken by individual members and also by designated subcommittees. All members of the Group are government officials who shared a common knowledge and culture about conducting business. Glitches in the process were relatively minimal, since as they all share a common objective.

LESSONS LEARNED

1) A functional approach helps with the focus and productivity of a group (at least this one).

2) A collaborative group like this takes a lot of energy, especially to keep it going over the years. It helps when participants have the energy and dedication, and a commitment to the Group's overall objectives. "It's worth meeting if we can show we're being effective."

3) One reason the Group was successful was because they were able to bring all the agencies together. Talking proved to be a good way of learning about the various ways OHVs were (or

were not) being managed, and about the agencies' various laws and policies. Conflicts between and among Federal and State agencies were identified, discussed, and usually resolved.

4) The support and interest of the Regional Forester and the BLM State Director (and ultimately the Chief of the Forest Service) lent an even greater sense of credibility, timeliness, and importance to the group.

5) An interagency group can do some things collectively which they can't do individually. In addition, the public develops an understanding that the IWG is working towards common goals and common management of OHVs, irrespective of which agency has jurisdiction on the ground.

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

The IWG continues to meet. Participants feel that the exchange of information and cooperation between the agencies benefits them all. They see great value in continuing discussions about this topic and possibly about other related issues. The IWG plans to develop further informational and educational products, and to begin working on a strategy for implementing the Forest Service's OHV policy.

OHV USE AND FOREST PLAN REVISION ON THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST

By Larry Fisher and Kathy Bond

THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST

The Ouachita National Forest (ONF)[12] covers nearly 1.8 million acres in central Arkansas and southeast Oklahoma. Established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907 (initially as the Arkansas National Forest, and later renamed by President Coolidge), it is the oldest and largest National Forest in the Southern Region. The Ouachita has 12 Districts[13]; the Supervisor's office is located in Hot Springs.

The Ouachita forest is primarily a pine-oak mix, but it is managed for multiple uses, including wood production, watershed protection and improvement, habitat for wildlife and fish species (including threatened and endangered ones), wilderness, minerals, and outdoor recreation. The ONF has over 700 miles of trails for hiking, mountain biking, interpretive use, equestrian use, off-road vehicles, and trails that allow for accessibility. The Forest also includes many areas for developed recreation, scenic areas and vistas, float camps, shooting ranges, historical sites, wilderness areas, two Wild and Scenic Rivers and a National Recreation Area. Most of the developed recreation areas are open April through September, but some sites are open year-round (see http://www.fs.fed.us/r8/ouachita/about/).

FOREST PLAN REVISION ON THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST

OHV group in the Little Missouri River

The National Forest Management Act (1976) requires the Forest Service to develop Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans) for all the National Forests, and to revise these plans every 10 to 15 years. The Forest Plan sets management direction by establishing standards and guidelines, and it describes resource management practices, levels of resource production, and the availability and suitability of lands for resource management. The ONF began the process of revising its Forest Plan in May 2002, and is hoping to complete the Plan and the required Environmental Impact Statement by the end of 2005.

[12] Ouachita (pronounced wash-i-tah) is the French spelling of a Native American word meaning "good hunting ground."

[13] The 12 districts are: Caddo, Choctaw, Cold Springs, Fourche, Jessieville, Kiamichi, Mena, Oden, Poteau, Tiak, Winona, and Womble.

The use of Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs)[14] on the ONF has grown significantly in recent years. According to Forest Service sources, increasing and unmanaged OHV use has led to erosion, sedimentation in a number of streams, and impacts on wildlife. Of additional concern are conflicts that have been reported between OHV users and other recreationists, such as hikers, horseback riders, and non-motorized vehicles. The ONF's standing "mostly open" policy is in contrast to those of many other national forests in the Southern Region, where OHV use is not allowed unless explicitly posted as authorized.[15]

Public meeting

Anticipating that growing OHV use, and possible changes in existing ONF policies, could become the major issues in the Plan Revision Process, the planning team organized a series of open houses, or "listening posts," to gain input from the public. The meetings were held in a variety of locations surrounding the forest so that a wide segment of the public could meet directly with Forest Service staff, share their opinions and concerns, and access information related to OHV use and other issues related to Forest Plan Revision.[16] Written comments were also accepted via the ONF's website.

The Forest Service hired Kirby Williams Communications as a consultant to assist with the design and implementation of this public participation effort. In addition to organizing the listening posts, the Forest Service prepared and distributed an array of press releases, outreach materials, exhibits and presentations. Almost 400 people attended the six listening post sessions, and more than 100 e-mail responses were received. Independently, a concerned citizen circulated a petition at community stores, OHV dealers and sports suppliers resulting in approximately 2,500 signatures. The petition was presented to the Forest and Congressional offices. Here are some of the conclusions drawn from the input received:

a) Based on attendance at the meetings, the typical OHV user in the ONF is an upper-middle-aged male who uses his vehicle primarily for pleasure riding, and for activities related to hunting. He is often very protective of his "ownership rights" in the Forest, and he is conscientious and comfortable with the equipment he uses and the parts of the Forest he visits. The typical rider will pick up after himself, self-police among other riders, and given the opportunity, volunteer to build and maintain trails.

b) Use by women, couples and families appears to be increasing. Women comprised about 20 per cent of those attending the listening post sessions.

[14] While there is some degree of controversy (and inconsistency) over the use of terminology related to motorized vehicles used for recreation, the Ouachita National Forest defines OHVs as all-terrain vehicles that can travel without roads or trails and such vehicles as four-wheel drive vehicles originally intended for highway use but capable of traveling off-road (Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, 8/26/03).
[15] The ONF is one of only four national forests in the Southern Region that still allow off-country travel for OHVs.
[16] The locations and dates for the 2003 open houses were: Little Rock (9/9), Mena (9/15), Booneville (9/18), Hot Springs (9/22), Mount Ida (9/29), and Poteau, OK (9/30)

c) In general, OHV users respect Forest Service personnel and trust them to manage the Forest; however, they want to be involved in the process, from planning to self-policing. Some are very concerned that they will lose the ability to use OHVs on the Ouachita National Forest altogether.

d) Concerns about inappropriate behavior associated with OHV use are fairly widespread and include: trespass, alcohol use, late night/early morning riding, vandalism, and negative impacts to the Forest, to wildlife, and to livestock. OHV users and local residents acknowledged that these were isolated incidents associated with a minority of users; however, many expressed concerned that "a few 'bad apples' would spoil access for responsible users."

e) A cookie-cutter solution to all classes of vehicles will not work over time.

f) Permitting (i.e., the requirement that OHV users pay a fee for a license to operate a vehicle within the ONF) is acceptable to the majority.

g) Communications – remote and trailside – must be improved.

h) The handicapped and aging population must be considered.

A number of important recommendations also emerged from the public input. These include:

a) Consider expanding the OHV trail network
b) Participate in an OHV users trail advisory group (possibly in cooperation with the Arkansas Trail Council)
c) Formalize and advertise more "walk-in" hunting areas
d) Revise and clarify OHV regulations and applicable state laws
e) Inform users of Forest regulations and safety procedures
f) Encourage the creation of an "adopt-a-trail" program and other volunteer trail-building and maintenance groups
g) Create new printed materials especially for OHV users
h) Create a page on the ONF website for OHV users, including downloadable documents
i) Sign designated trails and roads usable by OHV
j) Post OHV use rules and regulations at all trailheads

LESSONS LEARNED

Based on interviews conducted with Forest Service staff and with OHV enthusiasts who attended the listening post sessions, the following key themes and lessons are worth highlighting:

a) Prior to initiation of the Forest Plan revision, the ONF initially sought to resolve OHV-related issues through localized actions (e.g., closures of individual routes or areas). As it turns out, resolving a problem in one place often simply shifts the problem to another

location. A Forest-wide approach, and particularly one based on a broad-based planning initiative, can be the most effective way to address the array of issues related to OHV use and the changing nature of OHV use within the Forest.

b) The Forest must take into account local residents and non-Forest land holdings and jurisdictions. As the Forest Service closes trails or re-routes use, the impacts are often experienced by nearby residents or local governments. Their views and cooperation are crucial to a successful landscape-scale approach to resolving OHV issues.

c) Given the high degree of public interest and controversy, as well as the complexity of OHV use on the ONF, the Forest Service recognized that OHV issues could have overtaken and become a major distraction for many of the other important issues that were addressed in plan revision. When Forest Plan Revision was initiated, it seemed appropriate to focus a separate set of meetings on the identified OHV issue and give that issue special attention; however the issue was largely managed concurrently with other identified issues.

d) The use of a consultant was viewed as a critical resource in helping the Forest Service think through and design the public involvement process (open houses, questionnaires, information materials, displays, overall outreach strategy). Nevertheless, the participation and leadership of Forest Service staff at the meetings was significant (more than 20 staff at every meeting) and seen as important by participants in offering opportunities for candid exchange and learning, and in building long-term working relationships.

e) There were mixed views of the timing of the Listening Posts vis-à-vis the proposed national planning rule related to OHV use. The Forest Service, working under a strict Plan Revision schedule, designed the Listening Post meetings as part of the ongoing Plan Revision process, and they were scheduled prior to the release of the national policy in draft form.[17] However, since the draft policy was released following the public meetings, several participants felt that their input was premature because they believed that local (ONF) decisions will ultimately be superseded by the national rule. In one person's view: "The FS should have waited until the national policy was set, since local input won't really be considered once they have their directions from Washington. Why did they waste our time?"

f) While the listening posts were generally viewed as positive experiences by Forest Service staff and by the public, concerns were expressed about how to maintain the rapport and momentum (and the expectations) created by the events – particularly given other pressing responsibilities on the part of Forest Service staff. Skepticism, openly expressed by several OHV users interviewed for this case study, may be increasing – both because of concerns for increased closures and restrictions imposed by the revised Forest Plan, as well as because of the (perceived) lack of follow up and ongoing/regular communication with the public.

