

Trail Working Group
Minutes, January 22, 2002

Present: Chuck Anderson, Tony Biegen, Allyson Biskner, Otis Calef, Jim Childress, Ray Ford, Kalon Kelley, Carolina Morgan, Art Najera, Chris Orr, Brian Robinson, Sharon Sprouse, Ray Smith, Kelly Steelman, and Sarah Worth.

I. Meeting was called to order at 4:10 P.M.

II. Report From Interagency Meeting

Brian reported on a meeting which was held on January 7 among the various agencies responsible for the local front country trails (city, county, forest service). It was agreed by these agencies that they could support a committee recommendation but only if it were based on a measurable study first. What they wanted included:

- 1) A baseline study
- 2) One trail to be chosen for study
- 3) Based on that study a decision would be developed on what strategies would be applied to that trail, with follow up studies to be done to see how well the strategies were working
- 4) This trail would be used as a case study for how solutions might implemented on the other front country trails.
- 5) The study would be undertaken by the agencies with input and support from the committee

Concern was expressed by Kalon that decisions were being made by the agencies outside the group process. Several others concurred. The point was made, however, that for any of our efforts to be successful we needed buy-in from the agencies since they would be the ones who would need to make the final decisions.

Art added that what we needed was an “objective, fair study constructed in a way to get us the information we really needed. We understand there is a conflict and now we need to measure how great it is.”

III. Perception Index

Brian handed out a simplified version of the Perception Index developed in an earlier meeting and asked each of us to fill it out as an exercise to determine which trail would be good to use as a case study.

Looking at what we filled out it appeared there was a perception of conflict on most of the trails with Tunnel receiving a slightly (though not significantly) higher score for perceived conflict.

IV. Trail Survey Discussion

Based on the results of the study and the mandate we were given by the agencies, quite a bit of time was taken to discuss which trail should be used for the study. Eventually it was decided we should perform our study on the Tunnel Trail.

V. Subcommittee Meeting

A sub-committee was created to begin developing information for the study. Tony, Kerry, Brian, Ray F, Ray S and Chuck volunteered to be on the sub-committee.

The meeting of this group was held on Tuesday January 28 at the Tynan offices. Brian led off with an initial statement about what we needed to get done in the next few weeks before our next full committee meeting and assigned chores:

- 1) Develop questions--elicit survey questions (Chuck & Tony)
- 2) Research data--see what existing data is out there (Ray & Brian)
- 3) Resource availability—find out what resources are available to help support the study (Kerry)

VII. Range of Solutions

It was agreed the group should begin to develop a range of potential solutions for discussion. Ray suggested that everyone could send their suggestions to the listserv so everyone would get a copy and Ray volunteered to put them together for the next meeting.

VIII. Adjourn

We adjourned about 6PM.