[17] The final date for adoption of the policy remained uncertain at the time of the interviews conducted for this analysis.

g) In the meetings as well as in our interviews, the public expressed a tremendous interest and willingness in contributing ideas, labor, funding, and other resources to help maintain access and a quality OHV recreational experience. Several interviewees commented that "this is a very important part of our lives," and stated repeatedly that they would work with the Forest Service in any way possible, "if they can identify opportunities and involve as real partners." This clearly remains both an opportunity and a challenge for the Forest Service, in terms of designating staff, allocating resources, and demonstrating an ongoing commitment to these issues.

The main lesson – at least the one most often emphasized by Forest Service staff – was the tremendous value of interacting with the public: the new insights, relationships, on-the-ground information, sense of passion and commitment, and the (surprising, to some) awareness of shared values and interests with the OHV community. This was often acknowledged as well by participants who attended the meetings – they often described the Forest Service staff as "courteous" and "knowledgeable," and many indicated that before these events they had never had direct contact with a Forest Service employee.

Nevertheless, at least from the public's perspective, the value of these sessions, and this effort by the Forest Service, will clearly be judged on its merits in terms of addressing the outstanding concerns and finding acceptable solutions to maintaining access for OHV users on the ONF.

PERRY STREAM ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLE (ATV) TRAILS

By Robert Fitzhenry and Debbie Chavez

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Perry Stream All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Trails are located on 8,000 acres of timberland owned by Perry Stream Land and Timber in the northern reaches of New Hampshire. Snowmobile tourism is a big part of the winter economy in this region, while the summer tourism economy lags. The land managers employed by Perry Stream Land and Timber property sought ways to help the region's summer economy through managed ATV use on the Perry Stream lands. They approached the owners, who were supportive of the idea.

Grant funding for trail projects in New Hampshire must go to user groups rather than landowners, and this fact encouraged the formation of a local ATV club, the Great North Woods Riders ATV Club, Inc. Pittsburg Motorsports (snowmobile and ATV dealer), located at the trailhead to the Perry Stream trails and a subsidiary of Perry Stream Land and Timber, supports the Club and the trails.

The Perry Stream network is part of the statewide trail system sponsored by the State of New Hampshire, Department of Resources and Economic Development, Bureau of Trails (NH-BT). The network is interconnected with the State snowmobile trail system, but currently functions independently for summer ATV use. The Perry Stream trails follow existing roads and trails, with enhancements to the network focused on creating good links and connectors to eliminate dead ends and make attractive loop rides.

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

Perry Stream Land and Timber has always allowed recreation on its timberland; however, safety and harvesting priorities take first precedence. Communication among stakeholders is quite easy, as the land managers for Perry Stream Land and Timber are also involved in the ATV Club and with Pittsburg Motorsports. A key leader of the effort is Warren Chase, Trail Administrator for the club and construction contractor for the landowner.

The Great North Woods Riders ATV Club maintains the trails and works with the landowner on new proposals. The ATV Club receives grant funding from the State for projects, and provides a volunteer force for trail construction and maintenance. Pittsburg Motorsports supports the club, provides parking for trail users, and provides riders with regular shop services like sales, parts, and maintenance.

The ATV Club and Perry Stream Land and Timber, through its forest managers, largely drive the initiative, and NH-BT plays a rather low profile role. A small number of interconnected people lead the effort. The State serves as technical advisor, and provides grant funding to the club and liability insurance for the landowner.

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the effort are to generate economic benefits to the community and to meet the area's recreational needs. The landowner wanted to offer summer recreational opportunities that would not create adverse publicity, negative community reaction, or interfere with harvesting. In the beginning, the landowner directed the managers and the ATV Club to limit summer use to ATVs. They viewed dirt bikes as creating more trail maintenance concerns and greater potential for adverse publicity. ATV use is closed in November to accommodate hunting activity.

NH-BT sees ATV-only designation decisions becoming more prevalent, especially on timber property.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

As this project is still quite young, a big part of its achievement has been in laying the groundwork and in defining the overall vision. The project began in 2001, with steady development of the partnership and trail network in the years since then. The ATV Club understood its role at the outset and has focused on developing a thoughtful work plan.

Ridership is increasing in the area, and the ATV Club has seen a growing proportion of users "from away." Tourism was an original aspect of the project's goals, though it is still too early to determine the effort's economic impact.

The Perry Stream ATV Trails link to the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters lands, 146,000 acres of timberland with a conservation easement purchased through the USDA Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program. A two-year interim plan outlines the potential for tying the Perry Stream trails to the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters parcel, providing summer users access to services in downtown Pittsburg (NH). This opportunity would offer the long, cross-country riding experiences akin to snowmobiling, seen as a key element in attracting summer ATV tourism. The formal discussion has not yet begun on whether or not to allow summer ATV use on the Forest Legacy parcel (see below).

FOSTERING PROGRESS

This project experience has been fairly straightforward, due to the interest of Perry Stream Land and Timber management and owners to make their land available to ATV users. Local legislators and local communities were also supportive. All parties were determined to make it happen, and had they the collective authority to do so.

The land manager already had the equipment necessary for trail work as well as the basis of a trails network in place, and they had a good understanding of where trail or overall network improvements were needed. While the State remains a background player in this particular project, it offers two key tools as incentives for clubs and private landowners. The first tool is

the grants for clubs to build and maintain trails. The grants come from a combination of OHV registration fees and from Federal Highway Administration monies supported by the off-highway gasoline tax.[18] As mentioned above, NH-BT trail grants cannot go directly to the landowner - they must instead go to a users club, which acts as an intermediary, putting grant money into the building and maintenance of trails.

The second major tool offered by the State eliminates a key hurdle to landowner cooperation – a liability insurance policy held by the State covers private landowners who open up their land to recreational use. With the vast majority of New Hampshire's open space in private ownership, snow machine, ATV, and other trails often cross non-public land. The insurance offers $2 million of protection, with few claims brought against it and no claims brought in recent years.

KEY CHALLENGES

The key challenge for NH-BT was making sure the ATV Club had the appropriate level of resources for implementation. The club is seen as hard-working, competent, and ambitious, and although they proposed many project activities, the State was only able to fund from one-half to two-thirds of their requests. The club therefore worked to secure funding from other sources.

While this case is exceptional, the NH-BT experience suggests that trails that cross private land are often difficult to manage due to land sales and the impact of parcelization and fragmentation of the landscape. In the Perry Stream instance, a long-term landowner shares a vision of management vision that includes multiple use. This vision includes the economic benefits to the community and the easement in perpetuity on the neighboring Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Forest Legacy land will keep that property forever conserved.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

The project has a solid grassroots base, with 3-5 key leaders working together to make things happen. The landowner is the authority on decisions, but works through its forest managers and in cooperation with the club to provide the desired user experience. The ATV Club works with NH-BT for funding and sometimes receives matching funds from the landowner.

LESSONS LEARNED

The NH-BT experience shows that establishment of OHV trails works well with a willing private landowner when it doesn't involve the public scrutiny of using State or Federal land. It helps that the trails network is located in a low population area, and has been built from established trails on managed land. It is also in a region that has an interest in developing a stronger summer economy. In short, many positive factors are in alignment for success.

From the perspective of the land manager and user groups, the focus is less on the total miles of trail than toward on getting quality trails built or linked. Participants learned early on that

[18] A portion of every gas purchase nationwide is used to support off-highway routes.

they'd rather spend resources on "two good miles of construction than five miles that will need maintenance sooner."

The primary goal of construction is to keep the trails dry. From the perspective of the overall network, the principle goal is to build in links and connectors to the existing trails so that dead-ends are avoided and fun loops formed. Based on interviews with participants, and supported by the ATV Club's experience at Perry Stream, ATV riders don't want an out-and-back experience. A trail that can't be followed past a property line is an invitation for trespass; dead-ends are invitations for off-trail travel.

The ATV Club has emphasized that all the support possible must be gathered up front, as enthusiasm and volunteerism tend to wane over time. This can lead to burnout among the leaders and key contributors.

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

Statewide, the greatest challenge is soaring sales of OHVs and the resultant demand for legal trails. OHV ownership is highest in the developed southern portion of New Hampshire, with many users from neighboring Massachusetts also riding NH trails. The State simply cannot put enough OHV trails in the spots where OHV owners live.

The Perry Stream network is in the rural north of the State, which offers the most open land; however, it does not yet offer options for overnight or touring experiences. The State, landowner, community and the ATV Club are hoping to have a gateway from the Perry Stream trails to an expanded system which links to the 146,000 acre Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Forest Legacy property and the town center of Pittsburg, NH. Pittsburg has ample lodging accommodations for overnight stays, but at the present time, the town is not accessible from the trail system. Riders have to trailer their ATVs to the parking lot at the trailhead, which doesn't meet the convenience snowmobilers enjoy. With access to lodging and the Legacy property, the potential can be realized for touring and overnight stays that attract snowmobilers in the winter. Until a fuller summer OHV experience is available, the day-trip is simply too long for many riders to haul in for. A decision allowing ATV access to the Connecticut Lakes Headwaters Forest Legacy land and cross-boundary trails to the Perry Stream network is seen as critical in achieving summer ATV tourism goals.

The State of NH Department of Resources and Economic Development, parent of NH-BT, is responsible for developing the five-year recreation plan for the CT Lakes Headwaters Forest Legacy property. For the past two years there was an interim, "no change" period in the recreation plan, during which historically permitted uses were the only ones allowed. That period has just passed, and the NH state legislature is seeking an appropriation to help pay for the completion of the next recreation plan. This next recreation plan is where the future use of ATVs on the CT Lakes Headwaters property will be addressed. ATV use in the future is an option on the approximate 300 miles of designated roads on the property. A public input phase will be address future ATV use in the recreation plan. NH-BT anticipates that some summer motorized use will generally be supported on the property.

SOUTHEAST IDAHO TRAIL SYSTEM[19]

By Kathy Bond and Larry Fisher

BACKGROUND

The State of Idaho has experienced a rapid growth in the number of Off Highway Vehicles (OHV), seeing a three hundred percent increase of the number of registered OHVs since 1995. In response to this growth trend, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) began looking at a possible trail system that would provide an opportunity for the expanding numbers of OHV enthusiasts while eliminating unmanaged cross-country travel.[20] IDPR looked at models of trail systems in the United States and concluded that resource impacts can be minimized with a designated route that offers a quality riding experience.[21] In concept, the trail system would concentrate OHV use on a specific route and, in this way, use on illegal routes and trails would be decreased.

In 2002, IDPR took the lead and proposed a joint effort with federal and state agencies, cities, counties, and various interest groups to develop an Off Highway Vehicle Adaptive Management Plan for the Lost River Basin, an area of approximately 3,500 square miles.[22] The proposal's objective is to improve management of OHV use in the region by designating a 500-mile loop OHV trail system, in a phased approach. Management costs would be shared among participating local, state and federal agencies through a partnership Memorandum of Agreement. The designated trail system, utilizing existing roads and trails, would accommodate a demand for increasing OHV use, as well as provide opportunities for rural communities to diversify their economic base by providing services to trail users.

Land management partners for the proposed trail system include the Challis and Idaho Falls offices of Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Salmon-Challis National Forest (USDA Forest Service, Idaho Department of Lands, and Custer and Butte Counties. The management area would include portions of the Salmon-Challis National Forest, two different BLM districts, the road rights of way of three communities (Challis, Mackay, and Arco) and two county highway departments (see map). Because portions of the proposed route occur on lands within their jurisdiction, the Lost River Highway District and the Idaho Department of Transportation are also involved.

Staff members of BLM, IDPR, USFS, officials from respective counties, and representatives from the public comprised a steering committee to provide oversight to the project. The steering committee convened a number of informal meetings and collaborated on ground rules for the trail system, including the stipulation that all routes had to be legal and consistent with the Forest Service's travel management plan, IDPR laws and regulations, and county/town ordinances, and

[19] Also referred to as the Central Idaho ATV Trail and the Lost River Recreation Trailway.
[20] IDPR is responsible for managing OHV operations in Idaho.
[21] Among the trail systems studied: the Paiute Trail in central-southern Utah, the Great Western Trail in southern Utah, and the Hatfield-McCoy Trail system in West Virginia.
[22] To view the full proposal for the Lost River Recreation Trailway Adaptive Management project, see the IDPR publications website at: http://www.idahoparks.org/Data_Center/publications.html.

the effort to develop routes that tried to avoid possible conflicts (e.g., adjacent to Wilderness Study Areas).

Members of the steering committee presented the plan for the proposed trail system to Custer and Butte County commissioners and the city councils of Challis, Arco and Mackay during January and February 2003.

PUBLIC INPUT

In April 2002, IDPR sent a letter that outlined the proposed trail system, and solicited review and comment from selected individuals, entities, and interest groups. At least one person interviewed recalled that there was no map of the proposed project in the letter. To some interviewees, the project at this stage was characterized "as a demonstration project that had a scientific approach – for example, getting on-the-ground information that would lead to good management." IDPR hosted public meetings in the communities of Challis, Mackay, Arco, Idaho Falls, Ketchum/Sun Valley and Pocatello in early 2003. The objective of the public meetings was to present the proposed concept and seek input on both the management strategy as well as the proposed areas being considered. The public meeting format was an open forum followed by an opportunity to submit written comments. According to an IDPR publication, written comments raised concerns about the proposed trail's impact on wildlife and other resources, limited enforcement capability, lack of compliance by OHV users, as well as several other issues.[23]

The public meetings were described as "polarized" by one individual interviewed. According to some interviewees, only one map of the proposed trail system was brought to the meeting, and copies of that map were not distributed to the public. IDPR staff made the presentation at each meeting and they "[were not] prepared for the volume of public interest and were taken aback by the negative response – it was pretty overwhelming." There was a strong contrast between the perspectives of residents in the more rural communities of Challis, Mackay, and Arco, who, for the most part, were supportive of the proposal, to those of Ketchum/Sun Valley, where participants were "strongly wilderness oriented, non-motorized, and wanted to protect these values."

At the public meetings, "misconceptions" were fielded and clarified about the elements of the proposed trail system, including a perception that the route could potentially be 1200 miles in length, and a concern that "The route was not well defined as using existing trails." Some conservationists and landowners were concerned about the proposed one-mile management corridor (on either side of the route) that would give IDPR ultimate authority on that land. In the words of one person interviewed, the proposal "spooked a lot of people." The public meetings provided the first opportunity for many to finally see a map of the proposed route.

[23] Other concerns noted in the comments included: noxious weed control, adequate funding for the trail system, the amount of county funds needed, litter control, trespassing on private lands, the scope of the project, and proximity to Wilderness Study Areas.

Enthusiastic initial support faded in some instances, once members of the public saw the map outlining the proposed route. For example, while residents of the community of Mackay were initially perceived to be supportive of the proposed trail system, especially those in the business community, opposition grew, "especially from folks on private lands who would be affected by the trails."

NEXT STEPS

The steering committee is considering how to "redeliver the message" about the proposed trail system, while IDPR is internally adjusting to a change of leadership. Right-of-way issues are being clarified with Idaho Department of Transportation and alternatives to the one proposal presented are being identified. In response to public comments and concerns, a scaled-down version that would be a "link" system – one that incorporates existing trails around the communities of Challis, Mackay, and Arco (and would not connect these communities) is being considered during this initial phase. Conservation groups continue to maintain the position that the steering committee should prove it can manage *existing* trails before proposing to develop a designated trail system that would, in concept, serve as a recreational magnet for out-of-state and local OHV users. "If you build it, they will come," said one conservationist interviewed. The groups question the assumption that out-of-state enthusiasts would be more compliant with regulations than local users. In addition, conservationists question the value of the tradeoff between potential economic benefits to local governments and potential resource impacts.

When individuals interviewed were asked where they would place the designated trail project – on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the furthest along – responses ranged from "1" to "6." "These things take time," said one person interviewed.

LESSONS LEARNED

The following key themes and lessons have been drawn from the interviews:

a) The proposed trail system is essentially a top-down approach from a State agency, IDPR, rather than a bottom-up approach. The proposal "brought the right people together" and "markedly raised the awareness of OHV use as an issue," but it lacks grassroots support. Conservation groups remain skeptical. Perhaps a more effective way to initiate the project would have been to engage the public in a collaborative process where multiple stakeholders could exchange information, discuss perspectives, and participate in the decision making. As one individual said, "It was not collaboration as in 'We have a problem in this area and what can we do about it?'" Another person offered this view: "The key is to come forth not with a proposal, but with an idea—let your diverse interests come up with a solution and then it's their idea. If they can come up with the discovery of the answer, they buy into the process."

b) Managing OHV use and minimizing resource damage is a concern across the board. There is general agreement that the issue should be addressed by involving multiple jurisdictions and that there be consistency in rules and regulations. "We can't do it in a vacuum – we've got to coordinate with State agencies, the towns and counties, local jurisdictions, local police enforcement, and with other federal agencies," said one person interviewed. One success to date is that the effort has succeeded in raising awareness of issues surrounding OHV management. A conservationist said, "The current situation clearly isn't working, but we think this proposal will only make matters worse." While the public may feel a different approach – in terms of both process and substance – should have been used by IDPR, they are willing to be part of the solution if asked and have offered to contribute both ideas and resources. They want to be included in the conversation.

c) A public involvement plan could have identified multiple strategies to involve the public from the very beginning, including the "sit and whittle" approach by a well-known, credible local person in the communities – including "having a cup of coffee down at the diner and at the mini-marts." One person interviewed said, "We could have done a better job getting the facts out to the public, for example, [getting] the word out that the route is already there, that this [is] basically a signing program, linking the towns to the trails, and promoting the towns." Another person said, "I wish we had told them [the local people] what we're doing and made them part of the solution process."

d) The steering committee may have benefited from a more formal organizational structure that addressed protocols to deal with meeting schedules, roles and responsibilities, strategies, and contingency planning in the event one of the steering committee members dropped out of the process. Because IDPR was fairly limited in terms of staff and resources, "the steering committee meetings were pretty informal" and records weren't always maintained. When staff members from participating agencies were transferred or resigned, "the process got stonewalled" and now "the project isn't on the front burner."

e) An assessment in the project's early life may have allowed the steering committee to identify possible issues and concerns ("barriers") that may have surfaced, and the assessment could have provided the opportunity to address these issues proactively. For example, the steering committee did not anticipate the current legal issue involving the trail crossing the Salmon River on Highway 93 (a federal highway), nor did it anticipate the public's reaction to such a large-scale project. "Maybe we should have started with a smaller scale, with a phased-in approach with a smaller system, determined the effects, and if they're beneficial, then expand it."

f) IDPR's approach was new, and made some members of the public uncomfortable: "We're used to seeing more things in the package…there's usually lots of information to supplement a proposal." The project never moved into a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis, which would have involved identifying issues and concerns and cumulative effects. For some persons interviewed, the NEPA process is

one with which they are familiar, and they have grown to trust that a thorough analysis will be done before alternatives are presented to the public. "Having an in-depth NEPA process is a key requirement for conservation groups.'

WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST OFF-ROAD VEHICLE (ORV) TRAILS

By Robert Fitzhenry and Debbie Chavez

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Wenatchee National Forest extends along the eastern side of the Cascade Mountains in central Washington State. About 40 percent of the 2.2 million acre Forest is designated as Wilderness, with 1,477 miles of Wilderness trail. The remaining land is managed for multiple benefits, such as timber harvest, livestock grazing, and a variety of recreational opportunities, including the use of off-highway vehicles (OHVs).

The Wenatchee OHV trails program began in the 1970s, with staff enthusiasts for snowmobiling and motorbike riding providing the early vision, in collaboration with user clubs. For much of the time since, the principle collaboration effort has been between the Forest Service, the motorized community, and local law enforcement in a joint effort to manage the established OHV system.

The combination of timing and leadership at the inception of the trail network let the Forest get ahead of the growth in demand for dirt bike and four wheel drive (4X4) trails, rather than scramble to establish management from an unmanaged situation. Additionally, the Forest and its partners were intolerant of resource damage from the outset, working from this guiding principle to educate motorized users and direct them to developed areas.

Today, the Wenatchee National Forest offers about 840 miles of single-track, multiuse trail designed with off-road motorcycles in mind. Challenge level varies from beginner to highly advanced, though most trails are at the intermediate level in terms of degree of difficulty. There are an additional 600 miles of 4X4 roads and more advanced 4X4 trails. The Forest offers some All-terrain Vehicle (ATV)/quad trails, but these are not developed and there are not enough of them to meet the growing need. There is currently no ATV/quad use on FS roads, out of respect for Washington State, which until 2005 essentially banned these vehicles on roads.

Grant funding from the Washington State Interagency Committee (IAC) for Outdoor Recreation has long been a key component in keeping the Wenatchee's trails maintained and patrolled. The State funding, provided through OHV registration fees and the Non-Highway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program, is used for the building and maintenance of trails and partially pays for OHV enforcement deputies in two counties that work with the Wenatchee National Forest. Volunteer work, provided by user groups, plays a significant role in the maintenance of the trail system and other amenities.

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS AND ROLES

The stakeholder group at large for the Wenatchee National Forest has grown over the years to adapt to changing conditions and demand. Motorized user groups and non-motorized forest users serve as advisors, project initiators, and volunteers. Activities are organized at the district level, with input from local advisory groups such as the Trails and Wilderness Interest Group (TWIG),

which works with the Naches Ranger District. (Not all districts have such interest groups.) The Forest Service, as landowner, provides leadership and holds responsibility for final decisions.

On management of the established OHV system, the primary partners remain the Forest, local law enforcement, and the motorized community. These stakeholders have a strong interest in education and enforcement. Those with enforcement authority include the Forest Service and county OHV enforcement deputies. The Forest Service and deputies work collaboratively on education, and motorized user groups fulfill a peer-policing role and are involved in educating their constituencies. While the Forest Service employs trail crews for the construction and maintenance of trails, user groups provide a significant volunteer force to share the workload.

At the State level, the IAC grants process brings together another group of stakeholders. Where the Wenatchee National Forest may apply for a grant, the awarding of funds for the project is reviewed and decided upon by the IAC stakeholder panel. State law directed changes to the make-up of the IAC panel in 2003 to include "…persons with recreational experience… including, but not limited to people with off-road vehicle, hiking, equestrian, mountain biking, hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing experience." Today, the IAC consists of two hikers, one equestrian, one mountain biker, three motorized users, three non-highway users, three state agency representatives, one local government representative, and one Forest Service representative (from the Wenatchee). Opinions differ on whether today's make-up was a needed or forced change, or whether the change fairly meets the desires of the motorized and non-motorized communities. Regardless, the members of this panel work on behalf of their organizations, facilitating communication and allowing involvement by diverse interests at all steps of the process—from grant request, though vetting, to award decision.

PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVES

The original objectives of the Wenatchee OHV trails remain today: to provide a managed recreational opportunity while conserving natural resources. The underlying belief is that good trails meet user experience needs, prevent cross-country travel, maintain the integrity of the landscape, and reduce conflict among user groups.

Requirements of OHV trail design incorporate both user desires and resource protection needs. This involves quality and quantity considerations for holding rider or driver interest. The Forest uses a benchmark estimate of 100 miles of trail for weekend users to maintain the fun, prevent overuse impacts, and minimize cross-country travel.

Education and enforcement objectives remain paramount; interviewees emphasized both as critical management goals. The Forest provides 15 - 20 rangers riding bikes and meeting users, and it works with OHV enforcement deputies in two counties. This staffing level is perhaps unique on public land and IAC grant funding is critical to making this happen. Where the Forest Service tends to focus on education, county deputies bolster enforcement capability. County deputies patrol roads and campgrounds, as well as Washington Department of Natural Resources land. They also respond to OHV-related issues on private land.

Key educational messages concern environmental impact, state laws, safety and skills, and ways of limiting user conflicts.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

The originators of the Wenatchee trails did not talk about achievements—they focused on fun balanced with responsible resource use. This perspective manifests itself today in the character of the trail system and in the interaction among the Forest Service and motorized users. While the network is established and in a management vice development phase, many interviewees consider it a success that the Wenatchee OHV trails remain open, at a satisfying level of mileage and degree of challenge. They see opportunities for motorized recreation declining in other places and consider it important to keep responsible uses available to meet the diverse interests in public land.

FOSTERING PROGRESS

Leadership and funding were identified as the keys to progress. While the original leadership and decision model on the Wenatchee has matured as society has grown to broader views regarding diversity in collaboration, the common thread has been commitment to multiple-use from the Forest leadership, local law enforcement, and the users. Leadership and commitment at the district level was also critical.

Recreation users meeting

The IAC grants program serves as the principle external source of money for enforcement, education, trail building and trail maintenance. With IAC funding so critical, the lack of other significant funding opportunities is seen as a weakness. The impact of this will bear out in the near future, as the IAC grant allocation structure changed in 2005. For many years, the majority of IAC grant dollars went for projects principally benefiting motorized users. The new structure redistributes the fund, with more money now available for non-motorized users, likely shrinking the dollars granted for Wenatchee OHV education, enforcement, and trail work.

KEY CHALLENGES

Tolerance of one another's interests between user groups remains a challenge, addressed through education and open communication. Equestrians and motorized users—communities once thought to be most at odds—have gained an appreciation of one another. The equestrian community appreciates that they and their horses can hear a motor coming and so the emergence of the vehicle is forewarned, whereas a quiet hiker or mountain biker can startle rider and horse.

Funding for enforcement, education, and trail work is a perpetual challenge. Considerable administrative burdens are still associated with grant application and fulfillment. Once a grant is in place and the trail work set to begin, such things as weather and fire can become important challenges, causing areas to be temporarily closed or given a new maintenance workload. Fire also impacts the Wenatchee's summer trail crews, as workers get pulled out for firefighting details.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

4X4 work party removing wooden bridge in an undesirable wet area

The Wenatchee National Forest has an established reputation for fun, responsible motorized recreation. Collaboration works from a multiple-use perspective, with interest groups working in partnerships with the districts to bring issues to the attention of the Forest Service. On the Naches Ranger District, the Trails and Wilderness Interest Group fills this capacity. At a larger level, the State IAC and its grant process serves as a framework for collaboration.

Feedback channels for collaborative efforts remain open and continuously monitored. Wenatchee National Forest staff listens to ensure that the needs of all users are heard and balanced with the overall goals and needs of the resource. The involvement of Wenatchee personnel on the IAC and other committees and groups interested in outdoors recreation is a key avenue of communication to and from the Forest. Other ingredients of collaboration on the Wenatchee included:

- Trust
- Getting together
- Setting out clear goals
- Periodically reassessing goals
- Deciding how collaboration will work and "Who does what?"
- Stakeholders talking openly with one another

LESSONS LEARNED

In terms of risk, a single confrontation between users or a single incident of illegal use can undo the good work of many responsible users. This is a concern of the Forest, the user groups, and law enforcement. Illegal actions are fought through approaches such as:

- Providing legal alternatives for illegal thrills by building trails that are so attractive to users that they won't care to go off-trail,
- Educating users if an opportunity isn't available, and directing them to a place that does offer the experience, and
- Anticipating the issues and addressing them before momentum builds.

While user conflicts seldom play out on the trail, they do enter the political arena, as well as such places as Internet chat rooms and letters to the editor in local newspapers. Many interviewees indicated that they combat this through education and communication that encourages all people to get along on the trail. The respect for this message rests in the multiple use commitment that the Wenatchee has made, and made known.

Perspectives differed among interviewees on what constituted the minimum threshold for conflict. While most expressed or implied their desire to share public land, some interviewees pointed to the behavior preferences of a portion of non-motorized users to avoid motorized/multi-use trails as resulting from conflict. Conflict here referred not to the non-motorized user's expectation of physical or verbal confrontation, but rather the disturbance of their experience by the sound, sight, or expectation of machines. In 1999, the hikers group the Washington Trails Association (WTA) conducted a survey of its membership, including questions on trail sharing. The WTA survey revealed 91% of respondents "strongly opposed" sharing trails with motorized vehicles, though in a similar 1990-1991 WTA survey, only 3% of subscribers to WTA's magazine felt off-road vehicles should be disallowed all together. While these statistics came not from the public at large but from the audience of WTA members, they relate to an established phenomenon of behavior choice occurring when multiple-use recreation co-exists. Users will make choices to share or avoid places where other forms of activity occur. Often, collaboration must balance this phenomenon with access rights to public land by diverse communities of users.

The establishment of the Wenatchee OHV opportunities preceded the growth in demand for motorized off-road recreation and the explosion in demand for recreation overall. The Wenatchee trails also preceded today's emphasis for collaboration on OHV networks between agencies, motorized users and non-motorized users. Regardless, interviewees from the non-motorized community consider it a disservice that they were not included at the table earlier along the way. This regards both the Wenatchee OHV trails and IAC make-up/NOVA funding process regulated by State law. Today, diverse representation from the many user communities must be considered when collaboration is planned on the management of existing multi-use networks or establishment of new ones.

STILL TO ACCOMPLISH

Work remains on improving the acceptance of OHV use by other groups, most notably hikers. OHV issues become material for political struggles rather than opportunities for people to come together to seek solutions. Over the past four to five years there has been a focus on bringing the hiking and motorized communities together, both on the Wenatchee and at the State IAC level, for the purpose of inclusiveness and to achieve greater mutual understanding.

There is interest in increasing opportunities for ATV/quad riders on the Wenatchee National Forest. In particular, interviewees noted that families would like to see more beginner-to-intermediate trails, since 4X4 trails are seen as too rugged and motorcycle trails too narrow.

The Forest and motorized community will have additional work securing funding for OHV projects in light of the State's changes to the IAC grant allocation structure.

OHV AND COLLABORATION: KEY LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE CASES[24]

The cases described above represent considerable diversity in the experience with OHV route inventory and designation, as well as with efforts to develop appropriate policies and procedures for enhanced and responsible OHV use. The attempt to show this wide range of experience is deliberate. We've chosen projects from places as different as California, Montana, New Hampshire, and Arkansas; projects that range from a single workshop in a single site (Caribou-Targhee), to long-term, statewide or multi-state efforts (such as the California OHV Stakeholders Roundtable and the Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota Interagency Working Group). We've highlighted several cases with activities on specific national forests (e.g., Wenatchee, Daniel Boone, Ouachita), as well as projects that cover multiple jurisdictions, over which broad-based multi-stakeholder alliances have been formed (Arizona OHV Inventory Partnership, Southeast Idaho Trail System).

This diversity in the cases is key to presenting a broad sense of the national experience with OHV implementation. It's also helpful in making important connections and drawing broader lessons from among the projects that offer some general guidelines and principles in implementing these projects, under any circumstances.

The theme that ties them all together, however, is the element of collaboration – an attempt, however imperfect, to bring together all of the key interest groups, or stakeholders, to craft something new, inclusive, positive, practical, and enduring. As noted in the introduction, the National OHV Implementation Team found that this aspect of OHV project management was an indispensable component – and perhaps the best predictor of project success. This is the reason we sought out cases that demonstrated the value and the challenge of integrating collaboration into the project's design.

As promised, the descriptions and the analyses of the cases are indeed brief – primarily to allow for easy accessibility and just a basic introduction to the project – but also to avoid overwhelming readers with excessive detail. Our aim here is to provide these concise descriptions to allow for more ready comparison and to offer a general contextual sense of the state of OHV project activities around the nation.

We've also tried – within the appropriate degree of discretion and diplomacy – to take an objective view of the projects. These cases were not chosen because they are models of success, and indeed we undertook this project with a common understanding that there is no such thing as a perfect success or an absolute failure. In many of the cases we acknowledge the mistakes made, the still unmet goals, the ongoing challenges, and the opportunities ahead.

But, ultimately, our aim in highlighting these cases was to provide an opportunity for us all – authors as well as readers – to draw a more global sense of what is happening on the ground with OHV projects and what can be learned from this experience. Our goal in examining these cases was to squeeze as much learning as possible from them in order to offer some basic conclusions,

[24] These lessons were compiled and edited by Larry Fisher, based on comments from and discussions with other members of the case study team: Kathleen Bond, Debra Chavez, Robert Fitzhenry, Cynthia Manning, Sharon Metzler, Marlene Finley, and Kevin Martin.

central ideas, cautionary insights, and general guidance for people working in this area. We've tried to offer at least a sense of what to plan for, what to look out for, and how to think strategically about developing OHV management projects.

So, with this in mind, we offer below our own collective sense of the key lessons that emerge from these case studies. Some of them may seem incredibly simple, blindingly obvious, and some may certainly read like clichés, platitudes, and generalities. But we've come to understand that, however pedestrian they may seem on the page, managers and participants not infrequently overlook them, and they do so at their own peril. For this reason, they are worthy of careful consideration in the design and implementation of these projects – whatever the context and stage of development.

1) Collaboration is in the eye of the beholder

It turns out that "collaboration" means different things to different stakeholders. To some, it means simple compromise; to others it means working together to do joint problem-solving; still others believe it means complete devolution of authority to a community group. The truth is that collaboration can involve a spectrum of activities and approaches – and a collaborative process does not always mean that everyone gets to have a piece of the pie. What it does mean – generally speaking – is that different viewpoints can be expressed, all voices heard, in a safe environment. It means working together (co-laboring) to achieve a common goal.

So, if the lead agency or one of the key stakeholder groups is coming from a take-no-prisoners, give-no-quarter position there may not be a compelling reason for others to join in the conversation or participate in the activity. It is therefore important to clarify what *type* of collaboration is being considered for which types of decisions – to communicate clearly the legal and administrative sideboards, define what's really up for discussion and action, and spell this out in a clear, unambiguous way for all those interested in participating.

2) Be inclusive

A truly collaborative effort must seek to invite all affected stakeholders into the conversation. Several of the cases highlight the problems encountered when one side of the collaborative equation was achieved (for example, government working with a portion of the stakeholder groups), but where others were somehow not invited to the table, and felt alienated in the process. While this may work some of the time for a particular piece of land or a specific activity, the power of collaboration is in seeing all sides of a decision or action, all the implications over a wider scale – and this contributes to wider, more complete, more durable solutions. A decision is diminished, and its implementation threatened, when key constituencies are not included in the process of crafting that decision.

3) Communicate. Communicate. Communicate.

Access to information is a hallmark of contemporary public lands management decision making, and the public's interest in this information is growing, as is their sophistication about how to

gather, use, and disseminate this information. Decisions made behind closed doors invite long-lasting mistrust, alienate key stakeholder groups, and ultimately make OHV management and enforcement a much more difficult task. In several of the cases, the lead agency or group failed to cast a wide enough net to inform interest groups, government entities, and landowners about the scope of the proposed project. In these cases, widespread misinformation and distrust was obvious even before the first public meeting. Of particular importance was stakeholders' interest in gaining access to consistent information and maps showing proposed routes.

4) Leadership is a key element of successful collaborative efforts

Leadership – and in this context truly visionary, accessible, and facilitative type of leaders – was frequently cited by interviewees as one of the most important ingredients of successful collaborative efforts. In most of these cases, we see a small group of champions helping to initially define goals, catalyze public interest, gain attention from key agencies, and secure necessary resources (people, funding, materials, influence) to make the project happen. These advocates for success – people who fervently believe that collaboration is the only path to success and that failure is not an option – generated both the passion and the trust that helped maintain the commitment over time.

5) Resources are helpful, too…

Innovative funding arrangements show up in several of the successful projects, and several interviewees acknowledged that funding was a necessary – if insufficient – element of successful OHV projects. Several of the projects cited the availability of grants (from federal, state, and private sources) that helped fund professional facilitators, note-takers, conveners, coaches, volunteer coordinators, equipment, and other needs or activities. Indeed, a key byproduct of collaboration appears to be the broader accessibility to essential resources to make these projects happen. Several of the projects highlighted the critical role of volunteers in providing local knowledge of trail conditions and use, and a highly motivated (and inexpensive) labor force for inventory work, in addition to their more traditional roles in trail construction, maintenance, repair, monitoring, and enforcement.

6) Plan to be involved forever….

A frequent refrain during the interviews was this simple (if paraphrased) conclusion: "It's about the relationships, stupid…." For this reason, it's important to look beyond the immediate decision, the meeting or event at hand, the NEPA process, or even the most recent conflict, to define a strategic approach to building relationships and partnerships that last. For many of the interviewees, collaboration was viewed as a new way of doing business, an approach that may take many forms, a process in which there may not always be absolute agreement. But the principle aim is for everyone to agree to stay engaged, civil, respectful, and meaningfully involved in crafting solutions and outcomes.

Yes, it was noted often that the collaborative process takes more time – particularly upfront – but this investment yields better results than time spent at the tail end of decisions, or after decisions

are made and the lead agency ends up spending its time defending itself against appeals, litigation, or dealing with poorly conceived and badly implemented decisions.

7) Form follows function: Appropriate organizational structure

While collaboration is often thought of as an informal process, the cases illustrate how important it is to have thoughtful, carefully designed organizational structures in place to encourage and guide effective ongoing collaboration. Sound organizational structures offer a system for communicating (both internally and externally) the clear identification of roles and responsibilities, regular and appropriate meetings, and guidelines on how information will be shared. Other elements that contribute to clarity in organizational structure: a) clear decision protocols, b) a road map and timeline for the decision process, c) good record-keeping and access to meeting minutes and other relevant information, d) effective means for bringing in new participants and getting them up to speed, e) the strategic use of professional facilitators to ensure a fair, civil process, and, f) a commitment to monitoring and adapting the process over time.

8) If you build it, they will come

The simple reality is that OHV use has increased dramatically in recent years, and motorized recreation has become one of the most salient features of public lands management in the 21st Century. Growth predictions must therefore drive the design of new trail networks. In cases where trail networks grew from existing dirt roads and trails, the opportunity to plan routes with a broader landscape in mind never presented itself. Trail planning must often take into account multiple jurisdictions (public and private) in a broad-scale, seamless approach to OHV management.

The corollary – "if you close it, they will show up elsewhere" – is also worth emphasizing. A landscape-scale approach is often the key to dealing with more localized challenges; these broader-scale solutions will be more durable over time.

9) Not all OHVs are created equal

There are a variety of types of off-road vehicles, and motorized users are not all after the same experience and terrain. And it is certainly true that the image, and also the impact of 4X4 driving, ATV riding, and dirt biking are all very different. Therefore, it's important to understand the differences in needs and interests for different off-road enthusiasts, to subdivide the "motorized" category, and offer a variety of solutions to meet these different needs. This is one of the reasons that trail development and other OHV-related proposals are often met with varying levels of acceptance, depending on the motorized use put forth.

10) And then there's the conflict…

Many of the interviewees acknowledged and shared concerns about the level of conflict associated with OHV use on public lands. Conflict was described at several levels: 1) at the field (or trail) level, between motorized and non-motorized users, and, 2) at the political, or

ideological level. In the cases, we've highlighted important examples of projects where user groups have chosen to work together in practical ways to mitigate and overcome some of the tensions between and among user groups. It does appear true that use conflicts can be resolved more effectively by those closer to the resource, particularly when they reach a common understanding and pursue creative approaches to resolving the problems. We also heard repeatedly about concerns for the image of OHV use, how it is being promoted by industry groups through media and advertising that depict wild, mud-slinging, sod-busting recklessness. On all sides of the issue, interviewees considered illegal use – the action of a small minority of irresponsible users – a major threat to constructive, responsible, recreational use of OHV. The cases demonstrate some of the creative ways people have been able to address this illegal behavior and promote safe recreational OHV use.

SECTION C

PERSPECTIVES

PERSPECTIVES ON OHV AND COLLABORATION

During the National OHV and Collaboration Summit, organizers sought to encourage attendance by a wide diversity of participants and perspectives. The discussions of the cases and the exchanges during the topical sessions were characterized by vivid, and occasionally contentious (though largely civil and constructive) debate, and many participants commented on the importance of being able to listen to, and at times contend with, people of different views and experiences. One participant captured the general tenor of the discussions by saying, "we don't want more 'happy talk' – we're going to need straight, honest discussion if we're ever going to resolve these issues."

We decided to try to represent some of these diverse perspectives, both to offer selected individuals the opportunity to provide their personal viewpoints on the cases and discussions, as well as to help readers understand the different ways participants perceived the cases and issues related to collaborative problem-solving. We asked writers to comment briefly on the broad themes and lessons that emerged from the cases and the discussions, and to write from their own experience and perspective, not seeking to represent a particular constituency or organization. They were encouraged to share some of their key observations, insights, and concerns, but also to raise questions, offer challenges, and be provocative.

The following Summit participants agreed to contribute these perspectives pieces to this section:

- Jim Hassenauer, Professor of Communication Studies, California State University at Northridge, and Former President and Board Member of the International Mountain Bicycling Association

- Scott Kovarovics, Director, Natural Trails and Waters Coalition

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

The comments presented here are not meant to be either comprehensive or complete in terms of representing the broad array of viewpoints on OHV and collaboration issues; they are but a small sample of this diversity. But we do hope these perspectives will enrich readers' own perspectives on the opportunities and challenges of promoting collaboration in OHV management. We also hope these comments will stimulate ongoing discussion and debate over these issues that is indeed a critical part of the collaborative process.

PERSPECTIVES ON OHV AND COLLABORATION

By Jim Hasenauer, Professor of Communication Studies, California State University at Northridge, and Former President and Board Member of the International Mountain Bicycling Association

I appreciated the opportunity to participate in the National OHV Summit, and the chance to review the case studies and related background materials prepared for the conference. I was impressed with the commitment, energy and spirit of collaboration of the many agency officials and the OHV stakeholders. Luther Propst's comments established a strong foundation for us thinking about collaborative recreational planning on public lands. The structure of the conference really enabled us to learn from each other, and I've learned a lot.

I wear two hats here. I'm a mountain bicycle advocate and I'm a professor of Communication Studies deeply interested in collaboration. As a bicyclist, this was a wonderful opportunity. Sometimes agencies sweep mountain bikes into OHV planning processes. Mountain bikers feel strongly that we are not OHVs and should not be managed as such. The conference and the case study materials gave me a chance to think about collaboration, planning, and policy development without having to be defensive or to be vigilant about my group's needs. I was able to "go to school" on the process. Thanks for that.

Most of my remarks come from the perspective of someone interested in communication, how people who are different come to construct shared meanings; not necessarily agreement, but understanding. I read all the conference materials and as I went to the different panels, I tried to be a good listener and to identify areas of consensus, ambiguity or confusion. That's what I'd like to focus on here.

One of the truisms in my discipline is that all communication has a content dimension and a relationship dimension. The content is what we're talking about: the topics, the language, the decision making, etc. The relationship dimension has to do with the way we are talking. Are we speaking as equals or are we talking up or speaking down? Is there trust or mistrust in the talk? Are we just trying to get through the encounter or does this talk set up ongoing future interaction?

"Collaboration" means working together. It presumes an ongoing relationship. It's not just being together or having talked to someone and then checking the talk off a "to do" list. It implies an ongoing relationship.

I sensed some confusion about this at the conference and in the case studies. Perhaps "collaboration" is just the word *du jour* for approaching decision making within the democratic tradition of public involvement. In the past, we've talked of public participation, of stakeholder processes, of partnerships. These terms may work as well.

One meaning embedded in the term collaboration is the difficulty of working with those who hold a different perspective. In the case studies, we heard the term collaboration applied to in-house, intra-agency discussions (which as many of you know is difficult enough). We also heard it applied to partnership arrangements between an agency and some particular outside group.

Finally, we heard it used to characterize long term talks between multiple stakeholders in multi-party, multi-issue disputes. Clearly this is the most difficult case.

Collaboration must focus on sharing decision making about the process as well as sharing the outcome decisions. I think collaboration requires more than just participating according to the rules established by others. It means participating in establishing those rules and then the process that follows. At its most powerful, collaboration means a commitment to shared decision making from beginning to end. It's a project full of challenges.

I tried to collect and organize some of the challenges I heard and read about this week and also some of the potential solutions or best practices. I've organized them into four categories:

First is the inherent difficulty of people working with those of other interests, perhaps with those with whom they strongly disagree. I heard some great ideas for overcoming this:

- We should acknowledge conflict, not deny it and we should make a commitment to find common ground.

- We need to identify superordinate goals, goals which no one can achieve without working together. They'll keep us coming back, engaged and committed.

- We need to have a future orientation. Focus on the common vision, rather than being bogged down in the past.

- Several speakers spoke of "place specific" thinking. All of you who work in land management, all of us who love outdoor recreation, we share this love of the specific places that we'll be talking about. Users and local land managers will have deep knowledge of the local landscape. This is both a commonality and a foundation for practical decision-making.

- We also heard that "success breeds success". As we approach collaboration we should start small, secure small agreements and build from there. Past success builds trust and is proof-positive that people can work together. Not all tasks are small, but sometimes big ones can be broken down into more manageable decisions.

The second theme I heard was concern about how long collaborative processes take. It sometimes seems a tremendous investment of time when similar outcomes could be made more quickly by the authority on the ground. This goes back to the idea of relationship building that I spoke of earlier.

- We need to re-frame this time as an investment in the relationship. Time spent may produce pay-offs in the future beyond the scope of the topic being discussed. At the very least it may save time later by preempting complaints or concerns about the process. It's certainly cheaper than going to court.

- When meetings involve the public, we need to make it easy for the public to participate. It helps when meetings are held at reasonable times, on a regular schedule. Then folks can plan and consent to their involvement. They will also know that if they can't participate, they need to find a representative.

- There's a similar need for employees. Collaboration has to be seen as normalized, part of a person's job duties, not a time-out, "make work exercise" or distraction.

Third, there are the very real problems of working with difficult people.

- I'm an advocate and I know that everyone involved in these issues is an advocate or works with them. Sometimes we can feel so strongly about our positions that we can be hard to work with. Sometimes, stakeholders are stubborn or even obstructionist. They don't want things to change and they'll sabotage talk that promotes it. This is a place where the process is important. If we establish ground rules and commitments early, they can help keep us focused when it's hard to relate. This is a place where trained neutral facilitators can make a big difference. Most importantly, we have to step up and model collaborative processes even when it's difficult. We have to listen, when we want to talk. Stay when we want to leave. Keep the relationship positive, even when we disagree.

- In many of the case studies, we heard of processes being affected by latecomers and newcomers. They don't have the background, the relationship or the commitments to be fully functioning. Documents of previous meetings and repetition of the ground rules can help to initiate them. I know of one ongoing process where members begin each meeting with a 10 minute history of how they came to be a collaborative group. To long-time members, it sometimes seemed like a waste of time, but it provided a common starting point and baseline for every meeting. It built cohesion.

- A particularly worrisome problem identified by a number of cases was that members who participated in collaborative processes sometimes lost their legitimacy with their own groups. They became scapegoats, castigated or ostracized for consorting with the enemy. These are difficult times; groups are often polarized; civility is in short supply. We must honor our peacemakers. We should celebrate our compromises and we must support others in the process. It's important that collaborators keep their home groups informed and it may be useful to sometimes widen the process so that all parties know of the difficult, important work that's being done.

The fourth theme may be the most abstract – that's the recognition that collaboration requires system-level change. We need more equal relationships between stakeholders and between stakeholders and land managers. Our adversarial models of advocacy stress combative rather than collaborative work. It's in our best interest to empower, rather than overwhelm each other and none of us are used to that. Our current relationships and organizations will inherently resist this kind of change. This calls for courage and leadership.

- A number of the readings, case studies and sessions at the conference reinforce the value of trained, neutral facilitators. They can help establish a commitment to a real collaboration and they're astute enough to recognize pseudo-collaboration when it tries to pass.

- In any process, there needs to be clarity of what's on the table, and what is not. What decisions can be made here? Who will ultimately make those decisions? This work is difficult enough without false expectations or disappointment when there isn't follow-through.

- The agencies have a vital role in establishing the frame of decision making and providing and verifying the information necessary that collaborators can do meaningful work. Information needs to be timely, useful and held in common so that expertise of all participants increases as the process goes on.

In sum, if "collaboration" is to be more than just the new term for old ways, we need to build our capacity to engage one another. This is difficult, but learnable behavior. If we develop our skill, we will benefit not only with better land use decisions and decision making, but with communities better equipped to deal with the great civic problem of our time – when people are different from one another – how do we establish respect, trust, common ground and concerted action?

This conference and the lessons gained from the readings and discussions may be a milestone in establishing a new way of approaching our work together. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

PERSPECTIVES ON OHV AND COLLABORATION

By Scott Kovarovics, Director
Natural Trails and Waters Coalition

The Natural Trails and Waters Coalition appreciates the opportunity to comment on the initial draft of the report, *Off-Highway Vehicle Use and Collaboration: Lessons Learned from Project Implementation* developed for the National Off-Highway Vehicle Collaboration Summit hosted by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on April 11-13, 2005. The Coalition includes nearly 120 conservation, recreation, hunting and other groups dedicated to protecting public lands and quiet recreational opportunities from unmanaged off-road vehicle use.

We would like to articulate what we see as the main challenges and opportunities with using collaboration as a tool for addressing off-road vehicle recreation on National Forests. We follow this list by a brief discussion of each of these, and finally our recommendations to the Forest Service to make collaboration a more effective tool.

The main challenges to effectively implementing collaboration on off-road vehicle issues include the lack of:

- agreement on the definition of collaboration;
- broad-based representation across the spectrum of interests;
- effective sideboards for defining what is and is not appropriate for a collaborative group to consider; and
- training and capacity for the agencies to implement collaboration.

The main opportunities for implementing collaboration include the potential to:

- build positive relationships among diverse members of the public and agency staff;
- increase compliance with route designations; and
- reduce recreational conflicts on the ground.

Defining Collaboration

The word "collaboration" means many different things to many different people. These differences are evident in the wide variety of case studies represented in the draft report. The effectiveness of some collaborative efforts has suffered because of these differing definitions and the failure to develop a common meaning that all participants share. The Coalition defines collaboration based on the following fundamental elements: 1) a natural resource is involved; 2) participation includes individuals representing different and often conflicting views and interests; and 3) the intention is for participants to work together to jointly reach a decision, make a recommendation or take some other action affecting that resource generally by approval of all or a significant majority of the participants.

Many of the examples in the draft report are not based on projects that included participation from individuals representing different and conflicting viewpoints. Since intense polarization is a significant issue in terms of off-road vehicle management, any future assessment of off-road vehicle collaborative efforts would ideally use a definition that includes element number two above.

Applicability of Collaboration to Off-road Vehicle Management

In the context of improving off-road vehicle management, collaboration can be appropriate, but it is not universally applicable. Most importantly, the agency has a legal obligation to manage the land in compliance with certain laws and regulations. Decisions related to those laws and regulations must remain in the purview of the agency, they cannot be delegated to a collaborative group. The agency must set sideboards for understanding which types of decisions are appropriate for collaborative groups to discuss and make recommendations on, and which types of decisions can only be discussed and determined by the agency (with public comment and analysis as required). Science is a key component of any sideboards that would be set and it is not up to the collaborative group itself to debate the merits of different scientific articles. Instead, the collaborative group could introduce the agency to additional science that land managers may not have been aware of as they completed their analysis.

In addition, collaboration is not universally appropriate because local citizens do not always have the tools to participate effectively. In some places the building blocks of success are present – shared values and some common ground, mutual respect, and a commitment to developing a solution that builds on that common ground. In other places, they are not and the agency has to be willing to recognize and acknowledge this and move to address pressing issues itself. Even if these building blocks are present, collaboration on this issue is almost certainly going to be challenging. Positions on all sides are strongly held and often diametrically opposed. Some view this issue in zero-sum terms where every road, route or path is appropriate or inappropriate. Under these circumstances, land management agencies cannot simply invite people to participate, encourage them to work together, and then hope for the best. The foundation for success must be laid at the very beginning, and agencies have a critical role to play in helping to establish specific ground rules and sideboards, clearly articulating the decisions to be made and by whom, and closely monitoring the group's progress.

Building Agency Capacity

While the agency is actively promoting collaboration as a tool for resolving off-road vehicle conflicts, Forest Service employees have only limited resources for effectively implementing collaboration. This message is clear in several of the case studies discussed in the draft report. Without adequate capacity and good leadership, collaborative processes can degenerate, which could even sour the public on participation in future projects. Nonetheless, the agency has not invested in its own staff to give them the tools they need to carry out collaboration on the scale the agency may be considering.

Building Positive Relationships Among Diverse Interests

One of the key problems with off-road vehicle management is the polarizing nature of this issue and the different positions between the interests/stakeholders affected by management changes. By bringing people together to build decisions using collaboration, the agency has the potential to diffuse the tensions between the different interests and to enhance land management on the ground. Experience across the country demonstrates that relationships between diverse interests built through effective collaboration can continue once a particular process concludes. For

example, participants in California's successful OHV Stakeholders Roundtable have been able to work on off-road vehicle issues outside of the Roundtable structure.

Increasing Compliance with Route Designations and Reducing Conflicts

If the agency develops a neutral collaborative process, including all potential stakeholders, and that group agrees to certain route designations, then it is more likely that these designations will be followed after the process has been completed. Meaningful ownership of the process, and an understanding of why certain routes are open and others are closed, could significantly enhance compliance thereby reducing enforcement efforts and expenses. Similarly, if people are participating in a meaningful process to designate routes, then they will be more likely to comply with the regulations and to use peer pressure to encourage others to do so as well.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The case study document prepared for the Summit represents a first step toward compiling best practices and providing agency staff and the public with useful examples and lessons learned. In an era where the agency is engaging in collaborative processes to resolve a wide range of management issues, it is surprising that this report does not include any cases assessing efforts unrelated to the off-road vehicle issue. The report makes it somewhat clear that collaboration is still in its infancy in terms of its application to off-road vehicle management. As a result, it would be helpful to include examples from other realms of Forest Service management, where collaboration has been used effectively to bring diverse stakeholders together to solve problems. Collaboration is a prime example of an arena in which agency staff can learn from each other based on previous and ongoing experiences.

In closing, we appreciate the opportunity to highlight some of fundamental principles on which we believe collaborative decision-making should be based. First and foremost, an agency has to start with an honest assessment of whether or not collaboration is appropriate based on the issue, its legal responsibilities, the basic positions of the interests to be engaged, and its capacity/expertise concerning collaboration. In addition, the agency must set up a neutral playing field for any potential collaborative process. If the process is unbalanced, interests on all sides will be very reluctant to participate. If this assessment concludes collaboration is appropriate and can be productive, then:

- Agencies must have systematic and consistent guidelines for any collaborative process to ensure similar issues are addressed with similar approaches, information, and rules across the country.
- Agencies must establish clear ground rules and sideboards. The legal and regulatory requirements and constraints should be made clear from the outset and serve as the fundamental sideboards of any process.
- Agencies must ensure truly balanced representation of interests and should consider using a neutral party to interview and select participants.
- Processes must utilize neutral/trained facilitation (using agency staff or third parties).

- Agencies need to invest in training/capacity-building for their staff on this issue.
- Agencies have a responsibility to articulate the core science at the beginning of the process and provide any collaborative group with the opportunity ask questions, offer additional peer-reviewed science, and identify critical information gaps. Unless credibly disqualified, this science should become part of the objective standards and sideboards that will guide decision-making rather than become endless debating points.
- Agencies must articulate whether or not decisions will be made and if so, what they are and who will make them.
- When collaboration produces an agreement between diverse interests, the agency has a responsibility to implement it in good faith provided it complies with legal and regulatory requirements. Failure to do so undermines the confidence of all participants and increases the likelihood that they may not engage in the future.

We appreciate the opportunity to share our views and look forward to working with the Institute and Forest Service staff on this issue in the future.

PERSPECTIVES ON OHV AND COLLABORATION

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

The following comments are submitted as an off-highway vehicle enthusiast and as a professional working in the field of OHV recreation education. The stated goals of the workshop, to provide a forum, share lessons learned in collaborative efforts, and consider public involvement in OHV route designation was largely successful. Throughout the Summit one found oneself sitting next to, walking beside, eating with or huddled in discussion with agency, environmental advocacy, motorized and non-motorized recreation, mediation, and industry folks. Case studies focused on positive collaborative efforts with no holds barred on admitting when things went wrong.

The emphasis on collaboration to facilitate more effective route designation efforts can be positive. With skilled facilitation, thorough and productive understanding of specific issues, rather then positions, can be gained. The end result is that land managers can address real issues even if agreements cannot be reached.

Of concern is getting the necessary groups to the table that have a genuine desire to find solutions through the collaborative process.

Of equal concern is relying on collaboration and route designation as a cure-all for OHV recreation management challenges that have developed over the past 35 years.

The following are thoughts on effective participation by OHV interests, including off-highway motorcycle (OHMs), all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and four-wheel drive (4WD), in collaborative efforts and management direction within and beyond the collaboration and route designation process.

The OHV public typically says that they are not joiners, that they are independent and that they are a working public that doesn't have time for "a bunch of meetings." Right or wrong it doesn't matter. This is the responsibility of OHV leadership organizations from club level up to identify those who can and will responsibly represent their interests at meetings wherever and whenever they're held over whatever time it takes. If we're not at the table, shame on us.

The agencies' responsibilities are to develop inclusive groups and to provide professional facilitation, including at least introductory collaboration training, to the representatives that come to the table. If an agency does not already have working relationships with the OHM, ATV and 4WD communities in their area their obligation is to go to regional and national organizations for assistance. When the collaboration process is complete they must follow through with the consensus of the group or if no consensus is reached to proceed with professional management including actions that address the real issues identified in the collaboration process rather then what is easiest or in reaction to threatened court action.

If effective OHV management is the goal, collaborative efforts and management actions must include all components of good management. Simply, collaboration members and agency staff

must have a common understanding of the importance and interrelationship of the 4E's: engineering, education, enforcement and evaluation.

Engineering will broaden the selection and improve the sustainability of trails, trail systems, and areas. Redesigning or relocating a trail with desirable trail attributes can increase compliance by providing a vastly better trail experience while at the same time reducing environmental and social impacts.

Education tells the visitor what you expect of them. You cannot be upset with what the public does if you do not tell them what you want them to do. Education is a must! Signs, maps, kiosks, and websites that clearly state the rules and regulations, let the public know where they can and cannot go, and let them know the neat things about an area that enhance the experience, can increase compliance, reduce impacts, and provide the enforcement justification to take action that will stand up in court.

Enforcement is as necessary on a trail as it is on a highway. Volunteer patrols and non-enforcement staff can provide the presence and peer pressure that reduce (but do not replace) the need for enforcement officers.

Evaluation makes sure we do things right. If we don't or conditions change an evaluation process, that's actually used not filed, will correct mistakes before they become monumental problems and address change so that we can continue to meet visitor needs without jeopardizing natural and cultural resources.

Without recognizing the interrelationship of the 4E's and supporting its principles, effective collaborative decisions and management actions will be difficult.

A final concern is how we build compliance by the general OHV public as implementation of route designation takes place. How do we break through the "we don't have the money," "we don't have the time," "we don't have the staff," "it's just a few bad apples," "I didn't know," "I saw it in a magazine," and "you can't catch me" excuses and challenges?

OHV management challenges did not develop overnight and we will not be able to correct them with just route designation. What we need is a massive attention-getting education effort on the scale of "Got Milk." Here may be the most effective opportunity for collaboration by agencies and organizations – to create a universally supported "stay on the trail" message followed by additional responsible recreation ethic messages put repeatedly in front of the OHV public.

When California legislation, developed by the CA Off-Highway Vehicle Stakeholder Roundtable, reduced the allowable OHV sound level from 99 dB to 96 dB, the Stakeholder organization and agency members mounted a statewide educational effort to reach the OHV public in every conceivable way. Post cards, websites, flyers, DMV notices, newsletters, event sound tests, and magazine articles made it difficult after a nine month period to find any enthusiast within the State who had not gotten the word.

Beginning with Executive Orders in 1972, 1977 and 1987, to the 2001 BLM "National Management Strategy for Motorized OHV Use on Public Lands" to today's USFS "Four Threats" verbal direction has been to provide appropriate management. It is hoped that the Summit and these case studies, particularly the key lessons learned, will be the catalyst that drives the talk to action, including dedicated funding and active management beyond just route designation.